



## **CWG-WCIT12 TEMPORARY DOCUMENT 43**

**SOURCE:  
Chairman**

### **Draft compilation of options**

*Editorial Note: this document is based on TD 36 Rev 6. It will be revised to include additional proposals presented to CWG-WCIT12.*

*The proposed revisions to the ITRs have not been agreed.*

The following table presents the proposals to be discussed by the CWG-WCIT12. The table has been simplified with respect to previous versions, taking into account decisions made by the group at the previous meeting, see item 5 of CWG-WCIT12/R – 5:

- It was agreed to produce a document that clearly identifies each option for each article, including the option of no change.
- It was agreed that the compilation of proposals could be simplified by combining similar proposals, reflecting differences and options.

Consequently:

- a) Several versions of the option are used in the compilation, which are indicated as the following: (NOC)- no change; (MOD)- modification of the existing text; (ADD)- introduction of new text; (SUP)- suppression of the text.
- b) The no change option has been added for each article, even if it had not been explicitly proposed.
- c) The left-most column containing the original text of the ITRs has been deleted because the original text is found as a no change option.
- d) The various proposals have been numbered as option 1, option 2, etc.
- e) Whenever possible, proposals have been combined and shown in a single row, while still showing them as separate options.

Member States reserve their right to submit additional proposals and/or comments.

## Compilation of options for proposed revisions to the ITRs

The views expressed in all documents / contributions are yet to be agreed.

