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>> CHAIR: Good afternoon. Thank you for coming. This is the third meeting of the Admin Committee and we would like to get started where we left off yesterday. We had some questions. We stopped off at agenda item No. 6, efficiency measures and a contribution from China. We were at the stage of answering questions. And I have gone through our notes and the only question that I believe that we did not answer ‑‑ that we did not respond to was the question from Russia regarding the report ‑‑ document 45's format. And just to confirm that you wanted to see the report in more of a tabular form for the next Council. That is my understanding. Russia, could you please confirm?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes, yes, thank you, Madam Chair. We can confirm that for efficiency we would like to see all of the information in a tabular form.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Mr. Ba.

>> ALASSANE BA: Thank you, Madam Chair. And good afternoon to you all. All right. We have taken this request of the Russian Federation and we will do our best to improve the presentation aspects of this document next year. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. With that I would like to move on to item No. 7 and my apologies. We are looking at Revision 4 to C17/DT/3 and as regards to item ‑‑ agenda item 6 we have taken note of all the comments. And we will make sure to respond to them in their report of the Admin Committee.

All right. So moving to item No. 7, the first one, and we will take these as a block and then we will have a discussion. Cost recovery for the processing of satellite network filings, C17/16 and I understand this is Mr. Henri. You have the floor. Thank you.

>> YVON HENRI: Thank you, Madam Chair. And good afternoon to you all. I have the pleasure on behalf of the Secretary‑General to present this document to you, C17/16. It is a kind of document she has presented to each session of the Council and this document provides information in table 1 on page 2 on the status of the implementation of decision 482 as amended in 2013, providing information for 2015 and 2016. And it shows invoices in '15 and '16 which in 2015 amounted to 14 million 727,000 francs and 17,688,000 francs and the percentage of invoices which are paid timely amount to almost 99%. So much for table 1 and paragraph 3, a reference is made in document C17/11 which provides information on the status of arrears and special arrears as of the 31st of December 2016. And conclusion as in all of previous years the Council, the implementation of the decision 482 by the Bureau did not give rise to any difficulty and everything was settled vis‑a‑vi administration. Council is to take note of this report. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Are there any comments on document C17/16? Any clarifications? Thank you. I see no one asking for the floor. So we will take note of this document as recommended by Mr. Henri. Mr. Henri, introduce document 61. Thank you.

>> YVON HENRI: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair. Once again on behalf of the Secretary‑General I would like to present to you document C17/61. This document appeared as an outcome of the decision during the World Radiocommunication Conference in 2015 and which partially amended the regulations and took a decision that certain of its provisions will counterforce the 1st of ‑‑ on the 1st of January 2017. Among such provisions which were approved by WRC‑15 are certain of them ‑‑ certain of them pertain to Article 9 of the radio regulations which describes the procedure for coordination with other administrations. And a decision was taken to delete a part of Article 9 concerning advanced publication. And it has also been decided ‑‑ it was decided to add another provision to the same section 1 of the regulations. As a result of that modification the need arose to revise a decision for 82. What is most important here is that the WRC‑15 decision does ‑‑ doesn't have any financial implications for the satellite network filing in annex to 482. Those are mostly editorial amendments which were necessitated by certain other amendments to introduce in the radio regulations approved to WRC‑15. And those amendments are presented in the annex.

I am not going to read it all out in detail, but linked in the table to the annex that is directly rooted in decisions taken by the W ‑‑ by WRC‑15 and decides 11 of the decision. It would also find a clarification in terms of this amendment 482 which has been applied under 482. It is just a clarification. Once again an important element to emphasize no financial implications. The Council is invited to review these modifications and if possible to adopt the amended text which is presented in document 61. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Henri. Now I would like to invite Russia to introduce document 79.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Many thanks, Madam Chair, today for an opportunity to present a presentation on behalf of the Republic of Armenia and Belarus and the Russian Federation. This contribution is related to the issue of the process in ‑‑ of satellite networks in non‑GSO orbits. The recovery of costs and possible measures to be taken by the Council to deal with an issue of the growing time for processing non‑GSO system filings and the length of time needed for the publication of such notices.

Madam Chair, over the past two years non‑GSO satellite systems have made significant headway which make it possible to set up a global broadband communication systems and to conduct climate observation and earthography as well as to tackle other objectives which are crucial to mankind as a whole and in that sense non‑GSO satellite systems are, of course, of crucial importance.

During the work of our Council we have seen successful launch of satellite systems, broadband system, global express. On the 16th of May the satellite was delivered to in to orbit and I would like to congratulate our colleagues on the success and to point out a major contribution of the ITU and in particular of the BR in that success. At the same time, Madam Chair, I would like to point out that we have seen the trend for growing delays in the processing of notifications at the level of the BR. And this issue was first flagged last February at the ‑‑ at a meeting of the radio regulations board. During the discussion it was pointed out that such delays had to do with the growing complexity of notifications as well as growth in their number following some decisions taken by the latest conferences as well as by a lack of resources, shortfall in resources in order to meet the demands of growing complexity of satellite systems. Since November 2014 the Bureau has received a whole host of requests, notification requests for non‑GSO satellite systems, some of which incorporate thousands or even tens of thousands of satellites.

The BR emphasized that the ‑‑ two administrations, that the processing could not occur within the regulatory deadline of three to four months. The processing of such complex notifications it is a difficult matter because systems operate different numbers of satellites and numbers of orbits. Over the past few years we have seen 50 such satellite networks and in our contribution you can see for yourselves the differences between non‑GSO and GSO systems and the rising difficulties for the BR. It is not surprising that against this backdrop we have seen delays in the processing. Two of our contributions demonstrates a dependence of the processing time with respect to the 50 satellite network filings we have analyzed on ‑‑ the processing time grows from by 50 to 100%.

So instead of four months we have ten months as the time needed by the Bureau for processing. We can also observe a clear‑cut correlation to the complexity of networks and the needed time for their processing. The importance of this issue also lies in the fact that the processing of filings at the Bureau level is done consecutively both with respect to GSO and non‑GSO satellite networks. That is why a delay ‑‑ delays in non‑GSO filings entails delays in the processing of geostationary satellite networks. So it affects the entire satellite industry.

It is quite clear that a longer time for processing and publication leads to shorter times for coordination. Shorter time for coordination makes operators' lives more difficult. And I would continue this chain of logic even further, but what is important to bear in mind here is that the processing and publication times are commitments on the part of the ITU vis‑a‑vi the notifying of administration. They need to be done in a timely manner, in a clear and timely manner if the filing has been properly made. Why is that? We have our decision 482 pursuant to which costs are being recovered for the processing filings. If that decision operates as a truth on one hand we have enough financial and human resources to process the filings in a timely manner. And B, we would have a guarantee that we are not going to see the emergence of a paper non‑GSO satellite networks with which we have had to contend for a number of years.

We tried to analyze how 482 applies to non‑GSO systems and we concluded that firstly the processing systems are similar for both GSO and non‑GSO in terms of low in pay. But at the same time there is a certain threshold of 100 units where if the costs are higher than 100 units the ‑‑ further recovery is not levied and the notifying administration does not pay that additional sum.

Figure 3 of our contribution shows that the difference between the costs recovered under decision 482 and actual costs by the Bureau in terms of processing these non‑GSO systems which we have analyzed. What is important to bear in mind here is that in order to have this diagram in a single page we needed to use the logarithmic scale to show you the great difference between the sums received in terms of cost recovery and the actual costs shouldered by the Bureau.

So this analysis demonstrates that decision 482 because of rapid development of nongeostationary networks does not fully cover the new ‑‑ the emerging difficulties and new methods used by nongeostationary systems. Because of that our administrations have put forth a range of measures to be taken which would make it possible to mount an immediate response and not to tolerate any further delays in the processing of filings.

In conjunction with that I suggest first to make a budgetary allocation for the improvement of software used by the BR. And so expanding the staff, the BR staff in order to speed up consideration of filings. Secondly to task the BR director to breakdown complex notifications in to simpler ones and to proceed with cost recovery on the basis of those individual parts pursuant to 482. And a third proposal in the longer term to invite the Council to consider possible methodology for cost recovery involved in the processing of nongeo system filings.

