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1. **Introduction**

**1.1** The second meeting of theEG-ITRs (2023-2026) was held on 29-30 January 2024. The Vice Chair – Asia Pacific Region, Mr. Sunil Kumar Singhal, was Acting Chair on behalf of the Chair of EG-ITRs, Ms. Shahira Selim, who joined the meeting remotely.

**1.2** On behalf of the Secretary-General Ms. Doreen Bogdan-Martin, the Director, Telecommunication Standardisation Bureau (TSB), Mr. Seizo Onoe, welcomed the participants to the second meeting of EG-ITRs (2023-2026). He commended the members on their active participation and commitment to the work of the Group as demonstrated also by the number and diversity of contributions submitted on the various issues and aspects relating to the ITRs, and urged the Group to continue working together in the spirit of collegiality.

**1.3** The Chair thanked the TSB Director for his presence and support for the meeting and stressed the importance of constructively considering the proposals presented to the Group and reaching agreement on a way forward that could guide the work of Group to accomplish the tasks set out by PP22 and Council 2023. She invited the Acting Chair to conduct the meeting.

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

The Agenda (Document EG-ITRs-2/1 (Rev. 1)) was presented by the Acting Chair. Some members requested for future agendas of the meeting to include titles of the contributions along with the hyperlinks. The Agenda was adopted.

**3 Discussion on draft report of the first meeting of the EG-ITRs**

**3.1** The Acting Chair presented the draft report of the first meeting of the EG-ITRs ([EG-ITRs-2/9](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0009/en)).

**3.2** The EG-ITRs considered the contribution submitted on the draft report. The summary of the contribution (as submitted by the author of the document) is provided below, followed by an overview of the discussion on the contribution.

**3.2.1** **Contribution** [**EG-ITRs-2/10**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0010/en) **from Hill**

This contribution presents proposed revisions to the draft report of the first meeting.

**3.2.2 Discussion of Contribution**

1. The revisions proposed in the Contribution were accepted by the meeting.
2. The proponent further requested that, as noted in the draft first meeting report, since Addendums to EG-ITRs 1/2 were not presented or discussed in the first meeting due to lack of time, they be reconsidered for discussion at the second meeting. Given that the Addendums had not been re-submitted as contributions to the second meeting, the meeting agreed that, time permitting, they could be presented and discussed under the “Other Business” Agenda Item.

**3.3** **Actions**

The report of the first meeting of the EG-ITRs was approved. The draft containing the revisions suggested by Contribution EG-ITRs 1/2 will be published online by the ITU Secretariat. It was also agreed by the EG-ITRs that any summaries of contributions submitted for future meeting reports of the Group would be restricted up to 250 words. Final versions of EG-ITRs meeting reports will continue to be published with open access (not TIES protected). The meeting requested Secretariat to provide a contribution template to members that contains a “Summary” section for inclusion in the meeting reports.

**4 Discussion on general contributions received**

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) along with the corresponding discussions are provided below.

**4.1** **Contribution** [**EG-ITRs-2/4**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0004/en)**, Hill**

**4.1.1 Summary**

This contribution proposes that – pursuant to the collaboration agreement between ITU and WTO – a liaison statement be sent to WTO inviting collaboration with respect to matters of common interest, in particular on technical and regulatory and development matters concerning telecommunications that have arisen in the context of discussions on binding treaty-level provisions that are taking place in the WTO Joint Statement Initiative on e-commerce, such as security and spam. The ITU’s technical and regulatory expertise could assist participants in WTO meeting to ensure that the actual language in WTO agreements is consistent with the intended goals of the agreements, and that the language does not have unintended side-effects (for example, of inadvertently permitting targeted advertising when the intent is to combat spam).

**4.1.2 Discussion**

* Some members welcomed the contribution as it highlights the importance of updating the ITRs to meet the needs of the modern telecommunications environment, given that several related aspects are also concurrently under discussion at WTO such as frequency management, numbering, spam and cybersecurity and could be supported by ITU’s expertise in this regard.
* Some members were of the opinion that the discussions at WTO are taking place in a different context and specific to the mandate/expertise of the organization separate from the discussions on the ITRs at ITU. These members suggested that it is premature to send a liaison statement to WTO at this stage while they are still in the process of discussing these matters, but that in the meanwhile, WTO would be welcome to approach ITU should they have any questions on technical or regulatory aspects within ITU’s expertise.
* The contribution was noted. The Acting Chair proposed that no liaison statement would be sent to WTO for now, with the possibility to review this course of action later pending a release of a report by WTO on these discussions.