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> Overall change. It would be much clearer if the term ‘<i>administration</i>’ were used in the ITRs in the same sense as defined in No. 1002 of the Constitution and that an entity providing public telecommunications networks or public telecommunications services would be defined as an <i>operator</i> or <i>operating agency</i>. The term ROA could then either be included in <i>operator</i> or <i>operating agency</i> or preferably deleted. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1 and Côte d’Ivoire</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b></p> <p>It is not clear what is being proposed, and we do not clearly know what Member State is proposing this change. The United States needs clarification as to the intent of this change. Also, this is not treaty-level text as required in Res 171. We do not support expanding ROA to include the terms operator or operating agency or replacing ROA with those terms because it would expand the scope of the ITRs. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Cf. Contribution from Germany (CWG-WCIT12/C-53) to the 5th Council Working Group on “Considerations for the revision of the ITRs” [see below]. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p><i>NOTE: the positions expressed by Portugal in this document are also supported by: Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, The Netherlands, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom</i></p>
<p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It might be considered appropriate that revised ITRs contain only provisions regarding obligations of Member States, and not direct the activities of private parties.</li> <li>- In this light, it would be appropriate to use the term “Member State” instead of “administration”.</li> <li>- In this light, it would also be appropriate to discontinue with the incorporation of “recognized private operating agencies” by reference to obligations for “administrations”. <i>Source C 53 (Germany)</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> CEPT invites the other delegations to take the following considerations into account and proposes that the revised ITRs should only contain provisions regarding obligations of Member States, and not direct the activities of private parties. <i>Source C 53 (Germany)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> It might be considered appropriate to include in the ITRs whenever applicable provisions to request Member States to transfer to their national laws and administrative regulations those provisions of the ITRs that reference obligations on the Member State or address fraudulent practices or possible harm to another Member State. <i>Source C 58 (Egypt) and Côte d'Ivoire</i></p>	<p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b></p> <p>Germany on behalf of CEPT in its contribution (CWG-WCIT C53) stated that “ITRs are a treaty. The purpose of a treaty is to record agreements between parties subject to international law (in particular countries) concerning obligations that they undertake regarding national or international matters. In general, treaties do not directly bind private parties. Private parties are bound by national laws, which national laws might be adapted and interpreted in the light of treaties, so as to fulfill a country’s treaty obligations”. Hence it is appropriate that the ITRs request Member States to adapt in their national laws and regulatory frameworks provision applicable to private operating agencies authorized by them to comply with the provisions of the ITRs whenever it refer to an obligation, particularly that may otherwise cause harm or represent a fraudulent activity on another Member States. Transfer of the provisions of the ITRs to the national laws and regulatory framework should not be just an optional and selective process as long as they concern certain obligations on Member States or address harmful or fraudulent practices that may cause disadvantage to other Member States. <i>Source C 58 (Egypt)</i></p> <p>The United States believes that the proposed MOD is unnecessary. The preamble to the Constitution and the ITRs recognize each Member State’s right to regulate its telecommunication and therefore do not preclude transfer of applicable provisions of the ITRs to national laws if a Member State chose to do so. <i>(USA)</i>.</p>
	<p>CEPT puts forward 5 criteria for accepting proposals from other regions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The idea is to set a predictable pattern for CEPT reaction towards proposal from.</li> <li>- These criteria do not preclude the evaluation of each proposal on a case-by-case basis.</li> <li>- In view of the relatively limited time for a comprehensive review of ITR and for reaching a worldwide agreement, CEPT considers that disclosing a set of objective, balanced and a legal based criteria will facilitate negotiation in future.</li> </ul> <p>The criteria for accepting proposals are the following (presented in no particular order):</p> <p><b>Criterion 1:</b> General compliance with the key principles indicated in CEPT Contribution 35, the ITRs should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Contain high level strategic and policy issues concerning international telecommunications services and facilities</li> <li>- Safeguard the rights of telecoms operators and service providers to exercise commercial choice.</li> </ul> <p>The fundamentals for this criterion are laid down in Resolution 171 “Preparations for the 2012 world conference on international telecommunications” (Guadalajara, 2010) which in its “Resolves further” 3.iii) and 3.iv) .</p> <p><b>Criterion 2:</b> Consistency with the Preamble and Article 1 of the CS</p> <p>In this criterion it is underlined that the Constitution of the Union does not provide ITU Recommendations with a binding force, by their nature ITU-T Recommendations are non-binding, i.e. of voluntary application, and should not therefore be imposed as a matter of routine. CEPT considers that the ITRs revision shall not be used to change the nature of ITU Recommendations.</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
	<p><b>Criterion 3:</b> Consistency with International agreements / legislation adopted by CEPT members. There are two main concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) to comply with the Fourth Protocol of the WTO Agreement;</li> <li>2) Evaluation of proposal in subjects which are part of EU/EEA legislation on electronic communication, in light of its consistency with such legislation.</li> </ol> <p><b>Criterion 4:</b> Areas related to Member States' application of legal or policy principles which are within their sovereign rights.</p> <p>CEPT will consider proposals related to national defence, national security, content, and cybercrime issues in the context of Resolves no. 3 of Resolution 130 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010) “ITU shall focus resources and programmes on those areas of cybersecurity within its core mandate and expertise, notably the technical and development spheres, and not including areas related to Member States' application of legal or policy principles related to national defence, national security, content and cybercrime, which are within their sovereign rights”</p> <p><b>Criterion 5:</b> Exclusion of areas not related to the Purpose and Scope of the ITRs.</p> <p>Under this criterion, it is referred that proposals concerning national telecommunication services or national transport means should not be included in the ITRs.</p> <p>At this respect, CEPT considers that proposals concerning national telecommunication services or national transport means should not be included in the ITRs.</p> <p>The compliance with this criterion is also linked to the Preambles of both the ITU Constitution and the ITRs which fully recognise “the sovereign right of each State to regulate its telecommunication” and also with Article 25 of the Constitution establishes that “A WCIT may revise (...) revise the International Telecommunication Regulations and may deal with any question of a worldwide character within its competence and related to its agenda”.</p> <p><i>Source: C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>The revision of the ITRs, needed because of the evolution of international relations, must permit an easier use of this document and greater transparency in the supply of international telecommunications services. The inadequacies of the current version of the ITRs has the consequence of causing well-known problems particularly for developing countries but also security problems for these countries. <i>(Côte d’Ivoire)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>PREAMBLE</b></p> <p>While the sovereign right of each country to regulate its telecommunications is fully recognized, the provisions of the present Regulations supplement the International Telecommunication Convention, with a view to attaining the purposes of the International Telecommunication Union in promoting the development of telecommunication services and their most efficient operation while harmonizing the development of facilities for world-wide telecommunications. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> ... the provisions of the present Regulations <del>complement supplement</del> the International Telecommunication <del>Union, Constitution and</del> Convention, with a view to attaining the purposes of the International Telecommunication Union ... <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1 and C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> ... the provisions of the present Regulations <del>supplement the International Telecommunication Convention, with a view to</del> <del>serve</del> to attaining the purposes of the International Telecommunication Union ... <i>Source: C 9 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD 3</b> While the sovereign right of each <del>country</del> member state (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1</b></p> <p>The purpose of this change is to align with the current terminology used in CS No. 31. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1 and C 28 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>Supported. CS no 31 says: “The provisions of both this Constitution and the Convention are further <b>complemented</b> by those of the Administrative Regulations (..)”. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>It was stated that the 2014 Plenipotentiary Conference could make changes affecting the use of the terms “Constitution and Convention” (<i>Iran</i>).</p> <p>It was stated that changes to the Preamble should be minimized (<i>Iran</i>).</p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2</b></p> <p>The Regulations should be stand-alone and be independent, so there is no reason to mention the CS, CV. <i>Source: C 9 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>According to CS 29, 31, and 32, the ITRs and the Radio Regulations are the Administrative Regulations of the Union and that in the case of inconsistency between a provision of CS or CV and the Administrative regulations, the CS or CV shall prevail. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>CEPT considers that it is necessary to keep the principle of complementing ITU Constitution and Convention. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Article I</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Purpose and Scope of the Regulations</b></p> <p><i>Source none</i></p>	

