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1. **Introduction**

**1.1** The Secretary-General Mr. Houlin Zhao, welcomed the participants to the second meeting of EG-ITRs. He stressed the importance of the work that lies ahead of the Group and highlighted that it is very important that Sector Members actively participate in the process of the review of the ITRs.

**1.2** The Chairman thanked the Secretary-General, Deputy Secretary-General and Directors for their support. The Chairman stressed the need for the Group to work together in the spirit of consensus and thanked the Vice Chairs for their valuable support and advice. The Chairman stated that the milestones he was looking for by the end of this 2nd meeting was to have an agreement on: (a) the structure of the final report to Council 2018 (b) an agreed process for completing the final report.

**2 Adoption of the Agenda and allocation of documents**

The Agenda (Document EG-ITRs 2/1 (Rev.2)) was presented by the Chairman and adopted as presented. The Chairman clarified that Document EG-ITRs 2/10 was reserved for a draft contribution which was later withdrawn by the Member State. EG-ITRS 1/10 was a contribution from Vimplecom (now VEON) to the first meeting of the group. At the first meeting, the group agreed for this contribution be carried over to the next meeting.

**3 Summary of Contributions**

The Chairman proposed that – (a) the contributions would be presented in the order that they have been received. (b) After the presentation of each contribution, the floor will be opened for clarifications only. (c) A more detailed discussion would follow after all contributions have been presented. This proposal was accepted by the group.

The contributions presented are summarized as follows:

**3.1 Contribution EG-ITRs 2/2 from United States –United States views on the structure of the final report on the review of the ITRs**

The United States is of the view that the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the EG-ITRs should form the structure of the final report. Thus, three issues are essential to the review of the ITRs and could serve as the major sections of the final report: (1) applicability of the 2012 ITRs in a rapidly evolving international telecommunication environment; (2) legal analysis of the 2012 ITRs; and (3) analysis of any potential conflicts between the obligations of signatories to the 2012 ITRs and signatories to the 1988 ITRs with respect to the implementation of the provisions of the 1988 and the 2012 treaties. The United States believes that the ITRs are no longer applicable or relevant. The United States has serious concerns about the scope of the 2012 ITRs. Furthermore, we do not foresee any potential conflicts between the 1988 and the 2012 ITRs. Considering the inevitability of diverging views on the each of the review items, the United States believes that the report should include all views on the issues and should refrain from reaching any conclusions or making any recommendations.

**3.2 Contribution EG-ITRs 2/3 from Russian Federation, the Republic of Armenia, the Republic of Belarus and the Kyrgyz Republic – Increasing the efficiency of the work of the EG-ITRs**

Russian Federation introduced document EG-ITRs 2/3 (previously submitted to C17 by the Russian Federation, the Republic of Armenia, the Republic of Belarus and the Kyrgyz Republic), proposing that the structure of the Final report of the EG-ITRs should be based on the EG-ITRs Terms of Reference adopted by the ITU Council Resolution 1379.

 **3.3 Contribution EG-ITRs 2/4 from the Federative Republic of Brazil –Review of the ITRs**

Contribution 4 presented four dimensions to be addressed in a review of the ITRs: the applicability of the ITRs; the need for a periodic review of the ITRs; the cost-benefits of holding a new WCIT; and the impacts of the ITRs/WCIT on international cooperation and ITU's reputation. The contribution argues that a general consensus among all ITU members that the ITRs are necessary to govern the global provision of international telecommunications/ICTs is a necessary requirement in a decision to hold a formal revision by the ITRs in a new WCIT. The contribution supports a periodic and ongoing review of the ITRs and its issues by Council in its annual sessions and by ITU-T Study Groups, without the need to maintain formal groups such as the EG-ITRs. The contribution reflects on of the costs involving a formal revision of the ITRs, including a new WCIT, the preparatory process, and the opportunity costs for all involved, and argues that a new WCIT should provide benefit that outset these costs. Finally, the contribution reminds of the negative/unsatisfactory results achieved by WCIT-12, and proposes that a new WCIT should only be held if there is a previous consensus on the need of new ITRs and a general willingness to accede to a treaty.

**3.4 Contribution EG-ITRs 2/5 from NTT DOCOMO –Review of the ITRs**

NTT DOCOMO presented its contribution 2/5, in which it responded to a question regarding the potential conflicts arising from the existence of two versions of the ITRs. It suggested that the company had never experienced any issues or conflicts from the existence of the ITRs because its business is based mostly on private, contractual agreements. It believed that detailed rules should not be set at the treaty level considering that the degree of technological development and the maturity of the market vary among countries, and that further revision of ITRs is not necessary in this rapidly changing international telecommunications market.