**4.2 Multi-Country Contribution** [**EG-ITRs-2/12**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0012/en)**, Czech Republic , Bulgaria , Croatia , Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia , Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom**

**4.2.1 Summary**

The contribution considers the findings of the previous two Expert Groups on the International Telecommunication Regulations and what they can contribute to the work of the third Expert Group.
It follows the Terms of Reference, where it is stipulated that we should be taking into consideration the work of the previous two Expert Groups.

The text further highlights the most important and relevant parts of the previous work (2016-2018 and 2019-2022), mainly: the divergent views on the applicability of the 2012 ITRs; no examples of practical difficulties arising from having 2 versions of the ITRs; vast proportion of operators rely on commercial arrangements instead of ITRs; as well as the detailed, provision-by-provision examination of both texts of the Regulations.

The contribution also noted that the previous Expert Group already established that there is no conflict between the application of the 1988 and the 2012 ITRs because the Vienna Convention makes it clear which text should apply in any given circumstance.

**4.2.2 Discussions**

* Some members were of the opinion that the contribution is aligned with the Terms of Reference and the proposals set out therein should be included in the report of the Group.
* Some members were of the opinion that the scope of work and findings of the previous Expert Groups include several contributions regarding the use and relevance of ITRs by operators at the international, regional and national levels as well as the challenges that have arisen due to the two versions of the ITRs.
* Some members were of the opinion that most operators no longer rely on the accounting rate portions of the ITRs and that this does not necessarily reflect on other elements of the ITRs.
* The contribution was noted by the Group. The Acting Chair also invited members to submit contributions to future meetings on new aspects that previous Expert Groups may not have considered as well as on the aspects that may have been considered but are no longer relevant due to advancements in the telecommunication environment.

**4.3 Multi-Country Contribution**[**[EG-ITRs-2/13](https://www.itu.int/md/S19-EGITR1-C-0005/en)**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0013/en)**[, Russian Federation, Armenia, Belarus, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan](https://www.itu.int/md/S19-EGITR1-C-0005/en)**

**4.3.1 Summary**

At the first meeting of the EG-ITRs in 2017, the RCC countries submitted a contribution requesting the General Secretariat to update the legally relevant documents relating to the revision of the ITRs (Doc. EG-ITRs 1/7). The group agreed to publish hyperlinks to existing documents as a way to access them on the EG-ITRs page, and that the Secretariat would provide updated information at a later stage (Doc. EG-ITRs 1/13). However, this decision was never implemented. Thus, the objective of the contribution is to request the Secretariat:

- to carry out an analysis of all documents prepared by it between 1998 and 2012 that address the legal and other aspects of the ITRs and its revision through monitoring the existing legal and regulatory documents, background information and analytical data as well as updating their status as of 2024 (the documents to analyzed are listed in n. 2 of the “III Proposals” part),

- on the basis of the work done and the Member States’ contributions to prepare material on issues of law enforcement practice in resolving issues arising from the accession of Member States to the 2012 ITRs.

- to consolidate all the received materials specified in the contribution, including from the contributions of Member States and Sector Members submitted to the EG-ITRs in 2023-2026, into a single document that can be used for the preparation of a final report of EG-ITRs to the Council in 2026.

**4.3.2 Discussions**

* Some members were of the opinion that the scope of this contribution is beyond the Terms of Reference of the Group as it presupposes that another WCIT would need to be held. Furthermore, these members suggested that implementing the proposal set out in this contribution could also strain Secretariat resources.
* Some members supported the value of the contribution and expressed the importance of carrying out evidence-based discussions within the Group and that the General Secretariat has the expertise and experience to conduct the exercise requested in the contribution related to the update of the documents listed in it. Furthermore, these members were of the opinion that the ITRs are one of the basic texts of the ITU and the activities proposed in the contribution are essential to further the implementation of its objectives.
* The contribution was noted by the Group. Some members suggested that members could be invited to refer to the documents/links set out in the Contribution.