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b></p> <p>1.1 a) These Regulations establish general principles which relate to the provision and operation of international telecommunication services offered to the public as well as to the underlying international telecommunication transport means used to provide such services. They also set rules applicable to administrations*. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> ... <del>They also set rules applicable to administrations.*</del> <u>Member States may apply these rules to Recognized Operating Agencies.</u> <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> ... <del>They also set rules applicable to administrations.*</del> <i>Source C 54 (Portugal).</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> ... They also set rules applicable to <del>administrations and ROAs</del> <u>operating agencies.</u> (CEPT) to be discussed within CEPT</p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b></p> <p>Save for Article 1.5 and some editorials, the purpose and scope of the ITRs as expressed in Article 1 has stood the test of time well. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT).</i></p> <p>1.1 a) Editorial update to clarify that the ITRs apply to Member States. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal (<i>Iran, Egypt, Russian Federation</i>).</p> <p>Algeria reserves its right to propose revisions to this provision.</p> <p>Member States have to be requested in the ITRs to transfer to their national laws and administrative regulations those provisions of the ITRs that reference obligations on the Member State or address fraudulent practices or possible harm to another Member State. (Appropriate text and its citation in the ITR shall be provided and will be subject to further review). <i>Source C58 (Egypt).</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD1:</b></p> <p>CEPT proposes this amendment in light of the contribution from Germany (CWG-WCIT12/C-53) to the 5<sup>th</sup> Council Working Group on “Considerations for the revision of the ITRs”. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>