**3.5 Contribution EG-ITRs 2/6 from the Russian Federation - Review of the ITRs**

Russian Federation proposed to invite the Council 2018 to include into the EG-ITRs Final Report the view on the reasonability for all stakeholders to reach a broad consensus with regard to adoption of a single version of ITRs by the ITU Member States for the purpose of establishing a beneficial environment for development and operation of international telecommunications/ICTs.

**3.6 Contribution EG-ITRs 2/7 from the Russian Federation - Proposals on the structure of the final report of the Expert Group on the ITRs**

Russian Federation proposed the following structure of the EG-ITRs final report:

**1 Introduction**

**2 Future review of the 2012 ITRs**

2.1 Impact of new trends in telecommunication/ICT on the 2012 ITRs

2.2 Provisions of the 2012 ITRs that may require future review

**3 Applicability of the 2012 ITRs**

3.1 Legal analysis of the 2012 ITRs

3.2 Applicability of the 2012 ITRs in a rapidly evolving international telecommunication environment

3.3 Analysis of any potential conflicts between the obligations of signatories to the 2012 ITRs and signatories to the 1988 ITRs with respect to implementation of the provisions of the 1988 and 2012 ITRs

**4. Applicability of the WCIT-12 Resolutions**

[4.1 Analysis of issues that may arise from the implementation of the WCIT-12 Resolutions]

**5 Conclusion**

This proposal is based on the EG-ITRs Terms of Reference adopted by the ITU Council Resolution 1379, and aims to increase the efficiency of EG-ITRs work.

**3.7 Contribution EG-ITRs 2/8 from Austria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Slovakia, Sweden and the United Kingdom - Review of the 2012 ITRs**

Austria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Slovakia, Sweden and the United Kingdom noted that the task of the Expert Group was not to discuss revisions to the ITRs or propose a new World Conference on International Telecommunications (WCIT). They expressed concern that a new WCIT would open up a wide range of issues for discussion and that this would cause long-term uncertainty, which would make it difficult for operators to take investment decisions. They were not aware of any particular difficulties caused by the status quo or by conflicts between the 1988 and 2012 ITRs. The ITRs should remain focused on relevant international public telecommunications issues and should not be extended to domestic issues or to issues related to the Internet. They were committed to strengthening the ITU as a consensus-based organization and said that we should avoid division, as finding global consensus would be extremely difficult. They noted the significant costs of convening a WCIT, including the opportunity costs. We faced many challenges to increase investment in infrastructure and connectivity and to tackle the digital divide. Rather than another re-negotiation of the ITRs, our focus instead should be on delivering the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda.

**3.8 Contribution EG-ITRs 2/9 from Bell Mobility, KDDI, América Móvil, BT, AT&T, Verizon - Review of the 2012 International Telecommunication Regulations**

Based on the collective operational experience of the Sector Members noted above, the ITRs are no longer applicable to or relevant in today’s highly competitive international telecommunications market. Most, if not all, international traffic exchanged by the companies globally is done so through commercially-negotiated agreements. To their knowledge, there are very few countries that continue to rely on the ITR-based accounting rate regime, and such traffic accounts only for less than 1% of global traffic flows. The emergence of multiple competing private-sector operators in each country has resulted in a competitive landscape that does not require any treaty instrument like the ITRs. Furthermore, in response to questions from Member States regarding the potential challenges arising from the implementation of the 2012 ITRs, the Sector Members have not experienced any practical obstacles in this regard.

**3.9 Contribution EG-ITRs 2/11 from Japan - Japan's views on the review of ITRs**

Japan conducted the questionnaire survey on the ITRs and received answers from 12 Japanese operators. Regarding “obstacles by the implementation of the 2012 ITRs”, there is no obstacles or challenges for them. Regarding “conflict between 2 sets of ITRs”, they have not experienced or do not foresee any potential or actual conflicts. Regarding “applicability of the 2012 ITRs”, ITRs are not relevant to today’s international telecommunication services provided by them because they use commercial agreements. Japan think the substantial value of the ITRs is impaired in today’s competitive telecommunications markets in Japan and where Japanese operators do business. The ITRs should not be revised frequently. Operators will feel deeply insecure until new ITRs are completed. This insecurity will interfere with operators in investments, long-term business plans, or business expansion. Japan believe the ITRs should not hinder operator’s business activity.