**4.4 Multi-Country Contribution** [**EG-ITRs-2/15**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0015/en)**, Russian Federation, Armenia, Belarus, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan**

**4.4.1 Summary**

The purpose of the contribution is to provide information to assess the relevance of current editions of the ITRs. Thus, the contribution lists the reasons why changes are necessary in the ITRs:

- outdated terminology of the 1988 ITR and its inconsistency with the main instruments (Constitution, Convention, Radio Regulations) and other ITU documents (ITU Recommendations), which leads to significant difficulties in the application of the 1988 ITR as a whole and its individual provisions;

- the inconsistency of the 1988 ITR with modern realities in telecommunications/ICT, the roles, tasks and practical functions of administrations and operators, which even today does not allow administrations and operators to effectively apply the 1988 ITR;

- continuing uncertainty, since a number of communications administrations (55) at WCIT 2012 refused to adhere to the ITR text revised in 2012.

The contribution proposes:

- to recognize the importance of having a single ITR (similar to the Radio Regulations) applied by all ITU Member States;

- to note the current uncertainty regarding the possible joint use of the 1988 ITR and 2012 ITR or any one of these versions of the ITRs in the interaction of administrations and operators from Member States using different versions of the ITRs;

- if it is impossible to reach a consensus at the PP-2026 to overcome the contradictions associated with the application of the 1988 ITR and the 2012 ITR, propose holding a new WCIT as the only legitimate way to resolve the situation around the ITRs.

**4.4.2 Discussions**

* Some members were of the opinion that the proposals set out in this contribution are central to the ongoing review process of the ITRs and should be included in the progress report to Council 2026.
* Some members were of the opinion that the proposals are beyond the scope of the Terms of Reference of the Group and no concrete evidence of challenges caused due to the co-existence or application of the two versions of the treaty have been provided.
* The contribution was noted. The Acting Chair invited members to submit contributions to future meetings on the matter.

**4.5 Contribution** [**EG-ITRs-2/19**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0019/en)**, United States of America**

**4.5.1 Summary**

Document EG-ITRs-2/19 reiterates the longstanding U.S. position on the ITRs, organized along the elements of the current review as set out in the Terms of Reference.

Regarding new trends and emerging issues, there is a fundamental incompatibility with the use of an inflexible treaty instrument to attempt to regulate a dynamic, competitive international telecommunications/ICT marketplace.  Given the rapid evolution of market and regulatory conditions, any attempts at new or revised treaty provisions would immediately become outdated.  ITU Members are already addressing new trends and emerging issues through more flexible mechanisms (such as Resolutions and Recommendations), without need to modify the ITRs.

Regarding empirical data, U.S. Sector Members and other leading global network operators have repeatedly established that the vast majority of operators worldwide no longer use the ITRs and instead rely on commercial arrangements. This contribution welcomes the continued efforts of this Expert Group to base its conclusions on such empirical evidence.

Finally, regarding the relevance of the ITRs*,* this contribution reaffirms previous U.S. analyses demonstrating the limited relevance of the ITRs in today’s international telecommunications/ICT environment.As this Expert Group continues “taking into consideration the work of the previous two Expert Groups,” this contribution points to the persisting lack of consensus on this topic as an important conclusion to keep in mind.

**4.5.2 Discussions**

* Some members were of the opinion that, as a basic text of the Union, Member States have an obligation to apply at least one version of ITRs and upholding the relevance of the ITRs requires consideration of new trends that may have an impact on the treaty as set out in the Terms of Reference. Furthermore, these members were of the opinion that efforts on enhancing the relevance of the ITRs cannot be seen as one not representing the best use of limited ITU resources.
* Some members were of the opinion that the contribution represents their views, given that the vast majority of operators do not rely on the ITRs and that work on new trends such as AI is already ongoing elsewhere within the ITU, including ITU-T.
* Some members were of the opinion that most operators no longer rely on the accounting rate portions of the ITRs and that this does not necessarily reflect on other elements of the ITRs.
* The contribution was noted.

