

## Annex 6A: Draft guidelines for composing rapporteur teams

This document aims to provide a step-based summary of the process to compose rapporteur teams (collectively referring to rapporteurs, co-rapporteurs, and vice rapporteurs).

This document is provided for information only and is not legally binding in any way. It provides guidance only insofar as it remains fully compliant with the ITU Convention and all resolutions of the Plenipotentiary and World Telecommunication Development Conferences, with particular regard to PP Resolution 208 and WTDC Resolution 1.

### Summary of Steps

This document structures the process for composing rapporteur teams in seven steps and describes them in chronological order.

#### Invitation

1. *At some point following WTDC*, the BDT sends a letter of invitation for nominations to ITU-D members.

#### Nomination Process

2. *For a recommended period of at least four weeks*, ITU-D members submit nominations via online form.
3. *During this period*, the BDT assures the validity of each nomination received.
4. *Once the deadline has passed*, the BDT identifies overfill for roles for each study Question.

#### Informal Consultations

5. *Recommended at least one month before the first SG meeting*, members affected by overfill are notified and invited to begin informal consultations.

#### Team Composition

6. *At least 12 days before the first SG meeting (per WTDC Res 1 section 4.2.1.1)*, the Study Group Chairs compose a draft proposal for the rapporteur teams, with consideration to overall team composition and evaluation of individual nominations.
7. *At first Study Group meeting*, the Study Group approves the rapporteur teams in plenary.

---

### Invitation

The BDT should send a letter of invitation for nominations to ITU-D members, associates, and academia. In that letter, it should note:

- Eligibility criteria for valid nominations (in alignment with PP Resolution 208 & WTDC Resolution 1, see below);
- The critical nature of institutional support for individuals to successfully contribute over the years of the study cycle, including time allocations to prepare and attend meetings and to manage the Question's workload;
- The total number of vice rapporteurs proposed by any administration should be reasonable, so as to observe the principle of **equitable distribution** of posts among the Member States concerned (in alignment with PP Resolution 208 Annex 3 *recital* 4);
- The Plenipotentiary Conference's encouragement to Member States and Sector Members to make efforts to ensure gender-balanced representation in candidatures for leadership roles (per PP Resolution 58 *encourages Member States and Sector Members* 9) and WTDC's

invitation to Member States to candidatures for rapporteur and vice rapporteur roles in order to support the active involvement of women as well as men (per WTDC Resolution 55 *invites Member States and Sector Members 1*);

- The objective for each Study Group to compose dedicated, stable rapporteur teams with competent participants who reflect the diversity of ITU-D's membership;
- Nominations will be evaluated based on each candidate's experience and ability to participate and their member's motivation; and
- These guidelines, informed by the ITU Convention, PP Resolution 208, and WTDC Resolution 1, will be used to evaluate nominations in the event of any overfills of each rapporteur team (and an indication on when an overfill occurs, see below).

A copy of these guidelines should be made available on the ITU website.

## Nomination Process

ITU-D members shall be provided a clear process for the submission of nominations and a deadline by which nominations must be received.

Upon receipt of a nomination, the BDT should evaluate its eligibility. Namely, that the nomination:

- Is affiliated to a Member State, ITU-D Sector Member, Associate, or Academia (per WTDC Resolution 1, 3.3.1); and
- *For rapporteurships*, includes information that enables the Study Group to assess the candidate's expertise, ability to coordinate, and ability to actively participate in ITU-D activities (per WTDC Res 1, 3.3.3) including **physical participation** in the Study Group meetings (twice per year); or
- *For vice rapporteurships*, includes information that enables the Study Group to assess the candidate's expertise and experience related to the study Question (per WTDC Res 1, 3.3.5). [physical participation requirement + number of contributions + tasks at Question mgt team level ]

Should a revised, eligible nomination be received by the deadline, the Study Group can consider the nomination. The BDT should make every effort to support each nomination to be complete and eligible: revisions after the deadline to an initial nomination received before the deadline should be considered where at all possible.