In order to be able to do that you need to issue relevant tasks both the BR director and to a correspondent Council Working Group which deals with the mounting decision 482.

In conclusion, Madam Chair, I would also point out that this contribution has been considered by the RAG and the document presented by RAG to this Council in document 111, this proposal made in our contribution have received support in 111. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia, for that complete. Mr. Henri, will you introduce document 111, please?

>> YVON HENRI: Thank you, Madam Chair. 111 presents conclusions of the Radiocommunication Advisory Group and I would invite you more specifically to pay attention to 6.2, paragraph 6.2 which concerns cost recovery for the processing of satellite network filings by RAG and a copy of the Russian contribution which has just been presented by the Russian Federation.

The Russian Federation had the honor to present it previously to RAG and RAG conclusions are contained in paragraph 6.2. RAG concluded that decision 682 of the Council was not adequate as a whole to cover non‑GSO satellite network filings ‑‑ there is a cost recovery, particularly with regards to notifications received in the past 12 to 18 months. And RAG also points out that the situation has arisen because of the complexity and the great number of such non‑GSO systems due to the complexity of examining our procedures and which has led to delays in publication of these notification of filings with respect to non‑GSO systems but also with respect to all notification filings including GSO ones.

So RAG invited the BR director to share these considerations with the session of the Council and in the same paragraph 6.2 you would find other conclusions which RAG brought to the director so that he could bring to the attention of the Council with special emphasis on cost recovery. Two options have been proposed to use ITU budget and the second suggestion to review 482, the decision of the Council in identifying a specific procedure for cost recovery with regard to non‑GSO constellations, mega constellations.

The RAG has also invited the director to provide clarifications to the Council on the possible modalities of processing the non‑GSO filings in such a manner that it doesn't effect negatively the existing procedures. RAG has examined this Russian document and considered the things contained in the Russian document with RAG and has enjoined the Council to consider it itself and take a wise decision with particular regard to cost recovery for non‑GSO satellite networks filings processing. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Henri. The floor is open for discussion on documents 79, 61 and 111. Are there any ‑‑ we are having technical difficulties. So if you have asked for the floor, could you please raise your flag? I'm sorry. Spain, United States and Australia. Okay. Spain, you have the floor.

>> SPAIN: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. We just wished to say that we have some small changes to be made to the Spanish version of document 61. They are of an editorial nature. If that is required we can send it in to the Secretariat so they can make the corresponding modifications to the text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Yes. We can ‑‑ the editorial changes if we can send them to us that would be fine. Thank you very much. Is it to the Spain ‑‑ okay. All right. Thank you. United States, you have the floor please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much. And let me thank Mr. Henri for his presentation and the Russian Delegation for their deep analysis of the situation with respect to satellite network cost recovery. The United States supports an increase in the budget for the Radiocommunication Bureau. Recent human resource drawdowns in the ITR budget have created a new backlog and noncompliance with the regulatory time limits. This directly hinders the operations of the membership of the ITU and is detrimental to the ITU reputation and relevance as a leader managing satellite resources. Moreover the budget should include resources necessary to update the relevant software for the non‑GSO satellite filings and could assist the Bureau with its processing of these filings.

During the discussion at the RAG the director of the Radiocommunication Bureau informed members present that the current delay in processing network filings is not due to the non‑GSO systems but to a doubling of the number of GSO filings which in and of themselves have become more complex. The satellite network cost recovery process contained in decision 482 was created through a very lengthy, difficult and arduous process. It had to be substantially modified multiple times when some of the fees charged to be unpredictable and unverifiable and in some cases extremely high. This was a difficult period for Council Member States notifying administrations, satellite operators and the BR and such difficulties should be avoided in future cost recovery deliberations. As the BR has reported in several recent Council meetings including this one the current process for decision 482 is working well and compliance is over 99% in terms of payment.

We recommend that Council invite the director of BR to study this matter and to gather data on the actual efforts required to process non‑GSO filings, taking in to account ongoing developments in the ITR including the software and not rush to a conclusion about modifying decision 482. In the meantime the BR must continue to invoice according with decision 482 as approved by Council. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Australia, you have the floor.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Like the U.S. Australia would like to thank Mr. Henri for his presentation of the various reports and also the Russian Federation, Armenia and Belarus for their contribution. We would also support the increase of resourcing to the BR given the great importance of its work to administrations. However, we feel that any changes to the cost recovery for the reasons I think were well articulated by the U.S. Delegation should be researched in careful consideration and brought to Council. A considered change to cost recovery would be needed based on actual costs and actual time both for GSO and non‑GSO. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia. Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Madam Chair. While Canada supports the two previous speakers in that we as well believe that an increase in the funding and resources available to the BR to process these filings is required and also to improve software available to do this processing of filings. But we have the same concerns that were expressed by Australia and the United States and we believe that modification to the decision 486 would be premature at this time. That it requires careful study and that we would wish to have Council invite the director of the Bureau to study this matter more fully before we make any decision to identify first where the shortcomings might be and that we are in a better position to take an appropriate decision at the future Council. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So I see no more requests for the floor. I'm sorry, Mexico. Mexico. Mexico, you have the floor. Argentina, you have the floor. Delegates, it is actually Mexico sitting behind Argentina.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Madam Chair. It is just an issue that we couldn't address or resolve with regard to the seats we were assigned. Unfortunately we lack resources to have seats for our whole Delegation. So in the spirit of cooperation that we are showing for the WTDC and they are showing to us Argentina was very kind in offering seats that they still had available. So we would like to thank them for this advantage they have shared with us.

On this particular point, Madam Chair, Argentina is not a participant in the RRB. So we receive the decisions of the board sometime after the decisions are taken or suggestions or recommendations are made there. We would like to join other Delegates who spoke before us in saying that we believe that the process which was carried out in taking a decision with regard to cost recovery on notification of satellite networks during WRC‑15 and also in other fora was quite complicated. Too many different elements which were interrelated had to be considered. And we think that at a certain point it was very well balanced at the end of the day. But the question that Russia had with regard to the quantity of satellite networks, non‑GSO networks which were being notified in recent months and years do make the situation more difficult for the BR to comply with the requirements in the time frames established. We do insist that we should not take hasty decisions in trying to identify what the specialized groups are who could support us in defining what the best path is to take with regard to identifying how this decision might be possibly amended. In order to be clear, Madam Chair, Mexico at this point would not support any modification to decision 482. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mexico. So the IT staff were able to get our machine working again. So I understand that Russia is requesting the floor. You have the floor. So please push your button if you want to take the floor now. Thank you.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. And I would like to thank colleagues for their comments with regard to our contribution. I would like to say firstly that the decision of Council No. 482 is the prerogative of the Council. It is adopted by the Council. So we are fully able to reconsider it and accept it. Secondly I would like to note that the concern of those expressed some concern about reviewing decision 482 may be linked to geostationary satellite systems which we are not proposing to change in decision 482. They should remain as they were. We are only talking about nongeostationary systems. And then the contribution it is clearly indicated that for nongeostationary satellite systems the principle of cost recovery for processing is not being complied with or fulfilled. You will see the difference between the real expenditure and the sums which are recovered is for some networks, one thousandth, that's to the power of 3 in terms of difference. The difference between the real expenditure or costs and the sums paid by the notifying administration are different by ‑‑ well, they are a thousand fold different. So in this connection we do wonder how do we apply the principle that we agreed on for cost recovery for processing of satellite network filings and the publication?

The final thing I wish to say is that our proposal consists of firstly taking swift action so as not to see an increase in the time taken for processing satellite network filings and to ensure that there aren't some non‑GSO systems which are simply on paper. And in order to do this we need to instruct the BR to breakdown the requests for filing in to complicated and less complicated ones and to implement cost recovery on the decision 482 for simple and complex systems.