**5 Discussion on contributions received on new trends which may impact the ITRs and/or empirical data on the current use of the ITRs**

To facilitate the presentation and discussion of contributions under this Agenda Item, the Acting Chair proposed to re-cluster the contributions based on those that relate to new trends which may impact the ITRs and those that deal with empirical data on the current use of the ITRs. The meeting agreed to this proposal.

For the contributions received on empirical data on the current use of the ITRs, all the contributions were presented together followed by the discussion as reflected in the summaries (as submitted by the authors of the documents) and discussion set out in the section below.

For the contributions received on new trends which may impact the ITRs, the summaries of the contributions (as submitted by the authors of the documents) and corresponding discussions are provided below.

**5.1 Summary of Contributions received on empirical data on the current use of the ITRs:** [**EG-ITRs-2/2**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0002/en)**,** [**EG-ITRs-2/3**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0003/en) **and** [**EG-ITRs-2/17**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0017/en)

**5.1.1 Contribution** [**EG-ITRs-2/2**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0002/en)**, Hill**

**Summary**

This contributions presents a draft request for empirical data that could be sent to Member States and Sector Members, if the EG-ITRs is of the view that there is a need to request empirical data on the current use of the ITRs by operating agencies and/or administrations and the proportion of global telecommunication services which now rely on the ITRs.

**5.1.2 Contribution** [**EG-ITRs-2/3**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0003/en)**, Hill**

**Summary**

This contribution presents evidence to the effect that that a large number of international companies are of the view that binding treaty-level provisions are needed for cybersecurity and spam. It argues that it is preferable to hold discussions on such matters in the ITU, rather than the WTO, because the ITU’s technical and regulatory expertise can ensure that the actual language agreed is consistent with the intended goals of the agreements, and that the language does not have unintended side-effects. For example, of inadvertently permitting targeted advertising when the intent is to combat spam; or of inadvertently broadening provisions on security to include content-related aspects of ICT security, such as combating so-called disinformation.

**5.1.3 Multi-Country Contribution** [**EG-ITRs-2/17**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0017/en)**, Ghana, Kenya , South Africa , Tanzania , Uganda**

**Summary**

The Republic of South Africa presented document EG-ITRs-2/17 on contribution from Ghana, Kenya (Republic of), South Africa (Republic of), and Tanzania (United Republic of) regarding empirical data on the current use of the ITRs by Operating Agencies and/or administrations and the proportion of global telecommunications services which now reply on the ITRs.

The contribution highlights the use of the ITRs by some African countries. For example, in South Africa through its primary legislation, the Electronic Communications Act, 2005 has implemented some provisions of the ITRs. The survey was sent to the operating agencies in some African countries and operators were asked the following questions regarding the use and implementation of the ITRs:

1. What benefits have accrued to the operator because of the use/implementation of the ITRs?
2. To what extent does the operator utilise the ITRs?

Some of the findings of the survey were that the 2012 ITRs have enabled Member States to promote the development of international telecommunication services in a more competitive environment in which South Africa, like many other countries has liberalised markets for the provision of telecommunications services. Although some operators have not accrued significant direct benefits from the ITRs, they believe that the broad principles of the ITRs that cover charging and accounting for the provision of international telecommunications services, provide a framework for fair and efficient trade in such services across jurisdictions. This indicates the need for the ITRs as well as the need to review the ITRs to keep them current.

**Discussions**

* Some members were of the opinion that collection of empirical data demonstrates the use and relevance of ITRs, highlighting the need to update them, particularly in order to help guide Member States with setting the policy agendas for operators nationally.
* Some members were of the opinion that regulatory environments that are market-driven and promote competition, investment and innovation are important for the modern telecommunication landscape and the ITRs is not an appropriate mechanism for the same.
* A sector member, referred to in contribution EG-ITRs-2/3, clarified that they do not support opening, updating, or renegotiating the ITRs, nor extending their purview, stressing particularly that expanding provisions on ITRs to address cybersecurity and spam is unnecessary given that these issues are being effectively addressed in other platforms such as the ongoing work in SG 17 and other forums such as the Global Forum on Cyber Expertise. Some other members were of the view that the outcomes and the scope of ITU Study Groups and other global forums do not have treaty status.
* The Acting Chair suggested that, if they so wish, Member States can carry out their own surveys in the manner done by South Africa, and bring the results to the Group in future meetings. There was consensus that a survey for collection of empirical data would not be issued.