**3.10 Contribution EG-ITRs 2/12 from the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela - Review of ITRs**

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela considers that the ITR should act as an instrument to promote the advancement of telecommunications services at a global level, respecting the sovereign right of each country to regulate its telecommunications and recommends the revision of the 2012 International Telecommunication Regulations to the forthcoming Plenipotentiary Conference (PP) 2018, advancing the work for an eventual World Conference on International Telecommunications, which should have a unified position on the effective applicability of the ITR, in order to foster the Union's credibility.

**3.11 Contribution EG-ITRs 2/13 from Beltelecom RUE, PJSC "MegaFon", PJSC "Rostelecom" - Problem issues for telecommunication operators in connection with the application of the ITRs**Previous problems of effective implementation of the 1988 ITRs, also gives rise to new challenges for telecommunication operators when collaborating with partners from countries in which different versions of the ITRs (1988 and 2012) are applied at the national level. At the same time, the 2012 ITRs include a number of provisions of importance for telecommunication operators, including provisions on:  1) Avoidance of double taxation. 2) Application of mechanisms for the settlement of accounts for international telecommunication services. 3) Provision of international service (technical) telecommunications free of charge. 4) Procedures for issuing invoices and settlements for international telecommunication services. 5) Procedures for issuing invoices and settlements for international maritime telecommunications. 6) Application of settlements between operators for international communication services via a third party (“accounting authority”). Not all of the above provisions are included in both versions of the ITRs, which creates additional potential risks of financial loss for telecommunication operators. The proposals included in the contributions are: If it is not possible to reach a consensus on eliminating the discrepancies arising from the 1988 and 2012 ITRs, and in order to create a broad consensus on a single ITR text, to recommend to the ITU Council and PP-18 that a decision be adopted to examine the 2012 ITRs in respect of specific provisions that give rise to the greatest number of discrepancies between Member States and, on the basis of the outcome of that work, to hold WCIT 20 with a view to adopting a single ITR text. Before that work is completed, PP-18 may adopt a decision on the procedure for applying ITR provisions of great importance for telecommunication operators.

**3.12 Contribution EG-ITRs 2/14 from Mexico - position regarding the work of the Expert Group on the ITRs**

Mexico presents a contribution regarding the following five topics: 1) Applicability of the ITRs: Mexico considers that there are elements in the ITR that continue to be in force in the international environment of the telecommunications sector, since they promote regulatory coherence and generate certainty for international telecommunications; 2) Legal analysis: ITRs is broader in scope as it recognizes the importance of international standards for the global compatibility and interoperability of telecommunication networks and services and undertakes to promote such standards through the work of relevant international agencies including the International Telecommunications Union; 3) Analysis of any potential conflict between the obligations of the ITR 2012 signatories and the ITR 1988 signatories: Mexico considers there is no conflict detected in the coexistence of both instruments. 4) Structure of the Final Report: it should follow the ToR from the EG-ITR. 5) Mexico considers that it is not needed to revise the ITRs and that there is no need to celebrate a new WCIT at this moment due to the current lack of consensus.

**3.13 Contribution EG-ITRs 2/15 from the Association for Progressive Communications (APC) - Review of the 2012 ITRs**

APC welcomes the opportunity to contribute to the second meeting of the Expert Group on International Telecommunication Regulations (ITRs). In reviewing the 2012 ITRs, the guiding question should be whether there are any issues or conflicts arising from the existence of two versions of the ITRs. APC is not aware of any issues or conflicts as a result of two versions of the ITRs. Moreover, it is our view that the polarization that emerged from WCIT-12, namely the fact that just 89 of 193 member states signed the Final Acts, has not resolved itself in the past five years. We are concerned that an effort to amend or update the ITRs would reopen protracted debates and not result in progress. Furthermore, renegotiating the ITRs comes with considerable risk, in three areas: a) restricting the use of telecommunications, b) financial cost, and c) reputational cost to the ITU. Proposals at WCIT-12 and in other ITU processes in recent years, such as PP-14 and WTSA-16, posed a risk to human rights by limiting the ability of users to route around censorship or communicate anonymously by providing Members States the authority to determine routing paths and to prevent “misuse and misappropriation of numbering resources”, or would have effectively legitimized state shutdowns of unlicensed equipment, or would have imposed a global digital identifier system that uniquely identifies internet-connected devices in such a way that would have compromised the privacy and trust of users. APC reiterates that the ITRs should continue to be concerned with basic telecommunications and should not extend to services that make use of telecommunications networks, such as ICTs in general or the internet in particular, or include public policy objectives and areas of governance which are beyond their current remit of the telecommunications sector. In addition, the ITRs should always seek to facilitate and never to restrict the development of telecommunications and the availability of communications services. Finally, we encourage the ITU to take further measures to facilitate meaningful participation of independent civil society actors into its work by enabling open, participative, transparent, accountable, inclusive, and equitable processes.