As regards special methods of work, well, it is true that for cost recovery for non‑GSO systems there may be a need for more detailed consideration and study of the situation. We believe that this research should be carried out in the Council. So that at the next Council we can take a decision with the relevant information and arguments that will ‑‑ that we can then hear at the Council. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. I have a request from the UK. And that ‑‑ UK, you have the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon. Very briefly, we wanted to share some of the concerns that have been expressed about delays in processing. And share some of the comments made by previous speakers. But in particular we wanted to support the proposal to provide for improving the BR software here. We note with the U.S. there has been very positive discussion in Working Party 4A on this which may help in this regard. There is a view, of course, that updating the software would lead to a fall in the costs of examining non‑GSO efforts as networks. And we very much hope that the issue of software improvements can be addressed quickly. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UK. So this is where we are. There are ‑‑ in listening to the debate there is support for increasing the BR's budget to improve the BR software for processing non‑GSO systems. So we discussed this on Monday ‑‑ Tuesday when we introduced the budget. And if you note in DL3 there is ‑‑ we have funding in our parking lot, in our parking lot proposal for the BR. And I would like to defer that discussion of No. 1 under the Russian contribution. As for the other proposals inside document 79, while everyone ‑‑ all the speakers understood that there was ‑‑ it was a very complex and complicated issue there needs to be more study. So with that and that is also coming ‑‑ based on a recommendation from document 111, the RAG, the proposal of the Admin Committee is that the BR undertake a study and present the study to the Council Working Group on FHR at its next meeting in January, February. That is the proposal. There is no ‑‑ as far as 482 we will take the edits, the modifications that are identified in document 61 but at this time no other modifications to 482 are ‑‑ will be implemented.

So I see faces that are not clear. So here is my proposal, document 61 has a number of modifications to decision 482. And I'm proposing that we accept those modifications. I did not hear any objection to those modifications in decision 482 which did not change the proposal substantially, the decision substantially. So that's my decision on document 61.

As far as the Russian proposal there is agreement in the room for increasing the BR staff in order to improve the BR software. That discussion will take place when we discuss the budget. Is that clear? Okay.

As far as modifying decision 482 to include non‑GSO systems there is no Consensus. However what I did hear that more study needs to be undertaken. I am proposing that the BR undertake a study and present the results to the Council Working Group on FHR next January.

That is my proposal. I have Canada, Russia and U.S. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you for your clarity and your guidance. Madam Chair, just for clarification, I think I heard you saying something along the lines that the Council's Working Group on finance and human resources would be instructed to draw proposals to the next Council. Am I mistaken? My apologies and thank you for your clarity. And one last issue, I understand that we will be dealing with the budget issue tomorrow and one of the documents is the well referred to parking lot in which there are already some numbers allocated there for many issues which include the item, it is not pertinent to this discussion but it is the item on gender but we will certainly come back to your meeting with some observations concerning that particular item. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Just to confirm, I am not asking the Council Working Group on financial resources to do a study. I am asking the BR to do a study and submit the results to the Council Working Group on FHR in January. That is the clarification. Thank you.

Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. We are satisfied with your proposal on point 1 with regard to the increase in the budget and staffing and the improvement of the software. So we think that the BR might introduce its proposal as to what needs to be done for this part. We also understand secondly that a review of decision 482 may take a certain amount of time. It might require a certain amount of revision and we also support your proposal. At the same time with regard to the third proposal which is made in our document, we would like to further discuss and understand what you are proposing. The thing is that we understood that the BR at the moment may already consider or review complex filings and break them down in to simpler ones and taking the payment for their processing. We are not requesting nor do we need amendments to a decision 482. And at the same time we would resolve the main task which is to ensure that we don't have large numbers and non‑GSO satellite networks which only exist on paper which slow down satellite processing not only for non‑GSO but also for GSO satellite systems.

Therefore I would like to ask the BR as to whether or not they have full information about how to break down satellite network filings in to complex and more simple ones. And if there are no objections what we would propose is that the Council should instruct the BR for this Council to instruct the BR to act accordingly. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you for your proposal. With the exception of the forwarding of the report from the director of the BR to the Council Working Group on financial and human resources we can support the proposal. The Council Working Group on financial and human resources just doesn't have the expertise to deal with this sort of issue. In the last instance when we did an actual update of decision 482 and we looked at these issues more deeply, the Council decided to set up a special group. And it was extremely well attended by satellite network operators and administrations alike and to put an issue such as this in a Council Working Group on financial and human resources where we wouldn't have the experts or probably the awareness that this matter was being discussed would do us all a disservice when we got to Council next year. I would be very happy for the director of the BR to send his report to the Council next year and then we can decide what to do with it.

On the matter of the BR taking an action in the interim period to take a non‑GSO satellite network filing submitted by an administration as a single system and break it in to multiple systems each of them would be charged a separate filing fee. We cannot support that proposal. It would not comport with decision 482. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Mr. Henri, would you like to comment on Russia's question, please?

>> YVON HENRI: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think that with regard to the proposal which the Russian Federation made this refers to the concept of satellite networks for non‑GSO constellations as applied by the BR. This concept refers to the fact that under the same name because often at the end of the day at the level of satellite networks whether they are GSO or not, the information linked to this network is linked to a common name. So as I was saying for non‑GSO constellations the concept therefore refers to the possibility of having various orbital characteristic sets and inclinations linked to these satellites and networks. So to have various characteristics which will be proposed under the very same satellite network heading but each ones of these sets of orbital characteristics is mutually exclusive and that means in clear terms that now we have under the very same name various different non‑GSO constellations.

The approach that was applied by the BR came about, in fact, following numerous submissions by administrations received at the end of 2014 and in 2015. This ‑‑ they included having the possibility for administrations of having various sets of orbital characteristics which were mutually exclusive under the same heading under the same name. And this was indicated in the director's report to the conference as being a possible type of constellation that could be processed. The conference approved this approach indicating that it should be part of the rules of procedure which were established and approved by the RRB at their meeting in May 2016, if I recall correctly.

Now what's happened today is that under the very same name some constellations we have various subconstellations which are mutually exclusive and this was the approach that was approved by the conference and the RRB. The application of this approach to decision 482 is that decision 482 recognizes a cost for processing of notification filings by a satellite network. So it is true that today we apply a single cost for processing for these constellations, even if these constellations contain various families of orbital characteristics which are mutually exclusive. And if I understand correctly the proposal of the administration of Russia would be to breakdown or break up these constellations at the end of the day in to mutually exclusive subconstellations. To separate them out in to unique single constellations for each one of them. And to ensure that cost recovery was paid for each one of these subsets which are mutually exclusive for the moment.

Now as was indicated by the U.S. administration at the moment this possibility does not exist as such in decision 482. It is true that from a practical point of view in the Bureau that's something which could be applied without any difficulty. With regard to the application of decision 482 and providing a cost for each subconstellation that is a decision to be taken by the Council with regard to decision 482 and a special application of decision 482 as it exists today. As it would be applied to these non‑GSO constellations. So that is a decision to be taken by this Council. However as was indicated the act of separating the constellations as it has been done up to now by the Bureau does not actually pose any particular difficulties. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I give the floor to Iran.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Good afternoon. Sorry to take the floor on this issue. To avoid that Council decide on something that would create difficulties that we had between 2001 and 2004, there are technical issues and there are financial issues. Council may provide guidelines but do not go to the details and study to technical to divide to subsatellite and so on and so forth. Council should advise the ITR Working Group and so forth to look in to the matter how best this issue could be addressed from a technical point of view enabling Council to decide on financial aspects of that.

