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REPORT OF THE FIRST MEETING of the expert group on the international telecommunication regulations (eg-itrs) |

1. **Introduction**

**1.1** On behalf of the Secretary-General Mr. Houlin Zhao, the Deputy Secretary-General, Mr. Malcolm Johnson, welcomed the participants to the first meeting of EG-ITRs. He noted that the ITRs are one of the treaties forming the foundation of ITU’s mission, the others being the ITU Constitution and Convention, and the Radio Regulations, and therefore stressed the importance of the work that lies ahead of the Group.

**1.2** The Director of the Development Bureau, Ms. Doreen Bogdan-Martin, conveyed ITU-D’s support and availability to assist the deliberations of the EG-ITRs as needed.

**1.3** The Chairman thanked the Elected Officials for their presence and support for the meeting and stressed the need for the Group to work together effectively, efficiently and in the spirit of consensus to accomplish the tasks set out by PP18 and Council 2019. He also acknowledged the work of the previous EG-ITRs and emphasized that he looks forward to working closely with his Vice-Chairmen to achieve the mandate set before the Group.

**1.4** The Vice-Chairmen introduced themselves briefly and stressed that they look forward to working closely with the Chairman and the members of the EG-ITRs to successfully achieve the mandate of the Group.

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

The Agenda (Document [EG-ITRs-1/1-E](https://www.itu.int/md/S19-EGITR1-C-0001/en)) was presented by the Chairman. The Chairman proposed to re-organize and cluster contributions into three broad categories (Broad Comments on ITRs, Working Methods and Work Plan) and to inter-change Agenda Items 4 (Discussion of the work plan of EG-ITRs) and 5 (Introduction/Discussion of Contributions from Member States and Sector Members) in order to better structure the discussion at the meeting. The revised version of the Agenda ([1/1 (Rev.2](https://www.itu.int/md/S19-EGITR1-C-0001/en))) was adopted.

**3 Discussion on working methods and terms of reference of EG-ITRs, based on PP Res. 146 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) and Council  Res. 1379 (Mod. 2019)**

As background information for the discussion at the meeting, the Chairman presented relevant excerpts from PP Res. 146 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) and Council Res. 1379 (Mod. 2019) on the working methods and terms of reference for the EG-ITRs. This power point presentation was posted as [EG-ITRs-1/DL/4-E](https://www.itu.int/md/S19-EGITR1-190916-DL-0004/en).

**4 Contributions from Member States and Sector Members, and corresponding discussions**

The EG-ITRs examined the various contributions (in the order listed in the agenda), which were noted by the Group. The summaries of the contributions (as submitted by the authors of the documents) and the corresponding discussions are provided below:

**4.1** **Broad Comments on ITRs**

**4.1.1** [**Contribution EG-ITRs-1/2**](https://www.itu.int/md/S19-EGITR1-C-0002/en) **from Austria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, the Netherlands, Romania, Sweden and the United Kingdom – “Review Of The International Telecommunication Regulations”**

a.Summary

Austria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, the Netherlands, Romania, Sweden and the United Kingdom welcomed the opportunity to contribute to the Group. They were pleased that the Group would produce a report that reflected all views in a factual and balanced way and hoped that discussions would be focused on “real world” evidence drawn from practical examples. They noted a number of critical findings from the report of the previous Expert Group last year:

* the Group did not find any examples of any issues or “real-world” difficulties that have arisen from differences between the 2012 and the 1988 texts
* the Group found that there could not be a conflict between the 2012 and 1988 texts because the Vienna Convention would always make it clear which provisions apply
* the Group heard that a very large proportion of operators no longer use the ITRs and instead rely on commercial arrangements.

They noted that their operators have not raised concerns or uncertainties caused by the status quo: in fact, the development of telecommunications services had continued to advance since 2012 and the existence of two sets of ITRs did not appear to have hindered this development in any way.