Based upon eligible nominations, the BDT should indicate to the Study Group Chairs which rapporteur positions have more than one nomination and which rapporteur teams have more than **two nominations for a vice rapporteur position from any one region**.<sup>1</sup> Any such instance should be treated as an *overfill* of the rapporteur team.

## Informal Consultations

In the event of an overfill of a rapporteur team, the BDT in coordination with the Study Group Chairs, should notify the affected members of this fact and provide sufficient information and time for informal consultations among them. This notification should include:

- *In the context of rapporteurships*, a request for the member to reaffirm that they are prepared to allocate sufficient time (estimated at an average of four hours per working week)

---

<sup>1</sup> The word 'region' here is concordant with the definition from WTDC Resolution 31.

and budget (the cost of physical participation in two meetings per year, with supporting information from BDT on fellowships) for each affected candidate to participate in their study Question and notice that any candidate not so reaffirmed may be deferred for a vice rapporteurship;

- *In the context of vice rapporteurships*, a request for the member to reaffirm that they are prepared to allocate sufficient time (estimated at an average of two hours per working week) and budget (with supporting information from BDT on fellowships) for each affected candidate to participate in their study Question;
- A designated period of time for informal consultations that does not extend past one month before the first Study Group meeting of the cycle;
- Information on all of the candidacies that constitute the overfill (in line with the current Web portal of submitted candidacies);
- The objective for the Study Group to compose dedicated, stable rapporteur teams with competent participants who reflect the diversity of ITU-D's membership, in line with the ITU Convention, PP Resolution 208, and WTDC Resolution 1;
- A reminder that in any persistent overfill after informal consultations will be resolved by the Study Group, using these guidelines and based on each candidate's experience and ability to participate; and
- A reminder that those not a part of a rapporteur team can and should remain active participants in all of the study Question's activities.

Based on this notification, members may conduct informal consultations among themselves to aide the process of resolving any overfill. This might include withdrawing or revising one or more nominations with the objective to help facilitate the Study Groups' composition of rapporteur teams — but the option for any of these actions remains at the discretion of the member.<sup>2</sup>

- Among nominations for *rapporteurship*, efforts should focus on reducing the number of candidacies, identifying willing co-rapporteurs, and/or reaffirming each candidate's institutional support (including time) to attend the Study Group meetings physically twice a year.
- Among nominations for *vice rapporteurship*, efforts should focus on reducing the number of candidacies to no more than two per region per study Question.

## Team Composition

In the event that any overfill persists after the period of informal consultations, it remains the responsibility of each of the Study Groups to compose dedicated, stable rapporteur teams with competent participants who reflect the diversity of ITU-D's membership for each study Question.

Several factors contribute to the composition of a rapporteur team. These include:

- Each candidate has the requisite experience and ability themselves and institutional support (including time) from their member to participate actively;
  - In the case of a rapporteur or co-rapporteur candidate, this includes being physically present for both meetings each year;

---

<sup>2</sup> For the avoidance of doubt, no member is required to take any of these mentioned actions: it remains the right of any member to submit nominations and to maintain them unchanged through this period of informal consultations.

- The team represents the diversity of the ITU-D's membership through the individuals' gender and ability and through members' membership category and region; and
- The team is of an appropriate number that rapporteurs can effectively lead the work and vice rapporteurs have sufficient opportunity to contribute meaningfully and develop new skills in leadership (in alignment with PP Res 208 *resolves* 2).

Unless provided by the ITU Convention or a PP or WTDC Resolution, no single factor should disqualify or exclusively characterise any nomination. One example is known:

- WTDC Resolution 1, 3.3.1: An individual can only be a rapporteur or co-rapporteur to a single study Question.