Otherwise you will face the same problems that we had before and would be a pity. So guidelines or guidance from the Council would be to ITU‑R Working Party, the Study Groups and others to look in to the matter and to find the best way how it should be addressed. At this stage it has not been studied. No document before the Study Groups, the issue was raised in the RAG and still yet to be discussed in detail from a technical point of view. Once clear then it comes to the financial point of view and cost recovery that you have to address. But it is quite clear that the situation does not reflect the reality today but how to address that, yet to be decided first technically and then financially. And thank you very much for giving me the floor.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. So here is my proposal again and I'm sorry that I wasn't very clear. Without the technical studies on ‑‑ if 482 should be modified to address the non‑GSO satellite issue, it cannot be updated at this Council based on the proposal outlined in document 79. The BR has to study this first. So it is not possible based on the explanation from Mr. Henri to break up the satellites in to smaller because they are considered a family and 482 doesn't allow that. So we cannot modify decision 482 unless ‑‑ until we have the study from the BR. So here is my suggestion again, is that in document 61 we accept the modifications from the BR. So we approve those modifications. When it comes to the non‑GSO satellite systems we request the BR to do a study and I'm going to look to the proponents that spoke on this issue to please get together and develop the questions that you want the BR to answer. The BR is instructed to submit this study to FHR not for FHR to look at technical aspects. Just so that there is an interim that administrations and Councillors look to see the see study so that they can make proposals to the next Council meeting on how to proceed. I'm not asking the FHR to review the technical study. Would that be acceptable? And if I could ask ‑‑ I have Russia and U.S. Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Many thanks, Madam Chair. In respect of modifying decision 482 we completely concur with your conclusion. What we are discussing is merely the second element which does not need any specific technical studies which is purely a financial issue and an issue of principle. That of recovering costs for the processing of non‑GSO satellite systems. At the present the application of 482 for non‑GSO satellite networks creates a situation whereby the difference between the actual costs incurred by the Bureau and the amount paid by the notifying administration is a thousand fold. And this Council needs to take a financial, not a technical decision as to how, in what manner we are going to recover these costs. Are we going to talk them up from our ITU budget? Or will we be recovering our costs in full agreement of our principle for the processing of satellite network filings. So we would like to seek a decision by the Council on this matter alone. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Our concerns with respect to sending this issue to the Council Working Group on financial and human resources remain for the reasons we gave earlier. Likewise, with applying a different schedule of fees to non‑GSO systems that does not comport with decision 482 would be inconsistent with our working methods here in the ITU. And administration and satellite network operators need to know when they file a satellite network filing what they will be charged. And you can determine that today with the existing software. We can't enter in to a situation where that is completely unpredictable based on rules we haven't discussed. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Germany.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Madam Chair. Well, we are not experts in the radio sector. We trust very much Mr. Arasteh and his intervention on this issue, but we have a historical knowledge which is that changes to this charging system for satellite network filing done in a hasty manner will cause a lot of difficulties for the Union and may not generate the revenue that they are supposed to generate. I remember a certain Plenipotentiary Conference where unpaid invoices for this exercise have been sent to the reserve account. So from this historical knowledge I would be very cautious and I think that as previous speakers that there should be both, of course, a technical analysis which certainly cannot be done in the Council Working Group on financial and human resources and a cost recovery methodology that all of this methodology to understand it in this particular case you need a lot of technical knowledge how this satellite filing, satellite network filing really works.

So I think that it would be appropriate to ask a study from the BR. This study can be sent directly to the Member States. You don't need to send it to any Council Working Group. What I forecast is that probably a Council will then establish another group with experts to look at this particular topic in detail. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Madam Chair. We, too, have some concerns with as we expressed earlier, but we want to reiterate here in light of ensuing discussions that adopting interim measures that have not ‑‑ that may or may not really be sustainable in the future in absence of the studies that we are calling for here would not necessarily serve, you know, the Union in this case. And we are concerned that we may while it may be appear to be even be tempting to adopt something quickly to address in part the issues that have been raised with respect to the processing of satellite systems and non‑GSO satellite systems it's really risky here to introduce I guess an approach that could end up being an inequitable vis‑a‑vi system. So we are very concerned about that. And we would certainly prefer that we have all the facts and understand the issues better and have the benefit of studies before adopting any measures at this Council.

With respect to the study that the BR would be conducting and with respect to your proposal to have it submitted to the Council Working Group dealing with financial and human resources issues we also have some concerns with the ability of that group to be able to examine this report. And we feel it would be important indeed to have input from administrations and experts that the BR would produce before Council 2018 would make a decision. We are open to what vehicle and would allow for that input and interaction if we wanted to make a decision at the next Council. Otherwise I'm afraid that we would be postponing for another year a decision.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. So I have the issue is not about the study because I ‑‑ all parties that have taken the floor agreed there should be a study. The issue is whether ‑‑ where it should go. And the different pieces of the study. So my proposal to address the concerns is that the BR does a study on non‑GSO satellite systems and submits it to Council 2018 so that Councillors and Member States can base their proposals to Council. I suggest that BR have this study done by January 31st. It should be submitted to ‑‑ posted to the Council website by July ‑‑ January 31st. So that Member States have the opportunity to review and submit proposals to Council 2018. That is my proposal. So I have two speakers requesting the floor. Are you objecting to the proposal to have the BR do a ‑‑ to a technical study on the non‑GSO satellite systems and submit the propose ‑‑ the study by January 31st? Okay. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Yes. Thank you, apologies. I would never object to you, Madam Chair, except that we would like to have some clarity as to in the elaboration of the report by the BR what process would be put in place for to allow Member States administrations to contribute to the elaboration of such reports which in turn will not be sent to the Council Working Group on finance and human resources for the obvious reasons. But again it is just a matter of clarity. And I'm not objecting to any of your proposals, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. I will provide an elaboration after. I'm sorry, Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Many thanks, Madam Chair. Firstly we have absolutely nothing against the proposal to look in to technical aspects. We completely agree with that. We have no other proposals in that area but I would like to re‑emphasize that we have a financial aspect which is in the purview of the Council and we would like to settle at this session. To clarify it our Canadian colleagues what is that financial aspect about. If you notify a nongeostationary satellite network you may have to pay 24,000 Swiss francs whereas the Bureau spends 24 million Swiss francs to process these filings. This is not very technical at all. This is a matter of deciding that these costs need to be met, need to be recovered by the notifying administration. Such a decision would not require any underpinning technical study. It just needs to be taken. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So I'm going to ‑‑ Russia, I'm going to respond to your question. There is a lot of uncertainty with modifying decision 482 without having all the information. So it ‑‑ the Admin Committee is reluctant and there is a lot of concern and it would be inappropriate to modify decision 482 with prior we have a study. Yes, we agree with the principle of cost recovery. And so we are trying to put together a mechanism to do that and so ‑‑ and the mechanism from this group is to have the BR do ‑‑ to commit to doing a study that has Member State input. I would need to ask the BR what that process would look like. And we could include it in the report ‑‑ the Admin Committee report but at this time it is ‑‑ it is not possible to modify decision 482 until after the study has been completed. So that is my proposal.

Can I ‑‑ Mr. Henri, would you please comment on what would the process be for the BR to get Member State input? Are there current processes in place to allow Member States to contribute to the BR study on non‑GSO satellites? Thank you.

>> YVON HENRI: Thank you, Madam Chair. The most simple approach that I have in mind in order to put in to place this mechanism would be for the Bureau to develop a preliminary document on the processing of non‑GSO filings. These constellations we hear so much about, various methodologies used by the Bureau and trying to do it in a timely manner in a similar way to what we did about 10 to 15 years ago when decision 482 was being prepared. So the Bureau could develop ‑‑ could conduct such a preliminary study and then with the help of a circular letter to bring that letter to the attention of administrations and to ask these administrations to supply comments with regard to this first preliminary study so that the Bureau could take them onboard and within the time limit you have given to the Bureau to have the document, final document ready, that is the 31st January 2018 so that by that date we have a more complete document which has taken in to account comments made by administrations. That it could be then submitted to the Council and I think that I share a preliminary study and such a circular letter could certainly be brought to the attention of administrations. I'm not being pessimistic or optimistic, but perhaps by November, in the course of November send it to administrations, leaving administrations about two months to supply their comments for the Bureau to incorporate these comments in to the preliminary final version in respect of the processing of non‑GSO satellite filings by the end of January 2018. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Okay. With that understanding and from Mr. Henri can we accept that process for getting Member States as well as it would be sector members as well, correct? Yes. To get membership comments on the report in the study. I see ‑‑ no.

Okay. So what I will do is I will work with Mr. Henri to develop the text that will go in my report, and I will share with the Member States that have taken the floor informally to consult. Okay.

So if we could take a look ‑‑ before we take our coffee break we are adopting the modifications to 482 in document 61.

(Gavel).

>> CHAIR: And before we take a coffee break I would like to thank ‑‑ well, I don't know if you guys know but Mr. Henri is retiring. And I have to say that I remember Mr. Henri when I started in Council in 2000 and it was on this very issue, network cost recovery. It was way over my head. But I remember him having grace. He never lost his patience. He was always smiling. So I would like to thank you, Mr. Henri, for your service to the ITU and I wish you lots of fun in your retirement. Take me with you.   
 (Laughter)   
 (Applause.)