They noted that despite this progress, developing countries continued to face significant challenges in terms of investment, affordability and capacity and said there was a danger that spending valuable time in inter-governmental negotiation of a new treaty would only take resources away from efforts to address the digital divide. They drew attention to the differences of view that exist regarding another WCIT. They had not signed the 2012 ITRs and did not intend to do so. They believed that holding a new WCIT to revise the treaty again would undermine efforts to build capacity and could potentially damage the good reputation of the ITU.

b. Discussion

Some members[[1]](#footnote-1) shared the views set out in this contribution. Some members stated their view that the Contribution contains certain foregone conclusions regarding the relevance of the ITRs, however, these should not be anticipated in advance of the provision-by-provision examination of the ITRs.

**4.1.2** [**Contribution EG-ITRs-1/3**](https://www.itu.int/md/S19-EGITR1-C-0003/en) **from the Russian Federation – “Further Steps Towards A Comprehensive Review Of The International Telecommunication Regulations (ITRs) And The Achievement Of Consensus On A Single Text Of The ITRs”**

a. Summary

Russian Federation presented contribution C3. This contribution contains a proposal for EG-ITRs with a view to achieving consensus on a future single text of the ITRs. Bearing in mind that at present there are only two options for addressing issues arising from the application of the ITRs, EG-ITRs should decide which one of them is most acceptable to all Member States and focus on it as the main way forward at PP-22:

* The first option is for all Member States to accede to the International Telecommunication Regulations (Rev. Dubai, 2012).
* The second option is for a partial or full revision of the ITRs with a view to the adoption of a new version of the treaty by consensus.

In view of the foregoing, EG-ITRs proposes that the way forward in respect of the ITRs should be decided as a matter of priority, namely:

* the accession of all Member States to the version of the ITRs revised in 2012; or
* the partial or full revision of the ITRs.

b. Discussion

Some members suggested that the proposed approach set out in the Contribution to reach a consensus text is beyond the scope of the Terms of Reference for the EG-ITRs and should not be a part of the current process.

Some members were of the view that the proposal is in line with the mandate of the Group and could form the course of action to be taken at the conclusion of the review process.

The proponents elaborated on the proposal and clarified that, while conducting the provision-by-provision review process, members may also want to identify text that is most acceptable to all, leading to a version of the ITRs that can be adopted on the basis of consensus.

**4.1.3** [**Contribution EG-ITRs-1/4**](https://www.itu.int/md/S19-EGITR1-C-0004/en)  **from the Russian Federation – “Possible Future Steps Towards Achieving Consensus On A Single Version Of The International Telecommunication Regulations”**

a. Summary

Russian Federation presented contribution C4. This contribution provides an article-by-article overview of the versions of the International Telecommunication Regulations (ITRs), conducted by the member administrations of the Regional Commonwealth in the field of Communications, and presented at the 2018 Plenipotentiary Conference, taking into account the terms of reference of the Expert Group on the ITRs (EG-ITRs) and proposals for a possible way forward to achieving consensus on a single version of the ITRs.

Given the complementary nature of the 1988 and 2012 versions of the ITRs and the resulting problems relating to their application for Member States and their authorized operating agencies, which are parties to the different versions of the regulations (1988 and 2012), it would seem appropriate to discuss what should be included in an acceptable text combining the provisions of both treaties, with a view to merging the two versions of the ITRs in the future. This should allow those States which did not sign the 2012 ITRs to sign the amended consensus version.

b. Discussion

Some members were of the view that the Terms of Reference do not anticipate a comparison of the 1988 and 2012 ITRs, but instead specify that the review should focus on the 2012 ITRs.

Some members expressed the view that the proposal could form a useful base text for a provision-by-provision examination of the two versions of the treaty and allow for a way to identify sources of conflict in the two versions.