**3.14 Contribution EG-ITRs 2/16 from Australia on the ITRs**

Australia is pleased to provide our views to the second meeting of the Expert Group on the International Telecommunications Regulations. Australia is of the view that the ITRs should remain focused on the interconnection of international telecommunication networks and should not encompass matters such as those relating to the Internet. Australia is not aware of any concerns regarding the co-existence of the 1988 and 2012 ITRs. Australia is eager to ensure that the Union and membership are well positioned to progress the ITU's work in promoting connectivity, access to infrastructure and building capacity to bridge the digital divide. We believe that embarking on a revision of the ITRs could detract valuable ITU and member resources from other priority areas such as implementing the outcomes of the upcoming WTDC, progressing the Connect 2020 Agenda, the SDG's and the outcomes of the ten year review of WSIS and associated time lines.

**3.15 Contribution EG-ITRs 2/17 from NTT Communications - Review of the ITRs**

NTT communications believes ITR has no practical meaning in today’s privatized and competing environment. NTT communications has been continuing “Virtual Transit Agreements” for more than 10 years, and has proven that the ITR has no relevance to the current business practice. In addition, NTT Communications has not faced any problems caused by 2 sets of the ITRs or not using the ITRs. NTT Communications fears that if there are cases where the ITR is amended in a way where regulation is tightened, there will be a severe impact on the freedom of business between the connecting carriers. The re-establishment of commercial agreement, especially when it is based on an ITR with added restrictions will become a drawback to the quality and pricing of services provided. The inclusion of detailed rules within ITR will restrict freedom of trade between the international carriers, and will have a negative impact towards the telecommunication industry and users, and NTT Communications strongly objects to the revision of the ITR.

**3.16 Contribution EG-ITRs 2/18 from the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia - Proposals on the structure of the final report of Expert Group on the ITRs (EG-ITRs)**

ICTs today underpin everything we do, Therefore an up to date Treaty-level provisions are required for ensuring a connected world in a secure, safe and affordable manner and those international services are offered fairly and efficiently. Moreover the convergence of technologies, and the appearance of new ones, has changed the international environment dramatically. The contribution proposed a structure for the EG-ITRs final report based on the ToR specified by Council resolution 1379.

**3.17 Contribution EG-ITRs 1/10 from VEON Ltd. (Formerly VimpelCom Group) - Review of the ITRs: Application of Article 8.3 of ITRs 2012 and Article 6.13 of ITRs 1988**

In its contribution 1/10, which has been re-introduced as per the decision of the first meeting of the Expert Group, VEON highlighted issues of inconsistent application and legal interpretation of Article 8.3 of ITRs 2012 and, identical, Article 6.1.3 of ITRs 1988. It provided specific examples of the Kyrgyz Republic and the Republic of Tajikistan where misunderstanding in application of these provisions led to double taxation of international telecommunication services leading to financial losses for operating agencies in millions of US dollars. VEON noted that the matters of taxation cannot be resolved via commercial negotiations. VEON suggested that EG-ITRs takes these issues into account in its work, requests ITU Secretary General to provide legal analysis of specific matters relevant to these issues, and, on the basis of such legal analysis, includes in its report a suggestion to the Council to invite Member States to apply Article 8.3 of ITRs 2012 and Article 6.1.3 of ITRs 1988 in an accurate, consistent, predictable and certain manner as well as consider a need to develop and adopt binding and/or non-binding instruments to reinforce certainty and predictability of these provisions. VEON emphasized that predictable investment environment, to which ITRs contribute, is an essential pre-condition to achieving SDGs and Connect 2020 Agenda. VEON further noted that the Terms of Reference of the Expert Group does not limit review to the conflict between 2012 ITRs and 1988 ITRs. EG-ITRs shall undertake a review of the 2012 ITRs, taking into account new trends in telecommunications/ICT, emerging issues and obstacles that may arise from the implementation of the 2012 ITRs and WCIT-12 Resolutions and Recommendations. Conflict between ITRs 1988 and 2012 is only one of 3 points in a non-finite list of examples of what the group should review.