However, a number of factors can contribute to the holistic evaluation of nominations. *Ceteris paribus*, a nomination should be preferred when:<sup>3</sup>

- The candidate is a Chair or Vice Chair of the Study Group to the relevant study Question (per PP Resolution 208 *resolves further* 1);
- The candidate is from a country that does not otherwise hold any other rapporteur, co-rapporteur, or vice rapporteur position within the Study Group (in alignment with PP Resolution 208 *resolves further* 3);
- The candidate has demonstrated experience, within the ITU or elsewhere, concordant with their role's responsibilities (see *Rapporteur's checklist*, WTDC Resolution 1 Annex 5);
- The candidate has demonstrated experience in the ways of working within the ITU at any level and within any part of the Union;
- The candidate has participated in a previous study cycle;
- The candidate has actively participated in a rapporteur, co-rapporteur, or vice rapporteur position in the previous study cycle and is standing for renomination;
- The candidate has been physically present in a previous meeting of the Study Group;
- Financial and time support for the candidate's nomination has been reaffirmed by the member (where and as appropriate); or
- The candidate contributes to a greater diversity of the rapporteur team, with regard to individuals' gender and ability and to members' membership category and region.

Inversely, *ceteris paribus*, a nomination should be deprioritised when:<sup>4</sup>

- *In the context of a vice rapporteur's renomination*, the candidate failed to participate (either physically or remotely) in at least half of all Study Group meetings during the previous study period (in alignment with PP Resolution 208 Annex 3 *recital* 6);
- The candidate was a rapporteur or co-rapporteur in the previous study cycle and did not physically attend more than one meeting of the study Question;
- The candidate was a rapporteur, co-rapporteur, or vice rapporteur in the previous study cycle and did not submit any written contribution to the study Question over the duration of the study cycle;<sup>5</sup> or
- Financial and time support for the candidate's nomination has not been reaffirmed by the member (where and as appropriate).

---

<sup>3</sup> This the order of items on this list does not assume any ranking between the items of this list.

<sup>4</sup> This the order of items on this list does not assume any ranking between the items of this list.

<sup>5</sup> This includes editing chapters of text within the final report, any interim deliverable, and/or meeting reports.

This deprioritisation might include the deferral of a rapporteur or co-rapporteur candidate to a vice rapporteurship, given the critical nature of a (co-)rapporteur's physical presence to adequately chair the study Question (in line with the *Rapporteur's checklist*, WTDC Res 1 Annex 5).

To aide this process of evaluation, the BDT should prepare a report, circulated in an unabridged version only to the Study Group Chairs and Vice Chairs and to members as relates only to their own candidates, that includes, for each candidate:

- An indication if the member's support for the candidate has been reaffirmed (where and as appropriate);
- The number of study group meetings that the candidate attended in the last cycle, if any; and
- *In the context of rapporteurships only*, the number of study group meetings that the candidate was recorded as physically present, if any.

Based on this information and with these guidelines, the Study Group Chairs should assemble a draft proposal for each rapporteur team within each Study Group and submit this as a written contribution to the first Study Group meeting. In that effort, they should:

- Give particular consideration to the requirements of **competence and equitable geographical distribution** as possible and to the need to promote more efficient participation by developing countries (per No. 242 of the ITU Convention, emphasis added);
  - This competence of any candidate should be evaluated based on the information provided by the BDT and supporting information provided by the nominating member;
- Appoint **only the number of vice-rapporteurs deemed necessary** for the efficient and effective management and functioning of the Question (in alignment with PP Res 208 *resolves 2*, emphasis added);
- Ensure appropriate representation from **developing countries**, including the least developed countries, small island developing states, landlocked developing countries and countries with economies in transition (in alignment with PP Resolution 208 Annex 2 *recital 1*, emphasis added); and
- Utilise the human resources of as **broad a range of Member States and Sector Members** as possible within the rapporteur team (per PP Resolution 208 Annex 3 *recital 2*, emphasis added).

Before submission of the draft proposal to the Study Group, it should be shared for consultation with the proposed rapporteurs (and/or co-rapporteurs, if appropriate), as relates only to the study Question for which they are provisionally to lead. The Study Group Chair may revise their draft proposal based on this consultation before submission.

Ultimately, this draft proposal will then need to be adopted by the Study Group at its first meeting, with or without amendments, in accordance with WTDC Res 1 3.3.5. This remains the formal process of appointment for all rapporteurs, co-rapporteurs, and vice rapporteurs.