>> CHAIR: And before we take the coffee break I would like to give the floor to Uganda to say a few words. Thank you.

>> UGANDA: Thank you, Madam Chair, for giving me the floor at this point in time to discuss something that is much less technical than what we have been discussing. But before I say that let me on behalf of the Ugandan Delegation begin by extending warm greetings to all the Distinguished Members of the Council. I wish to take this first opportunity to commend the commitment of ITU for its steadfast leadership. Uganda is happy to be associated with the progress that has so far been made by the organization.

Secondly I would like to commend the members of the Council for the support and cooperation extended to Uganda during the Council meetings. And we look forward to your continued cooperation and support in the days and years to come.

While I reiterate my Government's commitment to the work of the ITU I also pledge our readiness to working with all of you members of the Council towards achieving the overall objectives of the Union. I am therefore pleased and honored to invite all of you to a tea and coffee break hosted by Uganda immediately after this session in the lobby area outside this meeting room.

So you are all welcome. And I thank you, Madam Chair, for the opportunity. Thank you.   
 (Applause.)

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Deputy Ambassador Lequia. And thank you Uganda for the coffee break. Please come back at 4:10. Thank you very much.

(Break).

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I would like to thank the Ugandan Delegation for the lovely coffee and tea break. Thank you very much. The next document, next item on our agenda is No. 8, preliminary amount of the contributory unit and you will find that in document C17/57 and I will turn the floor over to Mr. Ba.

>> ALASSANE BA: Thank you, Madam Chair. On behalf of the Secretary‑General it is my pleasure to introduce document C17/57 on the preliminary amount of the contributory unit. The Secretary‑General has the intention of proposing that the contributory unit be maintained at the current level of 318,000 Swiss francs. As was done at the last Plenipotentiary Conference this would be a good basis for discussing the financial plan for all Member States and to allow for adequate preparation before the 2018 Plenipotentiary Conference. The draft financial plan for the 2020‑23 period will be considered at PP‑2018 and as a project to fix the financial limit correspondingly for the period running up to the next Plenipotentiary period after having examined all the relevant aspects of the activity of the Union during this period.

I would like to invite you to look at 851 of the constitution. In accordance with 161b of Article 28 of the constitution, the Plenipotentiary Conference fixes the contributory unit based on the financial plan for the previous period and the total number of contributors. In accordance with decision 5 which was revised in Busan, the Council is invited as far as possible to set the amount of the contributory unit for the 2020‑2023 period at its ordinary session in 2017 and invites Member States to announce the class of contribution in a provisional basis for this same period before the end of year 2017. The Secretary‑General has the intention of keeping this level at 318,000 Swiss francs. Once the Council has approved the preliminary amount of the contributory unit the Secretary‑General will send out a letter to all Member States inviting them to announce their provisional choice of class of contribution for this period by 31st of December 2017.

The 2018 Plenipotentiary Conference is expected to establish the framework for the biennium budget for 2021‑2022 and the 2022‑23 will be established. You will see a table. Annex 2 shows the evolution in the contributory units chosen by sector members and the evolution of the number of associates and academic institutions between the Plenipotentiary Conference in 2014 and the current situation today. The Council is invited to consider and approve this proposal. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Ba. Thank you for introducing document 57. This document is open for discussion. Are there any comments on document 57? So I see Germany. Germany, you have the floor.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Madam Chair. Very brief, we welcome the proposal of the Secretary‑General because this will also help Member States to have a specific and concrete idea of their contribution. I think we believe that it is, of course, a tough decision taken by the Secretary‑General. It will not make it very easy to establish the financial plan for the next four years but we appreciate this decision. In this context we would note that the voluntary announcement of the provisional class of contribution for the following period to be communicated to ITU by the end of this calendar year 2017 would improve very much the possibilities of the ITU to present to the Plenipotentiary a consolidated and relatively stable financial plan. We should avoid, Madam Chair, to leave a Plenipotentiary Conference like the last one with a financial plan that due to the way the contributions have been declared starts with the line of 13 million Swiss francs that have to be found in savings before the financial plan is actually balanced. So Madam Chair, we are ready to approve this document. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. U.S., you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Madam Chair, and we too would like to thank the Secretary‑General for his commitment to zero nominal growth and to a balanced budget. When we consider the matter of asking Member States to determine their amount of contribution by the end of 2017 however we run in to some difficulty. Because not only does that not fit with our budget cycle it also doesn't seem to be fitting with CS 161c which says the Secretary‑General shall inform the Member States and sector members of the provisional amount of the contributory unit, et cetera, and invite the Member States to notify no later than four weeks prior to the date set for the opening of the Plenipotentiary Conference the class of contribution chosen. So I would like to ask through you if Mr. Ba could provide some additional clarification on that point. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Mr. Ba.

>> ALASSANE BA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Firstly I would like to thank the Delegate of Germany for his support with regard to this document. Now to respond to the Distinguished Delegate of the United States it is a question of a preliminary choice. It is not a definitive choice at this stage as indicated it is decision 5 which was revised at the last Plenipotentiary Conference which invites the Council to fix the value of the contributory unit during its 2017 session. So that's the ordinary session in 2017. And invites Member States to announce their preliminary choice of class of contribution before the 31st of December 2017.

This is to enable the Secretariat to correctly prepare the financial plan for the 2020 to 2023 period. The definitive choice will be announced during the Plenipotentiary Conference in Dubai. This is just to enable the Secretariat to have a solid basis to establish the financial plan for the 2020 to 2023 period. The constitution is not modified. It is just a preliminary choice which will be confirmed during the Plenipotentiary in 2018. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Ba. So the ‑‑ based on that I would recommend that we approve the document in 57 with the clarification from Mr. Ba that it ‑‑ the invite ‑‑ it invites the Member States to announce supervisional class contribution for the period 2020‑2023 before the end of the calendar year 2017. It is not a requirement. It is an invite. So we can make that clarification in our report. Would that be acceptable? All right. Seeing ‑‑ thank you for that.

(Gavel).

>> CHAIR: So Ms. ‑‑ Deputy Secretary‑General Johnson is not back. And we will move on to agenda item 10 and come back to 9. Ms. Kim, would you like to introduce document 34, please?

>> Ms. Kim: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good afternoon. On behalf of the Secretary‑General it is my great pleasure to present document 34. References of ICT‑DF can be referred to the relevant PP and Council resolutions. This document reports on the progress regarding ICT‑DF and analysis on its use to implement the projects on the basis of review and approval from its Steering Committee.

Since the last Council as explained in section 2 the two ICT‑DF Steering Committee meetings in the 50th and 51st meetings have been reviewed and approved to fund five projects which are now under the development and/or implementations, especially concerning accessing the digital dividend in Africa for Fund Africa countries. This is a project with the closer partnership among ITU EC and African Union commissions as well as even within ITU not only between BDT and the BR, among BDT headquarters and the regional offices, especially Africa and Arab for which EC has committed to fund five million Euros and ITU has committed its counterfunding of 500,000 Euros, meaning around 10% of its total project.

The Steering Committee will continue to review and propose projects and approve the projects based on the criteria including its principle as seed funds financing up to 25% of total cash contribution of the project with the some exceptions if approved by the Steering Committee. And the themes set by its rules and procedures within the limit of ICT‑DF capital account. Section 3 articulates status of ICT‑DF projects as mid March 2017. Its portfolio was composed of 17 projects. For example, 13 ongoing projects and four projects approved by the recent Steering Committee meetings of which analysis are illustrated by figure 1 for regional distribution and in figure 2 the areas of action. Figure 4 and then 5 illustrates the compositions of both ITU‑D development projects and ICT‑DF projects in terms of number as well as contribution. The overall development projects in ITU, especially the ITU‑D sector indicated was 59 ongoing in mid March 2017 when this document was prepared. While it is 56 as of today with the details available from the link, this is ongoing and living in nature along with the progress of implementation of projects such as closure of project.