**5.2 Contributions received on new trends which may impact the ITRs**

**5.2.1 Contributio**n[**EG-ITRs-2/5**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0005/en)**, Hill**

**Summary**

This contribution presents information on the current and future use of artificial intelligence (AI) on international telecommunication networks and submits that consideration should be given to adding provisions on such use of AI to the ITRs, in order to ensure the relevance of the ITRs which “consist of high-level guiding principles” in the current telecommunication/ICT environment.

**Discussions**

* + Some members highlighted that the contribution aligns with the Terms of Reference of the Group and there is an urgent need to consider how new trends such as AI will impact international telecommunication networks and services, stressing that such an analysis does not imply regulation of such technologies through the treaty.
	+ Some members were of the opinion that such a topic is beyond the scope of the treaty and is being addressed in several other platforms at ITU, including through standards development work.
	+ The contribution was noted. The Acting Chair indicated that, given the Terms of Reference of the Group, this topic could continue to be discussed in subsequent meetings of the Group based on contributions.

**5.2.2 Contribution** [**EG-ITRs-2/6**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0006/en)**, Hill**

**Summary**

This contribution presents information on issues regarding the routing of international telephone numbers and submits that consideration should be given to adding provisions to the ITRs to ensure routing of such numbers, and this in order to ensure the relevance of the ITRs which “consist of high-level guiding principles” in the current telecommunication/ICT environment.

**Discussions**

* + Some members were of the opinion that, while this is not a new trend, it is an important operational matter to be considered within the context of updating the ITRs.
	+ Some members were of the opinion that the discussions on the specific topic raised in the contribution in Study Group 2 had addressed the issue. Other members expressed a different view.
	+ The contribution was noted. The Acting Chair indicated that, given the Terms of Reference of the Group, this topic could continue to be discussed in subsequent meetings of the Group based on contributions.

**5.2.3 Multi-Country Contribution** [**EG-ITRs-2/18**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0018/en)**, Ghana, Kenya, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda**

**Summary**

The Republic of South Africa presented document EG-ITRs-2/18 on contribution from Ghana, Kenya (Republic of), Uganda (Republic of), South Africa (Republic of), and Tanzania (United Republic of) regarding new trends in Telecommunications/ICTs and emerging issues in International Telecommunications/ICTs environment which may impact the ITRs.

The contribution highlights the changing Telecommunications/ICTs environment and issues related to it. The essence of the contribution is to indicate that if emerging issues are not addressed through binding international instruments it might cause instability for ITU members and international legal framework required to regulate these new trends. This may for example, impact global economic trade and growth. The existing regime is not only archaic but also insufficiently adapted to a world where economies and policies are interdependent.

The contribution also highlights that the attempt to represent these new trends and emerging issues in the instruments is a move towards having a revamped harmonized framework which will amongst other changes reflect human-centric considerations in the face of the dynamic environment.

The contribution further highlights the following trends and emerging issues in International Telecommunications/ ICT environment which may impact the ITRs:

1. Internet of Things;
2. Connectivity Technologies (FTTH, 5G and Satellite);
3. Artificial Intelligence;
4. Cybersecurity;
5. Technological Evolution;
6. Adjacent services from OTTs;
7. Separation of infrastructure and service layers;
8. Decreasing voice revenues;
9. Reduction in CDRs;
10. Taxation;
11. Collection charges; and
12. E-commerce and digital trade