**4.1.4 [Contribution EG-ITRs-1/5 from Canada and the United States of America – “Views On The Comprehensive Review Of The International Telecommunication Regulations”](https://www.itu.int/md/S19-EGITR1-C-0005/en)**

Summary:

Canada and the United States continue to believe that the ITRs are no longer applicable or relevant to most international communications traffic. The ITRs were essential to the provision and operation of international telecommunication services in the monopoly era. However, this monopolistic environment has disappeared in most countries, along with the rationale for a treaty addressing its potential effects on international telecommunications services.

Canada and the United States also believe that the treaty provisions relating to telecommunications must be flexible enough to withstand constant changes in the market. Treaty provisions designed to address specific aspects of the market will continually face obsolescence. Given the dynamic, competitive nature of the communications market, and the fact that the telecommunications/ICT sector is increasingly being integrated into the broader digital economy, it is unclear how an inflexible treaty instrument such as the ITRs can play a positive role in promoting future growth and prosperity in the international telecommunication marketplace.

Discussion:

There were no comments on this Contribution.

**4.1.5** [**Contribution EG-ITRs-1/12**](https://www.itu.int/md/S19-EGITR1-C-0012/en) **from Brazil (Federative Republic of) – “Principles For The Review Of The International Telecommunication Regulations”**

Summary:

Brazil's contribution proposes that the ITRs are examined from two perspectives: first in its applicability an administrative regulation, regardless of their current provisions; second in the applicability of their actual provisions from the 1988 and 2012 treaties. This examination would shed light of the actual issue that prevents countries from adhering to the ITRs.

Brazil furthers observes that the ITRs are a rigid binding instrument that takes a long time to be revised, and therefore may not be appropriate to govern features of technologies that evolve at a fast pace. Brazil also highlights that there are several regulation instruments, including national and regional policies, ITU Recommendations, ITU Decisions and Resolutions, and the ITRs, and that each instrument deals with different aspects of the provision of telecommunications/ICT. Brazil highlighted the fact that the fast pace of development of telecommunication/ICTs and other new and emerging technologies calls for new, more agile approaches to governance and regulation that includes the perspectives of non-governmental stakeholders.

To conclude, Brazil proposes that ITU Members identify the high-level policy issues that require international coordination and collaboration and that do not require frequent revisions, and therefore are appropriate to be inserted in the ITRs, and that they propose provisions on these issues reflecting the consensual views of all Member States.

Discussion:

A member sought clarification on whether the relevance of the ITRs as an instrument is under question or if it is the content that poses a challenge for members.

In response, some members stated the view that the ITRs are not necessary in today’s fast evolving competitive market-based economy that is driven by dynamic technology, new uses and application, and innovation. These members suggested that different tools are needed to match the current pace of change in the commercial market.

Some members reemphasized that the Group was tasked to review the ITRs, and that a discussion on the need for the treaty is beyond the scope of the meeting.

Some members expressed that the ITRs are useful as an instrument but they are signed by governments while the practical implementation is carried out by other stakeholders. It is therefore important for the EG-ITRs to bring in the views of the other stakeholders through the current review process to fully achieve the mandate set before the Group.

**4.2 Working Methods**

**4.2.1** [**Contribution EG-ITRs-1/6**](https://www.itu.int/md/S19-EGITR1-C-0006/en) **from the Republic of South Africa – “Comprehensive Review Of The International Telecommunication Regulations”**

Summary

The Republic of South Africa believes that the terms of reference are clear and unambiguous. South Africa understands the work of the EG-ITRs to be a comprehensive review of the ITRs, broken down as follows:

* provision-by-provision examination of the 2012 ITRs;
* the provision by provision examination must consider new trends in telecommunications/ICT and emerging issues in international telecommunications/ICT environment;
* the review must include, but is not limited to:
	+ applicability of the provisions of the ITRs in fostering the provision and development of international telecommunication/ICT services and networks; and
	+ flexibility of, or lack thereof, the provisions of the ITRs to accommodate new trends in telecommunications/ICT and emerging issues in international telecommunications/ICT environment.