\* ~~or recognized private operating agency(ies)~~

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 1.1 b) These Regulations recognize in Article 9 the right of Members to allow special arrangements. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 1.1 b) These Regulations recognize <del>in Article 9</del> the right of Members <del>States</del> to allow special arrangements <u>as provided in Article 9</u>. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 1.1 b) These Regulations recognize in Article 9 the right of Members <del>States</del> to allow special arrangements <u>on the condition that these do not cause technical harm to third countries</u>. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1 and Côte d’Ivoire</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> 1.1 b) These Regulations recognize in Article 9 the right of Members <del>States</del> to allow special arrangements. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 4 MOD4:</b> 1.1 b) These Regulations recognize in Article 9 the right of <del>Members States</del> to allow special arrangements. (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> It was proposed to add at the end “on the condition that these do not cause technical and/or financial harm to third countries” pursuant to view (5) of the WTPF Opinion 6. (<i>Egypt</i>).</p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> The United States does not see the need to add “to third countries.” Technical harm to all telecommunications facilities should be avoided. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i> It was proposed to add “and/or financial harm” pursuant to view (5) of the WTPF Opinion 6, and this new text is proposed for MOD1 1.1 b) above. (<i>Egypt</i>).</p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> Editorial update. <i>Source C 28 (USA) and Canada</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new 1.1 c) The purpose may be general rules to be applied by administrations for regulating international telecommunication services and to be applied by operators/service providers for the provision of such international telecommunication services. <i>Source C 9 (Russian Federation)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> This proposal would result in detailed regulatory provisions, contrary to PP Resolution 171 (Guadalajara), which states that the ITRs should contain “strategic and policy principles” and be “of relevance to be included in an international treaty.” <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Canada</i> This proposal does not seem to be in line with “Criterion 1: General compliance with the key principles indicated in CEPT Contribution 35”. Contrary to contribution from Germany (CWG-WCIT12/C-53) to the 5th Council Working Group on “Considerations for the revision of the ITRs”. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i> This proposal is in line with CS articles 37, 38, additionally Member States have to be requested in the ITRs to transfer to their national laws and administrative regulations those provisions of the ITRs that reference obligations on the Member State or address fraudulent practices or possible harm to another Member State. (This text is subject to further review). <i>Source C58 (Egypt)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 1.2 In these Regulations, "the public" is used in the sense of the population, including governmental and legal bodies. <i>Source none</i></p>	<p>Some Member States reserved their right to propose revisions to this provision. (<i>Russian Federation</i>)</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 1.3 These Regulations are established with a view to facilitating global interconnection and interoperability of telecommunication facilities and to promoting the harmonious development and efficient operation of technical facilities, as well as the efficiency, usefulness and availability to the public of international telecommunication services. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> ... as well as the efficiency, usefulness and availability to the public of international telecommunication services, <u>and the availability, operation, and use of advanced telecommunication facilities in developing countries.</u> <i>Source: C 25 (SG3RG-LAC)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> ... as well as the efficiency, usefulness and availability to the public of international telecommunication services. <u>The scope may be all existing, emerging, and future telecommunication facilities and services.</u> <i>Source: C 9 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> ... as well as the efficiency, usefulness, <del>and</del> availability <u>and security</u> to the public of international telecommunication services. <i>Source: Russian Federation and Algeria</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1</b> The proposed addition is not in accordance with the purpose of the ITRs. <i>Source: C 33 (Brazil, C 45 (USA), C 54 (Portugal), and Canada</i></p> <p>CEPT considers that the proposal does not relate to international telecommunication services (see CEPT criteria for accepting proposals - "Criterion 5 - Exclusion of areas not related to the Purpose and Scope of the ITRs provision and operation of international"). <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD 2</b> This provision would establish a legally binding commitment on Member States that cannot be specified or well described for its consideration and evaluation. The United States is not able to agree to such an open-ended commitment. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>No support. CEPT favours that the ITRs should be technology neutral to accommodate new facilities and services. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p>



Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 1.4 References to CCITT Recommendations and Instructions in these Regulations are not to be taken as giving to those Recommendations and Instructions the same legal status as the Regulations. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 1.4 <u>Unless otherwise specified in these Regulations, r</u>References to <del>CCITT</del> Recommendations and Instructions ... <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1 and Russian Federation</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD 1:</b></p> <p>Article 1.4 of the existing ITRs protects the sovereign rights of ITU Member States to determine how, if and when to adopt any of the ITU-T Recommendations into its regulatory framework. The proposed revision would give recommendations a legal/policy/regulatory status that could have a chilling effect on the work of the ITU-T Study Groups and on their ability to adapt ITU-T recommendations to changes as needed. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>In this regard following clarifications are provided. Reference to any Recommendation could be made in three following ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Reference is made to specific ITU-T Recommendation proceeded by the word “shall” which makes the application of that Specific Recommendation Mandatory. Due to the rapid advancement in the technology, it would inappropriate to make the application of a given/specific Recommendation mandatory.</li> <li>2) Reference is made to the latest relevant ITU-T Recommendation in force proceeded by the word “shall” which makes the application of the latest in force Recommendation Mandatory. Such incorporation by reference seems not to cause any difficulty due to the fact that the application of the referenced latest Recommendation would duly take into account the latest advancement in technology in a mandatory manner.</li> <li>3) Reference is made to the relevant / latest ITU-T Recommendation in force proceeded by the word “should or may or could I” which makes the application of the latest relevant ITU-T Recommendation in a voluntary / non mandatory manner. Such incorporation by reference seems also not to cause any difficulty due to the fact that the application of the referenced latest relevant Recommendation would be optional and ,if applied, would duly take into account the latest advancement in technology in a non mandatory or optional manner.</li> </ol> <p>Whenever reference is made to a relevant ITU-T Recommendation a foot note to be added indicating that the TSB is instructed to periodically “[ every X Month ] publish the list of those Recommendation relevant to the subject referred to in the corresponding provisions of ITR .The inclusion of this footnote is absolutely necessary to avoid dispute(s) among the Member States involved in application of that Recommendation.</p> <p>The above-mentioned legal status of the referenced ITU-T Recommendation(s) needs to be duly included in the text, where required</p> <p><i>Source C 48 (Iran)</i></p> <p>Not supported. See CEPT criteria for accepting proposals – “Criterion 2 - “Consistency with the Preamble and Article 1 of the CS”. The ITRs cannot be used to change the non-binding nature of ITU Recommendations. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 1.4 References to <del>ITU-TCGHF</del> Recommendations and Instructions ... <i>Source TD 21 Rev., C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> 1.4 References to ITU-T Recommendations and Instructions in these Regulations are not to be taken as giving to those Recommendations and Instructions the same legal status as the Regulations. <u>However Member States should give due consideration to ITU-T Recommendations to which they have not expressed a reservation.</u> <i>Source C 25 (SG3RG-LAC).</i></p>	<p><b>Option 2 MOD 2:</b> Editorial update. <i>Source C 28 (USA) and Canada</i> Supported. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i> Some Member States did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD 3:</b> This proposal is not necessary because, once a country have expressed no reservation to a Recommendation, it is obvious that this country already gives its due consideration to the Recommendation. <i>Source: C 33 (Brazil) and C 54 (Portugal)</i> <b><i>The United States believes that the current version of article 1.4 is sufficient. Our point made above applies here. Source C 45 (USA)</i></b></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 1.5 Within the framework of the present Regulations, the provision and operation of international telecommunication services in each relation is pursuant to mutual agreement between administrations<sup>*</sup>. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> ..., the provision and operation of international telecommunication services in each relation is pursuant to mutual agreement between <u>recognized operating agencies (ROAs) administrations<sup>*</sup></u>. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i>.</p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b> 1.5. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD:</b>..., the provision and operation of international telecommunication services in each relation is pursuant to mutual agreement between <u>administrations or ROAs operating agencies</u>. (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD</b></p> <p>In light of increased competition, a provision that promotes bilateral agreements between administrations as a condition for provision and operation of international telecommunication services is no longer appropriate. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>Maintain. ITRs should be self-contained instrument. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i></p> <p>The United States does not support the UAE proposal; it is inconsistent with CV #29-32. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>)</p> <p>No support because ROAs by this MOD will not be bound by the provisions of these ITRs, but only by their mutual agreement. There should be a mechanism to transfer obligations when necessary to ROAs. <i>Source C58 (Egypt)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP</b></p> <p>Over 100 countries have made commitments in the Fourth Protocol of the WTO Agreement. In this context, the emphasis on mutual agreement is, arguably, counter to the basic principle of multilateralism (ie the most favoured nation (MFN) principle) which underlies the WTO Agreement. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p> <p>The United States proposes new Article 1.9. We believe that this new article would assist here and overall. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal (<i>Egypt, Russian Federation</i>)</p>