Section 4 presents evolution of the ICT‑DF capital accounts which remained with an amount of around 2.6 U.S. dollars including (inaudible) as of 31st of December last year. The Egyptian working capital fund remained over 10 million Swiss francs. As indicated in figure 6 the ICT‑DF capital account has gone from 3.7 million U.S. dollars in 2012 to 2.6 million U.S. dollars in 2016. Following approvals of project latest Steering Committee meetings as explained in section 2.3 ICT‑DF capital account is expected to be further reduced to around 1.7 million U.S. dollars.

Therefore taking in to account the demands of membership for supporting various developing projects, the high level of the contributions from partners and donors in ‑‑ converse the ICT ecosystem as well as the level of ICT‑DF capital account of which amount as I mentioned earlier is expected to be below 1.7 million U.S. dollars. The Secretary‑General recommends that this Council approves the transfer of 2 million U.S. dollars from the Egyptian working capital to the ICT‑DF capital account which it continued with the ‑‑ with the continued efforts for further resource mobilizations.

With this, Madam Chair, and this Council is kindly invited to take note of this report, and then approve the transfer of the 2 million U.S. dollars from the exhibition working capital to the ICT‑DF working account. I together with our team involved in developing and implementing the project with the partners remain at your disposal if you have any questions. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Kim. This document 34 is open for discussion. Germany, you have the floor.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Ms. Chair. Sometimes the sequence of creating documents is not optimal but the issue I'm going to address is the transfer of 2 million Swiss francs from the exhibition capital fund to the ICT‑DF fund. We have not yet looked at document 42. I can read on page 10 that the exhibition working capital fund stays at around about 10.1 million Swiss francs at the end of last year. So the 31st of December 2016. So my first question is what is the minimum required in this fund. And I'm pretty sure that the minimum will be maintained if 2 million Swiss francs are transferred to the ICT‑DF. I would, of course, prefer that this document had been examined prior to distributing the funds that we have not yet got the information about. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Egypt ‑‑ Indonesia, you have the floor, please.

>> INDONESIA: Thank you, Madam Chair, for giving me the floor. In regard of document C17/34, Indonesia would like to support this document. And we also would like to support ICT‑DF programme because this programme is benefitting Member States, especially Developing Countries. Madam Chair, we believe this programme can assist Developing Countries to solve specific challenges they are facing. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Indonesia. Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Madam Chair. I must say, Madam Chair, that we would like to retain ‑‑ we would like to support the content of this report. The ICT development fund will play a primary role and make it possible for ITU to put in place a number of development projects which reminds us of the double nature of ITU as a specialized agency and an agency charged with implementation of projects. This report also refers to the importance and the diversity of projects which are financed out of this fund, particularly for the benefit of Developing Countries to help them develop infrastructure, to strengthen their capacity for planning and management of spectrum. Therefore we support the content, the contents of this report around the need to approve the transfer of 2 million. We would like to thank the BDT, particularly its regional office for its close cooperation of the Egyptian administration and helping us to establish a regional center of ICTs for the disabled persons with limited abilities and to ensure facilitated access for them to ICTs. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Egypt. Algeria, you have the floor.

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. First of all, we would like to extend our gratitude to the Secretary‑General and to the BDT's regional office for all of the efforts undertaken with a view to financing all the projects, particularly those submitted by the Developing Countries. We would also like to share our support and to remind you that what we are calling for a transfer of 2 million and the exhibition working capital at the same time we would like to make certain recommendations or observations in the hope that they would be taken in to account. We would like to have a wider application ‑‑ a wider involvement of states in the financing of projects through this fund, particularly those countries that haven't benefitted yet of ‑‑ from the financing under this fund. So we would also know, would also like to spread the awareness of the benefits and the mechanisms that make it possible to use this fund. So the question I have is do we target a number of projects for ‑‑ to be financed out of this fund while taking in to account the most needy regions, that is the region of Sub‑Saharan Africa which is in particular need of support in ICTs. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Algeria. I now have Morocco. You have the floor.

>> MOROCCO: Thank you, Madam Chair. The Kingdom of Morocco supports the Secretary‑General's recommendations put forth in this document. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Azerbaijan, you have the floor.

>> AZERBAIJAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. For our part we also support this report and I have a question. What steps or procedures does the ITU have at its disposal in order to follow up the implementation of these projects? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Azerbaijan. I have U.S.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. The matter of having funding to mobilize resources for these projects is very important. But like Germany we wonder if it wouldn't be better to consider document 42 and also perhaps I believe it is 41 that deals with Telecom World. We know that the exhibition working capital fund is from Telecom World. And we should look at Telecom World wholistically before deciding how we are going to provide sustainable funding for such types of projects. It is not clear to us what the source of funding for the long term will be when we take decisions one year at a time. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I will be brief. We support the interventions by the Honorable Delegates and we are thankful to the Secretary‑General who developed this contribution. And we also support the proposed transfer of 2 million at the exhibition working capital to the ICT‑DF capital account. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Madam Chair. And to begin with we would like to thank the Secretariat, Dr. Kim, for the presentation of this document. We have a couple of questions, Madam Chair. One is following up which we had the same questions that the United States in regards to the exhibition fund but most importantly and it is a question to the Secretariat in terms of all the demands placed for project execution against which there are not enough resources, and that relates to the issue of the ITU's absence of a project execution, specific project execution funding because when you look at demands that ‑‑ genuine demands of coming from Member States there is always a challenge for the ITU to allocate resources, particularly when some of the projects and initiatives are of a capital expenditure and infrastructure against which, of course, there are no resources in the ITU.

So this combination of revisiting the issue of the project execution funding function of the ITU would also be tied to any efforts and efforts that Member States should undertake, for example, along the lines of sponsoring partnerships in particular regions with particular organizations. And in that context I could mention in the Americas two institutions, IFIs, one of which is the Inter‑American Development Bank and the other one is the Indian Development Bank. They have been actively participating in many of our CITEL meetings of explaining the extent of involvement, for example, in broadband infrastructure projects. And I think it would be useful to encourage ourselves and Member States to see what kind of dialogue needs to happen with those international organizations like the IDB and the CIF which is the acronym for the Indian Development Bank. Because sometimes we are continuously faced with this issue of an ongoing demand for really needed projects against which the ITU has to struggle to go look for resources to respond to the demands of Member States.

To that affect any advice or any additional information on the issue of the extent to which the ITU, in particular the BDT is currently able to act as a project execution agency within the ITU would be extremely, extremely useful. And, of course, we welcome this discussion in the context of our regional organizations because it is, of course, a priority. And I want to extend myself ‑‑ I don't want to extend myself too much, Madam Chair.

When we had Connect Americas in Panama City in 2012 that were required or attractive for investment either from the public or private sector and I don't know, it was in the order of 2, 300 million dollars. It is the issue of managing the expectations and the needs from Developing Countries in expected regions in terms of human and financial resources. We thank the Secretariat for the efforts that have been undertaken on this matter. And we hope to continue to cooperate to the best of our abilities. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. I have UAE wishing to take the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thanks very much, Madam Chair. I tend to share the views expressed by the previous speakers and in particular Audi Arabia, Algeria and as well as the speakers that supported the Secretary‑General's proposal in this document.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Cuba, you have the floor.

>> CUBA: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. We thank the General‑Secretariat for having prepared this document. We note the proposal to mobilize more resources of the ICT development fund. We think it is important. We believe that there is a need for these projects mentioned in the report which are still going to be implemented but have been outstanding for some time to be implemented at once. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: We have ‑‑ we received a number of questions and I will turn it over to Ms. Kim first and then to Mr. Ba.

>> Ms. Kim: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I do sincerely thank all these ‑‑ the Distinguished Delegates, especially the Honorable Delegates from Germany, Indonesia, Egypt, Algeria, Morocco, Azerbaijan, United States, Saudi Arabia, Canada UAE and then Cuba, especially in terms of some minimum amount of the Egyptian working capital funds that may be response ‑‑ can be done by Mr. Ba but I will try to answer the remaining questions.

The first one is from Azerbaijan. What kind of steps to be taken to get this fund. In order to get this fund, like most of our activities we are membership driven. So first of all, we receive actually project proposals from various sources. It could come from our regional directors, our chief of the departments, sometimes even Secretary‑Generals and elected officials. So we collect all these project proposals from all the regions around the world. Then we analyze together with our president and what is priorities and so on based on rules and procedure with ICT‑DF which has been recently revised and updated.