Discussion:

There were no comments on this Contribution.

**4.2.2** [**Contribution EG-ITRs-1/7**](https://www.itu.int/md/S19-EGITR1-C-0007/en)  **from People's Republic of China – “Proposal On The Review And Revision Of The International Telecommunication Regulations (ITRs)”**

Summary

ITR is an important multilateral treaty to ITU. It's a supplement to the constitution and the convention. With the rapid development of the telecommunication and the ICT application, it's urgently needed to review and improve ITRs to adapt it to the new trend, of the telecommunication and the ICT developments. According the resolution 146 and resolution 1379 from PP and the Council, ITU should review comprehensively, and step by step and to carry out the mandate of the EG ITRs.

Firstly, to fully discuss the new trend of telecommunication ICT development, as well as the new issues to determine the review and the improvement of the ITRs, especially its direction.

Secondly, to review ITRs provisions by provisions, especially to review its applicability and the flexibility to determine what are the items to be improved or the new items to incorporate. In the light of international telecommunication/ICT technology developments and policy changes, to determine non-controversial issues that can be accepted by all Member States and ITRs provisions that need to be improved and incorporating them in the form of revisions of the ITRs. To identify the provisions of ITRs which need to be improved or incorporated into the ITRs but are still in dispute, and make recommendations on the ways of their handling.

On the above-mentioned work, we should provide progress report and final reports to the Council.

Discussion:

Some members sought clarification on whether the proponents proposed a “review” or “revision” of the ITRs as a “revision” would fall beyond the scope of the Terms of Reference.

The contributor clarified that the proposal is based on a “review” of the ITRs and not a “revision”. The contributor further noted that while reviewing the ITRs article by article, too much emphasis should not be placed on whether it is a “review” and/or a “revision” as, even if Resolution 1379 does not directly mention “revision”, the phrase of “review and revision” cannot be avoided during the process of review by the EG-ITRs. Item 3, paragraph A of the Annex to Resolution 1379 mentions that the review should, taking into account new trends, include applicability of the provisions of the ITRs in fostering the provision and development of international telecommunication/ICT services and networks, and paragraph B of Item 3 of the Annex to Resolution 1379 mentions that it should also include flexibility of, or lack thereof, the provisions of the ITRs to accommodate new trends and emerging issues in international telecommunications/ICT environment. As per Item 3 of the Annex to Resolution 1379 therefore, the ITRs should be reviewed article by article in terms of their flexibility and applicability, thereby empowering the EG-ITRs to review these aspects. If the EG-ITRs find that the ITRs are neither flexible, nor applicable, any suggestions for improvements should be made to the PP conference.

**4.2.3** [**Contribution EG-ITRs-1/8**](https://www.itu.int/md/S19-EGITR1-C-0008/en) **from Ghana – “Contribution To The Work Of EG-ITRS”**

Summary

Further to the Terms of Reference of the EG-ITRs, Ghana proposed the generic template below to collate contributions in the examination of provision by provision of ITRs.

This was aimed at providing a synergy to the different views on each particular sub-article to make decisions on each provision as well as the future of ITRs:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2012 Article** | **Sub article and Provision** | **Related 1988 sub article and provision** | **Applicability in fostering provision and development of networks and services** | **Flexibility to accommodate New trends and Emergent issues** | **Proposed Amendment** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Discussion:

The members welcomed Ghana’s proposal to use a template to carry out the provision-by-provision examination of the ITRs. It was suggested that, during the review process, practical examples could be provided under the two columns dealing with the applicability and flexibility of the ITR provisions in order to ensure that any examination and analysis is evidence-based.

Some members stated that the last column proposed by Ghana in the table solicits proposed amendments to the provisions which is beyond the scope of the Terms of Reference.

Some members stated that the structured approach given by the table could serve the group in its work, but that any other contributions from members should also be taken into account.