---

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)  
CWG-WCIT12/TD-43E

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 1.6 In implementing the principles of these Regulations, administrations should comply with, to the greatest extent practicable, the relevant CCITT Recommendations, including any Instructions forming part of or derived from these Recommendations. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD</b> ... to the greatest extent practicable, the relevant <del>ITU-T CCITT</del> Recommendations ... <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1 and C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD:</b> 1.6 In implementing the principles of these Regulations, <del>administrations or recognized private operating agency(ies)</del> operating agencies (it makes no sense to write „member states“ here because these are bound ipso jure by the treaty) should comply with,... (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b></p> <p>Editorial update to align with CS/CV. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>Supported. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal), Canada</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal (CCITT should be deleted, not replaced by ITU-T) (<i>Russian Federation</i>)</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 1.7 a) These Regulations recognize the right of any Member, subject to national law and should it decide to do so, to require that administrations and private operating agencies, which operate in its territory and provide an international telecommunication service to the public, be authorized by that Member. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 1.7 a) These Regulations recognize the right of any Member <u>State</u>, .... <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 1.7 a) These Regulations recognize the right of any Member <u>State</u>, subject to national law and should it decide to do so, to require that administrations and <u>recognized private</u> operating agencies(<u>ROAs</u>), which operate in its territory and provide an international telecommunication service to the public, be authorized by that Member <u>State</u>. <i>Source C 28 (USA).</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> 1.7 a) These Regulations recognize the right of any Member <u>State</u>, subject to national law and should it decide to do so, to require that administrations and <u>ROAs private operating agencies</u>, which operate in its territory and provide an international telecommunication service to the public, be authorized by that Member <u>State and be subject to transparency and accountability requirements</u>. <i>Source C 34 (Global Voice Group).</i></p> <p><b>Option 4 MOD4:</b> 1.7a) These Regulations recognize the right of any <u>Member State</u>, subject to national law and should it decide to do so, to require that <u>administrations and private operating agencies</u> operating agencies, which operate in its territory and provide an international telecommunication service to the public, be authorized by that <u>Member state</u>.</p>	<p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> Editorial update to align with CS/CV. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> Member States should have the possibility to impose transparency obligations on ROAs so that Member States have full visibility and knowledge of the evolution of the market. Only in this way will member States be in the position to implement their policies. <i>Source C 34 (Global Voice Group).</i></p> <p>This proposal encroaches on Member States’ sovereign right to regulate their respective telecommunications environments as set out in the Preamble to the Constitution. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Provision under review by CEPT. CEPT does not support this specific proposal for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Transparency and accountability can be addressed at a national or regional level (“Criterion 5 - Exclusion of areas not related to the Purpose and Scope of the ITRs provision and operation of international”);</li> <li>- The choice of obligations / remedies is a technical issue to be addressed by national authorities (cf. criterion 1: General compliance with the key principles indicated in CEPT Contribution 35).</li> </ul> <p><i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>The ITRs should request Member States to adopt in their national laws and regulatory frameworks provision applicable to private operating agencies authorized by them, to comply with the provisions of the ITRs whenever it refer to an obligation, particularly that may otherwise cause harm or represent a fraudulent activity on “another Member States”. <i>Source C58 (Egypt)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 1.7 b) The Member concerned shall, as appropriate, encourage the application of relevant CCITT Recommendations by such service providers. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> 1.7 b) The Member <u>State</u> concerned shall, as appropriate, encourage the application of relevant <u>ITU-T</u> <del>CCITT</del> Recommendations by such service providers. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1 and C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD:</b> 1.7 b) The Member <u>state</u> concerned shall, as appropriate, encourage the application of relevant CCITT Recommendations by such <del>service providers</del> <u>operating agencies</u>. (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> Editorial update to align with CS/CV. <i>Source C 28 (USA) and Canada</i> Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. (<i>Russian Federation</i>)</p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 1.7 c) The Members, where appropriate, shall cooperate in implementing the International Telecommunication Regulations. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 1.7 c) The Members <u>States</u>, where appropriate, shall cooperate in implementing the International Telecommunication Regulations. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 1.7 c) The Members, where appropriate, shall cooperate in implementing the International Telecommunication Regulations. <u>The need to promote compliance will be given emphasis and appropriate assistances will be provided to strengthen national capacity in developing countries and countries in transition in support of compliance.</u> <i>Source: C 39 (Malaysia)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> 1.7 c) The <u>Members, states</u> where appropriate, shall cooperate in implementing the International Telecommunication Regulations.</p>	<p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> Could be further developed in new WCIT Resolution. <i>Source: C 39 (Malaysia) and Egypt and UAE</i> Compliance is a national matter. ITU-D has done extensive work in Study Group 1 to provide examples of how best to do this. In addition, ITU-D has assistance that can be provided to Member States in building technical capacity in this area. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i> Provision under review by CEPT. Nevertheless, Malaysia proposal is not supported, as it does not seem to be in line with the purpose and scope of ITRs (criterion 5 - Exclusion of areas not related to the Purpose and Scope of the ITR). <i>Source C 54 (CEPT)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 1.8 The Regulations shall apply, regardless of the means of transmission used, so far as the Radio Regulations do not provide otherwise. <i>Source none</i></p>	