And when I say the principle, a fundamental principle is the seed fund of 25%. This seed fund is aiming to attract external funds. So with lots of support from inside and outside we were able to mobilize larger funds, especially this year through partners and donors, including European Commission as I just mentioned and even CAF and from America which can help for the project from Cuba. And in our department we also developed the database for potential funding these entities all over the world, global level, regional level, national level. We are using this database. And also we had several visits including European Commission. We also visited the (inaudible) and like CEDA and the donors and the partners.

As a part of resource mobilization activities for the first time ITU prepared a sponsorship package for the WTDC and then also 25th anniversary of the BDT, our developer sector. Flyers are available outside. So we work very hard together with all these ‑‑ our elected officials as well as our team from headquarters as is mentioned in the case of the European Commission project. This is a very good model of close cooperation between even sectors and the Bureau and the BDT and the BR. We work closely to get some substance expertise from ITU to get funds from Europe for Pan‑African countries.

I think one of the Delegates mentioned about some needy areas, needy countries. I fully agree. That's why we work very hard to get the external funds. That is our ongoing actual mandate and then airports we are doing. So with that actually the proposal and with the principle of the criteria that was mentioned and then we are forming a once or twice of Steering Committee meetings which is composed of Secretary‑General and the BDT director, I am just administrator, and then to review all these projects based on the evaluation and propose and then going to all this criteria and then identify and then approve the project. So those are actually indicated in document 34. And last year we managed to have two meetings where we could approve this number of the projects. So these are actually processes.

One thing still remaining is some evaluation but this is actually new and then just still ongoing at the moment when these projects complete successfully we are also going to have some impact analysis for the sustainability, what kind of development actually helps with the countries in need. So that's actual process. And then all these are actually very transparent as indicated in document 34 and all these documents are there on this one at the same time in the website. We also the shared with the rules of procedure and criteria.

So this kind of step ICT‑DF. In terms of the questions raised from Canada I think answered to some extent what kind of means and then activities we have done and then as I just ‑‑ as a recap we developed tools inside in terms of databases and so on. At the same time we are just going out to actually propose and discuss and then also get some kind of support from the potential and existing and then also future donors as I mentioned. Some of them are including in the European Commissions and then CAF and then other ADBs. These are these funding agencies. And then for your information from the last Steering Committee members we are aware of this outsource of this fund. So success of telecoms is very critical for maintaining even strengthening this ICT‑DF. But knowing the current trend and our Committee members are very eager to find some alternative ways. So we decided to have some exploration of potential other means.

So we are just working on that to provide a means to have further funds for ICT‑DF. But at the end of the day this is your organization. So I am really looking forward to your strong support to have this fund to be strengthened and as the Delegate from Canada mentioned we don't have this project fund. We have a couple of different names of our funds. Maybe we can revise all these names of the funds and then make some kind of solid fund with the source of funds so we can make this ICT‑DF stronger to help at the end our membership, especially who are really in need, especially certain region of country is concerned. Those are actually the questions that I can just address. And then the remaining more or less support for this kind of ‑‑ this approval. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Ms. Kim, I think there is one more question. What steps or procedures does the ITU have at its disposal in order to follow up on the implementation of these projects? Okay. All right. Mr. Ba.

>> ALASSANE BA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm going to try to respond to the two questions asked by the United States and Germany. The first question was about the minimum level of funds for the exposition working capital fund. There is no minimum for this fund. It is replenished by the exhibitions, ITU Telecom World. If there is a positive result or a deficit result it is transferred to this exhibition working capital fund. As you might note during the last three ITU Telecom World events we have had a positive result which has enabled us to ask to replenish the ICT, ICT account to finance projects in Developing Countries. It is not a recurring request which comes back at every session. It is more a question of every two, three years of an exhibition working capital fund. We take note of the observations and comments saying that this document should be handled following document 44 on the financial management report or the report No. 41 on the external auditor's report of ITU Telecom World. But I can assure you that at the moment this working capital fund stands at 10.1 million Swiss francs. So at 2 million Swiss francs transfer would not affect the overall situation. And as I said before there is no minimum. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Ba. With that I will make sure that the questions that were asked are articulated in our report.

I also heard from three Delegations that we should defer approval of transferring the funds until after consideration of document 42. Unless you have an objection to that proposal I will defer adopting transferring the 2 million until after consideration of document 42.

UAE, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. We do not object to your proposal. Nevertheless following the explanations from Mr. Ba saying that there are some ten million Swiss francs in the ‑‑ in the relevant fund from the ITU Telecom World events recently transferring 2 million Swiss francs in order to finance these projects is possible in my view. My question is whether the countries who made this request to take in to account document 44 before taking a decision in this regard I think that Mr. Ba has provided a good explanation of what is being requested. And I think that the point has already been clarified. I think we should take the decision now, Madam Chair, unless these countries insist that we discuss the other documents before taking a final decision. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. Germany, you have the floor.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I don't think there is a problem to transfer the 2 million, but my question with regard to the minimum was obviously the wrong question. The question I have to ask is what would it cost at present if suddenly for whatever reason Telecom stops working. What costs are involved in this exercise. And the question ‑‑ why I ask this question, because this exercise needs to be financed through this fund. Otherwise it would be financed by the regular budget of the ITU. And this is something that at least for the time being Germany has always excluded to cross finance Telecom activities by the regular budget. But I think we can take the decision indeed to transfer the 2 million. And my question can be answered by the Secretariat because it suddenly needs some preparation when we discuss document 42. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Nigeria, you have the floor.

>> NIGERIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. We want to join our colleagues in thanking the Secretariat for this excellent report. And we have listened to the contribution of members and we have also listened to the response from the Secretariat. And in our own view there is a majority support for the transfer of the money. And so we don't think it is proper to delay taking decision on this matter at this point in time because there is no point in suspending what you can do now to a later time. Even at a later time you are still going to take that decision. So if we are delaying taking a decision of what benefit is ‑‑ of what importance is this particular delay going to bring to the Council, so Nigeria feels that instead of delaying taking the decision the appropriate decision should be taken now and then we allow the matter to be laid to rest. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. With that understanding I have ‑‑ I see no objection to adopting transferring the 2 million dollars from the ‑‑ sorry. Thank you. We will transfer 2 million from the exhibition working capital to the ICT‑DF capital fund. And when we discuss document 42 we will make sure that Germany's question is addressed at that time as well as the U.S. question regarding wholistic review of Telecom I think is similar as well as Canada. With that we approve transferring 2 million dollars.

(Gavel).

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Director Sanou.

>> BRAHIMA SANOU: Thank you very much, Madam Chairman. I'm just taking the floor to say thank you to the Council for the ADM for taking this decision. It is very important for us. We are using this fund as my colleague said a seed fund, a seed fund. Seed funding. Because we have this fund at our disposal we are just in the process of let's say of signing in the future a 5 million U.S. dollar project with the European Commission. Because we are putting 500,000 in the project and we are getting 4, 5 million. This is what it is going to be used for. They seen also in the Americas region they are using this fund as a seed fund to discuss with AIDB and CAF. This is what the fund is meant for is a seed fund. When we are discussing with the partners we can also show them that we are committed the ITU community to what you want to do. I would like to thank you and we are making all efforts to make the best use of this. Thank you. Again thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Director Sanou. With that I would like to go back to agenda item 9, we skipped if you recall. Deputy Secretary‑General Mr. Johnson is back. You have the floor to introduce document C17/38. Thank you.

>> MALCOLM JOHNSON: On behalf of the Secretary‑General it is my pleasure to introduce document 38 which is the report on the implementation of Resolution 191 on the strategy for coordination of efforts among the three sectors of the Union. The document focuses mainly on coordination efforts within the ITU Secretariat, in particular the work of the intersectoral coordination task force which was established at the beginning of 2015 to facilitate coordination and collaboration amongst the three Bureaus and the General‑Secretariat to provide duplication of effort and optimize the use of resources. The terms of reference of the task force are available in the information document 19. The group is chaired by the Deputy Secretary‑General with participation of the three Bureaus and all the General‑Secretariat departments as well as the regional directors join the meetings remotely.