The Chairman asked the proponents to coordinate an informal discussion to decide on an appropriate title for the last column. Based on these discussions, the Group agreed that the last column of the table would be titled “Summary Outcome” and adopted the table as set out in Annex I of this Report to serve as a template for a provision-by-provision examination of the ITRs (henceforth referred to as “Examination Table”), in alignment with the Terms of Reference of the EG-ITRs.

**4.3 Work Plan**

**4.3.1** [**Contribution EG-ITRs-1/9**](https://www.itu.int/md/S19-EGITR1-C-0009/en) **from Saudi Arabia (Kingdom of) – “General Views On The Comprehensive Review Of The ITRs”**

Summary

Saudi Arabia highlighted that the ITRs is one of the four binding treaties forming the foundation of the ITU, the United Nations specialized agency for ICTs. Treaty-level provisions are required for worldwide networks and services. The ITRs set out principles for ensuring that networks can connect with each other smoothly, and that international services will be offered in a secure, fair and efficient manner. The ITRs include articles dealing with matters such as cooperation among national administrations; giving priority to emergency telecommunications, and how to calculate the charges for traffic exchanged between carriers in different countries. To ensure organized work and success the contribution also suggested a work plan for the expert group.

Discussion:

Some members suggested that views of other stakeholders and practical examples of use of the ITRs could be included in the review process of the EG-ITRs through dissemination of a common survey or questionnaire that can be circulated by the Member States in their own countries. The survey or questionnaire will be addressed to operators and refer to the applicability and flexibility of the ITR provisions.

Some members noted that such surveys have already been carried out pursuant to the previous EG-ITRs and it would not be a productive use of time to do so again.

Some members reemphasized that the Group needs to work strictly as per the Terms of Reference and that members can choose to conduct surveys or circulate questionnaires within their countries, regions or networks but it need not be mandated to the Group as a whole.

Some members were of the view that in case different questions are used by different members to solicit inputs, the responses will be mixed and may not prove to be useful for the exercise.

Three proposals were made (see [EG-ITRs-1/DL/2-E](https://www.itu.int/md/S19-EGITR1-190916-DL-0002/en)) for soliciting views of other stakeholders: (i) open call for contributions in the Meeting Report, (ii) call for contributions in the Meeting Report based on the Examination Table, and (iii) circulation of a questionnaire containing questions drawn directly from the Terms of Reference relating to the applicability and flexibility of the ITRs along with a request for examples.

The Chairman proposed informal discussions to arrive at a consensus on this issue. Based on these discussions, the Group agreed that the Terms of Reference of the EG-ITRs are clear and members are at liberty to carry out their own form of consultations or information gathering with other stakeholders, in line with the Terms of Reference. The results of such consultations would be collated and presented to the Group over the course of the next few meetings.

The Group noted that the Vice Chair of the Americas region stated that, by way of an internal practice, the administrations that comprise CITEL will use and circulate the following questions among its Member States and Associate Members, that include the private sector, civil society, academia and the Internet technical community.

The questions agreed by the CITEL administrations are as follows:

*“Taking into account the terms of reference of Council Resolution 1379:*

1. *Do you use the ITRs?  If so, how?  If not, why?*
2. *In the current international telecommunications/ICTs environment, are the 2012 ITRs applicable in fostering the provision and development of international telecommunication/ICT services and networks?  Please give examples.*
3. *In the current international telecommunications/ICTs environment, are the 2012 ITRs flexible to accommodate new trends in telecommunications/ICT and emerging issues? Please give examples.”*

Further, there was a discussion on the difference between the terms “review” and “revision” based on column 3 of the table proposed by Saudi Arabia. Some members stated their view that a “revision” of the ITRs is beyond the scope of the Terms of Reference of the Group.