**4 Discussions**

The Chairman noted that the contributions received fall under three broad clusters (recognizing that there are overlaps):

**Cluster 1**: Contributions 2/2, 2/3, 2/7, 2/14, 2/18 address the final report to Council 2018

**Cluster 2:** includes contributions addressing the views of operators. Here Contributions 2/5, 2/9, 2/13, 2/17 and 1/10 are by operator Sector Members. 2/11 is a contribution by a Member State based on consultation with its operators.

**Cluster 3:** includes contributions that address general views on the three parts of the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the group. These include contribution 2/4, 2/6, 2/8, 2/12, 2/14, 2/15, and 2/16

**4.1 Discussions on Cluster 1**

* The chairman presented the different contributions addressing the structure of the report in a tabular format, with commonalities clearly identified, to help progress the discussion of the group.
* There was agreement on having an introduction and summary section. The focus of the discussion was mostly on identifying the remaining sections and their titles.
* Some were of the view that the three items listed in the ToR of the group (under item 2 of the Annex of Council 2016 Res. 1379) should form the structure of the report.
* Some were of the view that while the ToR of the group lists three specific points mentioned above, it does not preclude the inclusion of more points (as it states “among others” in the introductory statement of part 2)
* Some were of the view that the introductory part 1 of the ToR includes “taking into account new trends in telecommunications/ICT, emerging issues”, hence providing the rationale of including a section on “Impact of new trends in telecommunication/ICT on the ITRs”.
* Some were of the view that having a separate part on emerging trends would not be in line with the ToR of the group.
* Some suggested that a discussion on the ‘trends in telecommunications and ICTs’ could be subsumed under the point on applicability of the ITRs.
* Several compromise proposals emerged during the course of the meeting – attempting to bring different options together.
* After significant discussions, the group agreed to adopt the structure in Annex 1 of this report.
* The meeting agreed, that the subject on “trends in telecommunications/ICT” could be addressed anywhere in the report including sub-sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 of Annex 1.

**4.2 Discussions on Cluster 2**

* Concerning contribution EG ITRs 2/11 by Japan, some other Member States indicated that they have also carried out or are in the process of carrying out a survey along similar lines as Japan. One Member State mentioned that it was awaiting results of its survey. The African Region also indicated it was carrying out a region-wide survey and is awaiting results.
* Some (Member States and operators) expressed the view that operators are no longer using the ITRs or using it in a very limited manner, as they operate under commercial agreements. These Member States and operators also noted the operators did not face any issues due to the existence of both 2012 and 1988 versions of the ITRs. One member cautioned that operators are crucial in delivering vast sums of investments and are building infrastructure, and therefore care should be taken to not do anything to undermine their efforts.
* Some (Member States and operators) expressed the view that operators feel the need for more coordination with their counterparts in other countries and intergovernmental coordination on issues concerning charging and accounting aspects, network security, unsolicited messages, dual taxation, offsetting, settlements for maritime communications and state regulation impacting business models were mentioned as examples. In this regard, these Member States and operators noted the operators did face issues due to the existence of both 2012 and 1988 versions of the ITRs.

**4.3 Discussions on Cluster 3**

No specific issues were brought up by the group concerning this cluster of contributions that address general views on the three parts of the ToR of the group.