**Discussions**

* + - Some members were of the opinion that the Terms of Reference provide a clear framework for the deliberations of the Group, with new trends that may have an impact on the ITRs constituting a key component of the review. These members stated that clear detailed analyses is required to hold constructive discussions and provide a concrete outcome for the consideration of Council and PP, and for ITU to remain the lead organization within the UN system on technical and regulatory matters related to ICT/telecommunications. In addition, they stressed that the changing telecommunications/ICTs environment and issues related to it, if not addressed in binding international instruments will cause instability for ITU members and international legal framework needed to regulate these new trends. They urged members to consider the importance of the treaties for some members of the Group, particularly developing countries, and highlighted the necessity to reach agreement on how to progress efforts efficiently within the Group.
* Some members were of the opinion that the ITRs are not the appropriate mechanism for regulation on matters related to new trends. Review of the dynamic nature of new and emerging technologies is already taking place in ITU through the development and standardization sectors. In addition, these members highlighted other trends that need attention as well including (a) that nearly all traffic is managed under commercial arrangements between operators today, (b) expansion in access to services, such as the surge in the number of Internet users, (c) positive new trends in access to broadband services, mobile subscriptions etc., and (d) the wider range of issues that are being addressed by ITU Study Groups which also makes the ITRs less relevant in a modern communications environment that is driven primarily by private sector investment, innovation by technical community and governments/regulators putting in place an enabling environment for competition and innovation.
* Given the divergent views in the meeting, the Acting Chair indicated that specific contributions on the impact of new trends on the ITRs could be submitted to future meetings of the Group for inclusion in the Final Report.

**6 Discussion on contributions received on working methods, work plan and/or structure of the final report of the EG-ITRs**

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 discussions that followed are provided below.

**6.1 Contribution** [**EG-ITRs-2/7**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0007/en)**, Hill**

**Summary**This contribution proposes a structure for the final report to Council of the EG-ITRs. The structure proposed below is based on the structure of Document [C22/26](https://www.itu.int/md/S22-CL-C-0026/en), which is the Final report of the previous EG-ITRs.

**6.2 Contribution** [**EG-ITRs-2/8**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0008/en)**, Hill**

**Summary**

This contribution presents items to be included in the final report of the EG-ITRs. The items are presented as entries in the proposed Annex 1 of the proposed structure for the final report presented in [EG-ITRs-2/7](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0007/en): Proposal for structure of final report. The items are those set forth in contribution [EG-ITRs-1/2](https://www.itu.int/md/S23-EGITRS1-C-0002/en) and its addendums.

**6.3 Multi-Country Contribution** [**EG-ITRs-2/11**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0011/en)**, Czech Republic, Bulgaria, Croatia, Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Latvia , Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain , Sweden, United Kingdom**

**Summary**

This contribution proposed a work plan for the remaining five meetings of the third Expert Group on the ITRs.

It reflected the outcome of the previous session and strictly followed the group's Terms of Reference, trying to split the subjects and appoint them to particular future sessions, as per the calendar.
It was without prejudice to members of the Group making any other contributions to any meeting on any topic provided that it is within the Terms of Reference of the Group.
The intention is to help find an approach which allows for  flexibility and accommodates all views, but which also provides useful guide to the Group to help organise its work and produce a successful outcome.

**6.4 Contribution** [**EG-ITRs-2/14**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0014/en)**, Russian Federation, Armenia, Belarus, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan**

**Summary**

The objective of the contribution is to determine the necessary areas of work to review the ITRs. As the main approach, the contribution proposes an article-by-article review of the text of the ITRs, while specific clarifications, additions and changes are proposed to the specified articles of the ITRs, which are necessary and could be reflected in the new, unified, single ITR.

Its’s also emphasized, that the texts contained in the current Appendixes, as well as possible new Annexes to a future version of the ITRs, is to explain the general provisions of the relevant ITR articles, as well as to reflect relevant progress in the work of ITU-T on each of the work items and norms of the relevant ITU-T Recommendations.

The highest priority areas for the review of the ITRs, which require clarification in the future ITRs, are also proposed in the contribution.

**6.5 Contribution** [**EG-ITRs-2/16**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0016/en)**, Russian Federation , Armenia , Belarus , Kyrgyzstan**

**Summary**

The contribution proposes to boil down the content of the EG-ITRs Final Report primarily to the consideration of the ITRs, including changes and/or suppressions of provisions of the ITRs, as well as the addition of new provisions for the future ITRs, as proposed in the received contributions, in order to take into account emerging new trends in telecommunications/ICT. The proposed structure consists of:

- Introduction;

- Basic information;

- Work of the Expert Group on ITRs;

- Results of the work of the Expert Group on ITRs,

and recommendations are also given on the possible content of Annexes to it.