**4.3.2** [**Contribution EG-ITRs-1/10**](https://www.itu.int/md/S19-EGITR1-C-0010/en)  **from Zimbabwe – “Proposals For Incorporation Into The Work Plan Of The EG-ITRs”**

Summary

Zimbabwe’s contribution stressed the following points:

* It is important that as the new Expert Group work commences, members do not simply pick up their old arguments and dig in, as that will not resolve the issues that the Group was set up to deal with.
* It would be a disservice to the whole telecommunications sector, if the Experts that make up the Group start from their conclusions and then work backwards to justify those conclusions.
* In that regard, the contribution proposed that the work plan should cover:
* An examination of the manner in which each ITR provision fosters the provision and development of international telecommunication services and networks.
* Aspects of the provisions that need enhancement or to be changed
* Analysis of each provision to determine the level at which it accommodates new trends
* Identification of new trends and emerging issues
* Analysis of the flexibility of each provision to accommodate new trends and emerging issues and what can be done to enhance flexibility
* A fact finding exercise through a questionnaire administered on indigenous operators within Member States, on the issues under discussion.

**4.3.3** [**Contribution EG-ITRs-1/11**](https://www.itu.int/md/S19-EGITR1-C-0011/en)  **from Côte d’Ivoire – “Proposed Work Plan”**

Summary

The contribution from Côte d’Ivoire is a proposal of work plan in order to fulfil the expert group’s TOR.

For an efficient use of the time and resources allocated to the work of the expert group, we should have a clear work plan giving for each session or meeting the objectives, the activities to carry on and the expected results.

The proposed work plan will ease the preparation of contributions and allow  the expert group to make tangible progress.

Bearing in mind that the work of the expert has to be focus on ITR 2012 we propose a methodology based on 3 objectives :

* Identification of new trends and emerging issues in telecommunications/ICT environment.
* A SWOT analysis provision by provision including applicability and flexibility
* Drafting recommendations for the final report

We also call for contribution from Director of TSB in order to provide an information document on new trends and emerging issues in telecommunication/ICT environment. This document will help for the realization of the first objective and to avoid divergence views on what to consider as new trends and emerging issues.

Discussion on Contribution EG-ITRs-1/10 and Contribution EG-ITRs-1/11

i. Discussion on Inputs from the Directors of the Bureaux

Referring to input to the work of the EG-ITRs from the Directors of the Bureaux, some members noted that it would merit a discussion on whether or not it is important to send a liaison statement for this purpose to the chairs of the relevant advisory groups of the ITU sectors directly, or just a note from the Chairman of EG-ITRs to the Directors.

Some members suggested that a liaison statement can be issued to the advisory groups however, the timing of the response might be longer in this case, as opposed to reaching out to the Directors of the Bureaux directly.

Some members highlighted that Council Res. 1379 (Mod. 2019) instructs Directors specifically to contribute to the work of the EG-ITRs with advice from the relevant advisory group.

The Chairman proposed informal discussions led by the Vice Chair, Arab Region, to determine the course of action for seeking inputs from the ITU sectors. As an outcome of these discussions, it was agreed by the Group that in compliance with the Terms of Reference, a note, as set out in Annex II, would be sent by the Chairman of EG-ITRs to the Directors of the Bureaux inviting them to contribute to the work of the Group.

ii. Discussion on the Work Plan

The Chairman proposed holding informal discussions to arrive at a consensus on a Work Plan for the next five meetings of EG-ITRs.

The Group noted that any Work Plan agreed upon will act as a guide for members for future meetings of the Group and should not be considered mandatory. The Group remains contribution-driven and all matters discussed in individual meetings can be revisited as necessary in subsequent meetings with the understanding that the last couple of meetings of the EG-ITRs will review the work done by the Group and make overall observations based on the previous meetings.

The Chairman clarified that the Work Plan is a guide and members are at liberty to introduce other topics they wish at future meetings.

After the informal consultation, led by the Chairman, the revised Work Plan was agreed as set out in Annex III.