 **4.4 Discussion on potential contributions from Study Groups**

* The TSB Director provided the group with an update on the activities of the study groups on the review of the ITRs, indicating that TSAG at its meeting in May 2017 concluded to task the Chairman of TSAG to collect any relevant background information on the implementation of the existing 2012 ITRs from the ITU-T study groups. A liaison statement was sent to all ITU-T study groups. Most study groups have not yet met but many of the SG chairmen have responded to the liaison after consultation with their management team or the delegates. Some study groups will discuss the matter at their upcoming study group meeting. Some study groups responded that they were purely technical study groups and that their technical work does not have any regulatory implications on the ITRs. Some study groups responded that the ITRs have not caused any difficulties. ITU-T SG11 listed three ITU-T Recommendations that are related to the provision of International Calling Line Identification (mentioned in article 3.6 of ITRs). SG9 indicated that article 5.3 of the ITR could be associated with ITU-T Recommendations J.260-J.263 which are related to preferential telecommunications on cable TV networks.
* SG2 participants have been consulted by correspondence regarding background information on the implementation of the 2012 International Telecommunication Regulations, since the next SG2 meeting will be held from 27 November 2017. No information was received.
* SG3:  As far as the provision of any relevant background information on the implementation of the existing 2012 ITR is concerned, SG3 has no such information.
* SG5 will discuss it at the next meeting.
* SG9 plans to carefully review the liaison statement at their next meeting in January 2018. A quick feedback to the expert group:  Article 5.3 of the ITR could be associated with the SG9 Recommendations J.260 – J.263, which are related to preferential telecommunications on cable TV networks.
* SG11 identified three ITU-T Recommendations which are related to the provision of International Calling Line Identification (mentioned in article 3.6 of ITRs)
* SG13 is a technical group with no regulatory impact as of yet. However, at its next meeting in November SG13 will thorough review the ITU ITRs 2012 and the liaison statement from TSAG and prepare a reply.
* As SG15 is a primarily technical study group; there is nothing in the work programme right now that is related in any way to the ITRs.
* SG16 will discuss the issue at its upcoming meeting in October.
* SG17: At this time, the 2012 ITRs (including the regulatory definitions contained therein) have not caused difficulties with respect to SG17’s technical standardization activities on security.
* SG20 plans to respond requesting more clarifications on what it is expected from the study group.

The TSB Director also indicated that a written report will be provided to the group on the matter for its consideration subsequent meetings of the group.

* In response to a related question, the Legal Advisor clarified that during its latest session, TSAG agreed that the Chairman of TSAG should solicit the views of the relevant ITU-T Study Groups with respect to the implementation of the existing 2012 ITRs and all such information would be included in the report of the TSB Director to the current meeting of the EG-ITRs.

**5. Next Steps**

* The Chairman proposed a plan for finalizing the report to Council 2018, as indicated in the table below.

|  |
| --- |
| **Table 1** |
| **Steps** | **Action Item** | **Timeline** |
| 1. | The Chairman will prepare the draft 1.0 of the final report, working very closely with the vice-chairs, with the assistance of the secretariat.  | Available on the EG‑ITRs website by Oct 31 2017: in English |
| 2. | Comments on draft 1.0 will be invited from members of the Group (preferably in track changes). Comments could be in any of the 6 languages and will be translated in English only.  | Till Dec 8 2017  |
| 3. | A compilation document – with the draft 1.0 annotated with comments received on the various parts embedded is posted on the website. In English only | Available on the EG‑ITRs website by 3 January in English |
| 4. | Contributions directly to the 3rd meeting (i.e. not specifically on the draft report 1.0) to be translated in 6 languages | 3 January 2018 |
| 5. | 3rd meeting of the group  | 17-19 January 2018 |
| 6. | Based on the discussions at the 3rd meeting, the Chairman will prepare draft version 2.0 of the final report, working very closely with the vice-chairs, with the assistance of the secretariat. Will be translated in 6 languages | Available on the EG-ITRs website by Feb 15 2018 in English28 Feb 2018 in 6 languages   |
| 7. | Contribution to the 4th meeting will be invited from members of the Group specifically on the draft version 2.0 (or more general contributions, if any). Will be translated in 6 languages | Till March 22 2018  |
| 8. | At the 4th meeting, the group will finalize the report. The final draft will be submitted to Council 2018. | 12-13 April 2018 |

* The plan was accepted by the group as presented.

**6 Actions to be taken**

1. The group invites Member States and sector members to submit contributions in accordance with the structure approved, recalling that the subject on “trends in telecommunications/ICT” could be addressed anywhere in the report including sub-sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 of Annex 1.
2. The group will proceed with its work as per the steps listed in Table 1 of this report.

**7 Closing of the Meeting**

In closing, the Chairman thanked all the ITU Member States and Sector Members who made contributions and participated in the work of the Expert Group (including those who participated remotely), the Vice-Chairmen, and ITU Elected Officials and the Secretariat for their efficient assistance during the meeting.

The Group thanked the Chairman, Vice-Chairmen and Secretariat for their effective organization and management of the Group. The Group also thanked the interpreters and the remote moderator.

**Chairman: Mr Fernando Borjón (Mexico)**

**ANNEX 1: Structure of the Final Report to Council 2018**

1. Introduction
2. Review of the 2012 ITRs, taking into account new trends in telecommunications/ICT, emerging issues and obstacles that may arise from the implementation of the 2012 ITRs and WCIT-12 Resolutions and Recommendations:
	1. applicability
	2. legal analyses
	3. potential conflicts
3. Summary