To optimize the working time of the EG-ITRs in the period between in-person meetings, it is proposed to appoint Rapporteurs on individual issues (sections, chapters of the ITRs, etc.) to assist in the preparation of the text that will form the basis of the Final Report of the EG-ITRs, as well as in consolidating the texts presented in the contributions of Member States and Sector Members to the draft EG-ITRs Final Report. The desire of the EG-ITRs Vice-Chairs to act as Chapter Rapporteurs is called to be supported.

**6.6 Discussions on Contributions** [**EG-ITRs-2/7**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0007/en)**,** [**EG-ITRs-2/8**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0008/en)**,** [**EG-ITRs-2/11**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0011/en)**,** [**EG-ITRs-2/14**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0014/en) **and** [**EG-ITRs-2/16**](https://www.itu.int/md/S24-EGITRS2-C-0016/en)

**6.6.1** **Work Plan**

* + Some members were of the opinion that it would be helpful to adopt a high-level flexible Work Plan to guide the future meeting of the Group productively.
	+ Some members were of the opinion that a more detailed Work Plan focusing on new trends that may impact the ITRs and an article-by-article analysis would provide a more effective outcome for the Group’s work.
	+ Relevant contributions as well as several proposals aimed at advancing consensus were discussed. Taking note of the views of the meeting, the Acting Chair proposed a draft Work Plan for the future meetings of the Group. The draft Work Plan, attached as Annex 1 to this Report, was approved by the meeting with the understanding that it provides guidance for the work of the Group and does not limit any members to submit contributions in line with Resolution 146 (Rev. Bucharest, 2022) and Council Resolution 1379 (Amended 2023). A statement from the Russian Federation is attached as Annex 2 to this Report.

**6.6.2** **Final Report of the EG-ITRs to Council 2026 (Final Report)**

* + Some members welcomed contributions on the structure and content of the Final Report as a suggestion for a possible draft, whereas some members were of the opinion that it is premature to discuss the structure or contents of the Final Report at this stage.
	+ Pursuant to the Terms of Reference, the Final Report to Council 2026 will reflect all inputs made by Member States and Sector Members, and inputs from the Directors of the Bureaux, whether made in contributions or verbally.
	+ The contributions were noted. The Acting Chair suggested contributions could continue to be submitted to future meetings on the structure and content of the Final Report, noting that the Work Plan has set out initiation of the drafting of the Final Report at the 5th meeting of the Group and completion of the Report at its 6th meeting.

**7 Next steps**

7.1 Some members requested the Secretariat to share a list of participants who registered for the meeting. The request was agreed by the Secretariat.

7.2 Given the volume of contributions and the fact that some of them have been deferred several times to the next meeting, some members requested the Secretariat to allocate a minimum of two days for each meeting of the Group. Other members expressed a view that extending the duration of the meetings is not necessary.

7.3 The Acting Chair presented the draft report of the second meeting to the Group for approval. Members considered the Report and suggested modifications. The draft report was agreed for publication by the Secretariat.

7.4 In keeping with past practice, the meeting agreed that the first and second meeting reports of the Group, held in October 2023 and January 2024 respectively, will be presented and hyperlinked in a short document by the Chair and submitted as a Progress Report to be presented to Council 2024.

**8 Other Business**

8.1 Pursuant to Agenda Item 3, the proponent of EG-ITRs 1/2 requested for the floor to present the Addendums that were not presented or discussed in the first meeting, however, due to lack of time, the Acting Chair suggested re-submitting them as contributions to be discussed at the next meeting of the Group.

8.2 The Russian Federation representative made a statement on representation of the CIS region in coordination efforts during and between EG-ITRs meetings in the absence of a Vice Chair from the CIS region. The statement is attached to this Report as Annex 3.

**9 Closing of the Meeting**

In closing, the Acting Chair thanked all the ITU Member States and Sector Members who made contributions and participated in the work of the Expert Group, the Vice-Chairs, and ITU Elected Officials and the Secretariat for their efficient assistance during the meeting. The meeting expressed its appreciation to the Acting Chair.