**5 Discussion of next steps**

The Chairman proposed to the Group that the meeting report for each EG-ITRs meeting would be prepared offline and shared with the Vice-Chairs for circulation within their region/networks for review and finalized accordingly. The meeting reports of the meetings held in September and February would be merged and consolidated to be presented to Council as Progress Reports in 2020 and 2021 respectively.

**6 Other Business**

**6.1** The Chairman proposed that, if it is of interest to the Group, external practitioners can be invited to following meetings of the EG-ITRs specifically to provide an insight to the Group on the ways in which they are currently dealing with the issues that form the subject matter of the ITRs. This could take the form of hour-long panel discussions, either during lunch or at the start of the meeting.

**6.2** Some members appreciated the suggestion. Some members noted the challenges that would be involved. It was proposed that it could be explored further at the next meeting of the EG-ITRs.

**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, the Vice-Chairmen, and ITU Elected Officials and the Secretariat for their efficient assistance during the meeting.

The Group thanked the Chairman and Secretariat for their effective organization and management of the Group.

**Chairman: Mr. Lwando Bbuku (Zambia)**

**Annex I**

**Examination Table**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2012 Article** | **Sub article and Provision** | **Related 1988 sub article and provision** | **Applicability in fostering provision and development of networks and services** | **Flexibility to accommodate New trends and Emergent issues** | **Summary Outcome** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Annex II**

**Note from Chairman of EG-ITR to Directors of the Bureaux**

Pursuant to Res. 1379 (Council 2019) which instructs the Directors of the Bureaux

*“each within their field of competence, with advice from the relevant advisory group, to contribute to the work of the Group, recognizing that the ITU Telecommunication Standardization Sector has most of the work relevant to the ITRs”;*

you are kindly invited to seek advice from the relevant advisory group to contribute to the work of the EG-ITR Group, taking into account the agreed work plan of EG-ITR in annex 1, for further information please contact EG-ITR Chairman **Mr Lwando Bbuku** “**lbbuku@zicta.zm**”.

Input from your Sector would be helpful in achieving the goals of the Group as soon as possible, preferably by the third meeting of the Group September 2020.

**Annex III**

**Work Plan**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Meeting** | **Primary Actions** | **Provisions** | **Expectations** |
| 2nd Meeting (February 2020) | Provision-by-provision examination of the ITRs | PreambleARTICLE 1 Purpose and scope of the RegulationsARTICLE 2 DefinitionsARTICLE 3 International networkARTICLE 4 International telecommunication services | Draft results of the provision-by-provision examination using the Examination Table [[2]](#footnote-2) Progress report to Council |
| 3rd Meeting (September 2020) | ARTICLE 5 Safety of life and priority of telecommunicationsARTICLE 6 Security and robustness of networksARTICLE 7 Unsolicited bulk electronic communicationsARTICLE 8 Charging and accountingAPPENDIX 1 General provisions concerning accounting | Draft results of the provision-by-provision examination using the Examination Table  |
| 4th Meeting (February 2021) | ARTICLE 9 Suspension of servicesARTICLE 10 Dissemination of informationARTICLE 11 Energy efficiency/e-wasteARTICLE 12 AccessibilityARTICLE 13 Special arrangementsARTICLE 14 Final provisionsAPPENDIX 2 Additional provisions relating to maritime telecommunications | Draft results of the provision-by-provision examination using the Examination TableProgress report to Council |
| 5th Meeting (September 2021) | Overall Observations based on the provision-by-provision examination |  | First Draft of the Final Report to Council 2022 |
| 6th Meeting (just prior to Council 2022) | Finalize the Final Report to Council 2022 |  | Final Report to Council 2022 |

1. “Member” refers to a member of the Expert Group on ITRs, which include both Member States and Sector Members [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Note: Identification of new trends in telecommunications/ICT and emerging issues in international telecommunications/ICT environment will be covered under column 5 of the agreed* Examination Table *(Flexibility to accommodate New trends and Emergent issues)* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)