So it coordinates Secretariat work on climate change, emergency telecoms, accessibility, communications and web editorial, events coordination and bridging the standards gap. It has held nine meetings since the last Council meeting and it has addressed in particular the coordination and monitoring and implementation of the JIU recommendations. The development of the risk management policy and risk appetite statement has initiated the management of the business continuity and disaster recovery for the headquarters and the regional offices, coordinated and introduced guidelines for video and photography requests by the Secretariat, reviewed the development of the ITU gender dashboard and put forward a proposal for achieving gender equality in ITU panels, reviewed the implementation of the accessibility fund where we use that fund for in particular helping Persons with Disabilities to participate in ITU's work. We had a project team on the SDG work which has now been transferred to the WSIS task force following the comments at the last Council.

And we have also developed guidelines on the translation of the Web pages and that the trial on outsourcing translation of Web pages. It has also developed the ITU accountability framework and looked at the sponsorship guidelines which have been presented to the Council.

With regard to the membership coordination as you know the three advisory groups agreed in 2015 to establish an intersectoral coordination team on issues of mutual interest to the three sectors. Again to coordinate the work and avoid duplication of effort. This team met during TDAG last week under the Chairmanship of Mr. Fabio Bigi. So through you, Madam Chair, I would like to invite Mr. Bigi perhaps to give some update on the work of the intersectoral coordination team. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Mr. Bigi, you have the floor.

>> FABIO BIGI: Thank you, Chair. We, in fact, the group has met and has revisited the terms of reference that are representative of the three sectors with General‑Secretariat present. And we have established, confirmed the point of many interests for the three sectors and are given in annex to what our report of this point of interest is. And also we have made a matching of questions of the various sectors. So in order to see the focus, main focus can be held. And this is in order to avoid duplication of efforts. And we have had the input from Mr. Marcum. We have taken care and I think we have to revisit the result according to this Council decision. And I am at your disposal for any further clarification.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Bigi, for that. The last document is 111 from the BR ‑‑ from the RAG. And as I'm looking at 6.3 which is the section that's appropriate here, everything has been considered. I do think that we just need a clarification from ‑‑ if I can ask Professor Minkin as the Chair of TDAG to confirm. The first two paragraphs under 6.3, under 111 have been addressed already. And we addressed RAG 17/8 regarding the vocabulary committee in Plenary. Mr. Minkin, you have the floor.

>> VLADIMIR MINKIN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes. Of course, we work closely with RAG and TSAG and, of course, TDAG we looked with great care at the liaison statements which we received from our sister advisory groups. We came up with a decision. We agreed on it. And before TDAG in the meeting of Working Group 2b we managed to agree on all of the issues that we resolved. We didn't think we needed to resolve all the issues at the Council. We thought that maybe some of the issues could be solved at a different level. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. With that we will note this document. Germany, you have the floor.

>> GERMANY: Thank you. We note this document. We note that officially nothing is wrong. And despite, of course, this liaison statement from the Radio Advisory Group, despite, of course, document 16 presented by Germany at the regional preparatory meeting for the Western European region which deals with potential duplication of work in ITU‑D Study Group 1 and ITU‑T Study Group 3. I would just repeat what was our main concern at this regional preparatory meeting. If the ITU in its federal structure with three sectors intends to revive there shouldn't be competition between the sectors but cooperation. And we kindly ask all responsible officials of the ITU as well, of course, the Member States to work towards this goal, that is close cooperation and no competition between the sectors. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Germany. UAE, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I thank the Secretary‑General and the Secretariat for this document. I would particularly like to thank Mr. Johnson for having introduced this document.

Madam Chair, I had the honor of taking part in the last meeting of the intersectoral coordination task force. I beg your pardon, coordination team chaired by Mr. Fabio Bigi. And Mr. Bigi enabled us to participate in the work of the team, in particular as regarded coordination between sectors. It is important to enable people who wish to participate in the work to be able to do it. I would like to also thank Professor Minkin for his efforts and I think that this proposal comes from Russia. And in particular from Dr. Minkin who has been working how to make it happen and I think that we can add to that the work of the Secretariat.

Now turning to what the representative of Germany said with regard to overlap in the work of the sectors between standardization and development we have some observations to make. However we will leave these observations or comments until the relevant preparatory meeting and not deal with that here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, UAE. Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Madam Chair. We would like to thank the Secretariat for the contribution of this document and also thank Mr. Bigi as Chairman of the intersector coordination team. Last week during TDAG Canada raised the issue of the parallel activities. One at the level of the coordination task force and one at the level of the team. And we reflected among other issues on the terms of reference and the issues of mutual interest which were identified in the intersector coordination team which in Canada's view were mostly of a procedural nature as opposed to the issues dealt by the intersector coordination task force. For example, the issue of gender is one dealt with by the intersector coordination task force while it is not an issue dealt with by the team. So I know that there is work ahead of us ensuring work of both Committees is properly coordinated and consistent with the overall priorities of the Union. We also think, and I'm speaking more in terms of the Americas region, we fully understand that the membership of the intersector coordination team comes from the respective advisory groups that in their own right have appointed their representatives of each advisory group to the intersector coordination team. Of course, the Americas region would look kindly to the opportunity at the next meeting and whenever the members of the intersector coordination team are reappointed that the Americas region be represented in the intersector coordination team. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. In our report to the Plenary I will note comments received. With that can we note this report?

(Gavel).

>> CHAIR: Thank you. The next document is ‑‑ the next agenda item is a ‑‑ agenda item 11, and it is document C17/14 and I would like to ask the interpreters if we could have until 5:40.

>> Yes, Madam Chair. Ten more minutes is fine.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Sorry. Mr. Ba, you have the floor.

>> ALASSANE BA: Thank you, Madam Chair. On behalf of the Secretary‑General I have the honor to present to you document C17/14 on improvement of management and follow‑up of the defrail of ITU expenses by sector members and associates. Pursuant to Resolution 152 of the Plenipotentiary Conference the Secretary‑General has been instructed in consultation with the directors of the Bureau to report to the management and follow‑up of defrail of ITU expenses, highlighting any difficulty that may be encountered and proposal for improvement. The entry in to force had positive results. It has led to a better percentage of cost recovery and demission of debts excluding sector members and associates. Serious efforts have been taken to recover the debts of excluding sector members. In May 2016 most of those were incurred debts by 2016 are ‑‑ no other subject to exclusion procedures. This has led to organizations to have additional time to settle their debts and not to be automatically excluded. No further invoices have been sent and their participation remains suspended and they are still on the list of sector members.

I would refer you to annex 2 to this document. The 32 entities who have also been are excluded pursuant to Resolution 52, eight of them have been persuaded by the Secretariat to settle their debt and their membership has been renewed. Seven of them have settled their debts and one decided to opt out of our participation.

I would refer you to annex 2 of this document which contains the list of affected organizations. With regard to recommendations what is necessary to press on with close cooperation from the Secretariat, the Bureau and the regional offices for the efficient follow‑up of the payment of fees by sector members. Coordinated efforts are necessary to retain suspended entities with the aim of recovering the arrears and to reactivate their participation in the work of the sectors. While experience has shown that flexibility has been useful in providing additional time to certain entities it becomes pertinent to exclude other long‑term suspended entities as they are unlikely to be re‑engaged and repay their dues.

The Secretariat in such cases asks administrations under Article 19 of the Convention to approve the participation of sector members and associates and to continue the follow‑up of these entities. The Council is invited to take note of the Secretary‑General's report on the improvement of the management and the follow‑up of the defrail of the ITU expenses by sector members, associates and academia to the ITU and to approve recommendations contained in section 4 of this report. I thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Ba. This document is open for discussion. Are there any comments? Seeing no one requesting the floor, unless you have objections my proposal is that the Admin Committee adopt the following recommendations on page 4. We endorse the recommendations. Okay. The recommendations are endorsed.

(Gavel).

>> CHAIR: 62. Finish before ‑‑ I am going to yield my five minutes back to the interpreters I may need it later. I would like to thank the interpreters and thank you, Caption First. Thank you. And good night and see you tomorrow.

(Session concluded at 5:34 p.m. CET)
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