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Background

As requested by the Council-2024, Council Working Group on financial and human resources (CWG-FHR) took the task to advance on the review of regional presence under Resolution 25 (Rev. Bucharest, 2022) and established an online Correspondence Group to develop Terms of Reference for the ITU secretariat to complete a review of regional presence. The result of this work has been adopted by the CWG-FHR and presented in Annex A to Document [C25/50](https://www.itu.int/md/S25-CL-C-0050/en) for approval of the Council-2025.

Inception Report on the Review of ITU Regional Presence (Doc. [C25/69](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=S25-CL-C-0069)) presents a set of recommendations to facilitate the Council’s decision while providing greater clarity on the main aspects of the regional review (methodology, timeline, scope, stakeholder engagement, resourcing requirements).

We welcomethe establishment of the Inter-Sectoral Task Force on regional presence and its recommendations to the Council; however, we would like to make several proposals, as presented below, in this contribution.

Proposal

1 We invite the Council to approve the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Review of the ITU’s Regional Presence presented in Annex A to Document C25/50 so that the review process starts without delay.

2 Methodology, as presented in the ToRs, should be the basis of the review. Benchmarking analysis and combined methodology, proposed in the Inception Report, should be included in the overall methodology as valuable parts of the review.

3 We support the approach of including ITU Membership and other relevant stakeholders in the review process, especially the proposal to establish a Member States Advisory Group on Regional Presence. Such Advisory Group could have a role in planning and validation processes, as well as in coordination with/within the regions.

If the proposal to establish the Advisory Group is approved by the Council, the Secretariat should immediately issue a call to Regional Telecommunication Organizations (RTOs) to nominate two representatives per region for the Group.

At its first meeting, the Advisory Group could appoint the Chair from the members of the Group, develop and agree on the Terms of Reference, specifying the main objectives and modalities of its work. The Advisory Group should organize its meetings (remote or physical when possible) regularly, depending on the agreed timeline of each phase of the regional review.

4 Bearing in mind the time limitations, i.e. 11 months to develop the report, a more detailed timeline for each phase of the review, including stakeholder consultations and meetings of Member States Advisory Group, should be developed to align with the dates of the Council, Council Working Groups and Expert Groups sessions, as well as other meetings of ITU.

5 In terms of clarity, a more specific description of the validation process should be developed.
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