**Acting Chair: Mr. Sunil Kumar Singhal (India)**

Annex 1

Work Plan

| **Meeting** | **Objective** | **Possible Activities** | **Required outcome** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| EG-ITRs3rd, 4th and 5th sessions | The agenda for each of these sessions is to continue to review the ITRs, taking into consideration the work of the previous two Expert Groups, based on the Terms of Reference set out in Council Resolution 1379 (Mod. 2023) which include, among others, as indicated below ​a)       new trends in telecommunications/ICT and emerging issues in international telecommunications/ICT environment which may impact the ITRs,b)       empirical data on the current use of the ITRs by operating agencies and/or administrations and the proportion of global telecommunication services which now rely on the ITRs, andc)        the relevance of the ITRs which “consist of high-level guiding principles" in the current telecommunication/ICT environment. | * Discuss contributions received
* Consider the meeting reports
 | 3rd meeting - Meeting Report4th meeting – Meeting Report5th meeting – Meeting Report and begin drafting the Final Report |
| 6th session  | Discuss the draft Final Report to Council 2026 | * Discuss contributions received
* Completion of work on the Final Report to the Council
 | Final Report to Council 2026 |

Annex 2

Statement by the Russian Federation on the agenda item “Discussion on contributions received on working methods, work plan and/or structure of the final report of the EG-ITRs” regarding the approval of the group’s work plan for the period until the 2026 Plenipotentiary Conference

The discussions held on the substance and approval of the work plan of the Expert Group on International Telecommunication Regulations (EG-ITRs) for the period up to the 2026 Plenipotentiary Conference appear to be an attempt to slow down the work of the Expert Group and revise its mandate, which should be consistent with the decisions of Resolution 146 (Rev. Bucharest, 2022) and based on the ToR of the Expert group as set out in Council Resolution 1379 (Amended 2023).

The work plan approved during the second meeting of the EG-ITRs after the 2022 Plenipotentiary Conference appears to restrain the Expert group members and other stakeholders listed in PP Resolution 146 to submit contributions pursuant to the above PP and Council decisions and to curb them within the three specific topic listed in the Expert Group ‘s ToR.

With this statement, the Russian Federation confirms its commitment to the relevant decisions taken by the PP and the Council, and declares itself not bound by the provisions of the EG-ITRs work plan, approved during the second meeting of the EG-ITRs after the 2022 Plenipotentiary Conference. Thus, in preparing and providing the following EG-ITRs meetings with the contributions the Russian Federation will be in line the decisions of Resolution 146 (Rev. Bucharest, 2022) and Council Resolution 1379 (Amended 2023).

Annex 3

Statement by the Russian Federation on the representation of the CIS region in coordination efforts during and between EG-ITRs meetings in the absence of a Vice-Chairman from the CIS region

The need of the representation of the CIS region in coordination efforts during and between EG-ITRs meetings in the absence of a Vice-Chairman from the CIS region was stressed by the Russian Federation during the second meeting of the EG-ITRs after the 2022 Plenipotentiary Conference.

The Russian Federation requested that the RCC Executive Committee to be used as the CIS regional coordinator for the EG-ITRs until the issue of appointing a Vice-Chairman for CIS region is settled within due procedure and to reflect such a request in the meeting report.

The Russian Federation regards the refusal of a number of Member States that took part in the group meeting to reflect the mentioned request and corresponding objections in the meeting report as, firstly, another attempt to violate the rights of the CIS region to equal representation in the activities of the Union, which in turn violates a number of provisions of the ITU Constitution and Convention, as well as the Decisions and Resolutions of the ITU Plenipotentiary Conference, secondly, a direct violation of provision 153 of the General Rules of conferences, assemblies and meetings of the Union.

As for the appointment of the Vice-Chairman from the CIS region to Council Working groups in general the Russian Federation reaffirms its full alignment with the [statement](http://council.itu.int/2023-additional/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2023/10/Belarus-on-behalf-of-KZ-RU-e.docx) made by Belarus on behalf of Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation during the additional session of the Council, that was attached to its Summary record of the second and last plenary meeting (Doc. [C23-ADD/12](https://www.itu.int/md/S23-C23ADD-C-0012/en)).

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_