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> new 1.9 Nothing in these regulations shall be interpreted as modifying the rights and obligations of Member States under any other treaties to which they are parties. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i></p> <p>The proposed new article assists in avoiding potential conflicts between the ITRs and the provisions of other treaties to which Member States are already parties. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal, the ITRs should not refer to other treaties and should not be subordinated to other treaties. <i>(Egypt, Iran, UAE)</i></p> <p>It was stated that the ITRs should not conflict with other treaties. <i>(Portugal, Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>Some Member States categorically opposed this proposal. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p>
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Article 2</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Definitions</b></p> <p>For the purpose of these Regulations, the following definitions shall apply. These terms and definitions do not, however, necessarily apply for other purposes. <i>Source none</i></p>	<p>The Russian Federation stated that it reserves its position regarding definitions.</p>
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> 2.1 <i>Telecommunication:</i> Any transmission, emission or reception of signs, signals, writing, images and sounds or intelligence of any nature by wire, radio, optical or other electromagnetic systems. <i>Source none</i></p>	<p>Current definition is technology neutral and it should remain that way to ensure that the ITRs are a flexible and enduring treaty. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>Maintain so that ITRs is self-contained. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i></p>
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> 2.2 <i>International telecommunication service:</i> The offering of a telecommunication capability between telecommunication offices or stations of any nature that are in or belong to different countries. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 MOD:</i> 2.2 <i>International telecommunication service:</i> The offering of a telecommunication capability <u>including, but not limited to: offering of a telecommunication capability in roaming, international public telegram service, telex, traffic termination services (including Internet traffic termination), any kind of circuit provision services, other services integral to provision of international telecommunication services</u> between telecommunication offices or stations of any nature that are in or belong to different countries. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation) and Côte d'Ivoire</i></p>	<p>Maintain so that ITRs is self-contained. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 MOD:</i></p> <p>It is believed essential to list specific basic international telecommunication services in this definition so to make the text of 2.2 clear and well-defined. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal, the current definition is sufficiently broad and flexible; the addition is too detailed and not technology-neutral. <i>(Canada, Portugal, USA)</i></p> <p>It was agreed that definitions should be revisited after the other articles are agreed.</p> <p>It was stated that the specific issues raised by the Russian Federation could perhaps be addressed elsewhere in the ITRs, without changing the definition.</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 2.3 <i>Government telecommunication:</i> A telecommunication originating with any: Head of a State; Head of a government or members of a government; Commanders-in-Chief of military forces, land, sea or air; diplomatic or consular agents; the Secretary-General of the United Nations; Heads of the principal organs of the United Nations; the International Court of Justice, or reply to a government telegram. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> ... the International Court of Justice, or repl<del>ies</del>y to a government <del>telegram</del> <u>telecommunications mentioned above</u>. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b> 2.3. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT) and TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b></p> <p>Align with CS 1014. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1</i></p> <p>Maintain. ITRs should be self-contained instrument. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i></p> <p>If this text is to be retained, the United States supports aligning it with the CS/CV definition. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and UAE</i></p> <p>Some Member States reserved their position. (<i>Russian Federation</i>)</p> <p>Algeria reserves its right to propose revisions to this proposal.</p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b> Obsolete <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i>.</p>



Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 2.4 <i>Service telecommunication:</i> A telecommunication that relates to public international telecommunications and that is exchanged among the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- administrations;</li> <li>- recognized private operating agencies,</li> <li>- and the Chairman of the Administrative Council, the Secretary-General, the Deputy Secretary-General, the Directors of the International Consultative Committees, the members of the International Frequency Registration Board, other representatives or authorized officials of the Union, including those working on official matters outside the seat of the Union. <i>Source none</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 2.4 A telecommunication that relates to public international telecommunications and that is exchanged among the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- administrations;</li> <li>- recognized <b>private</b> operating agencies,</li> <li>- and the Chairman of the <b>Administrative</b> Council, the Secretary-General, the Deputy Secretary-General, the Directors of the <b>Bureaux International Consultative Committees</b>, the members of the <b>Radio Regulations International Frequency Regulation</b> Board, other ... . <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> Editorial updates to align with CS/CV. <i>Source C 28 (USA) and Canada</i> Maintain so that ITRs is self-contained. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p>2.4 - <i>CONTINUED</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 2.4 A telecommunication that relates to public international telecommunications and that is exchanged <u>by agreement</u> among the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- administrations;</li> <li>- recognized private operating agencies,</li> <li>- and the Chairman of the <del>Administrative</del> Council, the Secretary-General, the Deputy Secretary-General, the Directors of the <del>Bureaux International Consultative Committees</del>, the members of the <del>Radio Regulations International Frequency Registration Board</del>, other representatives ... . <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> 2.4 A telecommunication that relates to public international telecommunications and that is exchanged among the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- administrations;</li> <li>- recognized <del>private</del> operating agencies,</li> <li>- and the Chairman of the <del>Administrative</del> Council, the Secretary-General, the Deputy Secretary-General, the Directors of the <del>Bureaux International Consultative Committees</del>, the members of the <del>Radio Regulations International Frequency Regulation Board</del>, other representatives ... <i>Source C 35 (CEPT) and C 38 (USA)</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b></p> <p>Revisit after review of Appendix 3. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p>Proposed addition of “by agreement” renders the definition inconsistent with the definition provided in CV 1006. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> Align with CV. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> <i>2.5 Privilege telecommunication</i></p> <p>2.5.1 A telecommunication that may be exchanged during sessions of the ITU Administrative Council, conferences and meetings of the ITU between, on the one hand, representatives of Members of the Administrative Council, members of delegations, senior officials of the permanent organs of the Union and their authorized colleagues attending conferences and meetings of the ITU and, on the other, their administrations or recognized private operating agency or the ITU, and relating either to matters under discussion by the Administrative Council, conferences and meetings of the ITU or to public international telecommunications. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 2.5.1 A telecommunication that may be exchanged during sessions of the ITU <del>Administrative</del> Council, conferences and meetings of the ITU between, on the one hand, representatives of Members of the <del>Administrative</del> Council, ... , and relating either to matters under discussion by the <del>Administrative</del> Council, conferences and meetings of the ITU or to public international telecommunications. <i>Source: TD 21 Rev.1</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> ..., senior officials of the <u>General Secretariat and of the three Bureaux and members of the Radio Regulations Board</u> <del>permanent organs of the Union</del> and their authorized colleagues .... <i>Source: TD 8 (Secretariat)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1</b> Maintain. ITRs should be self-contained instrument. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i> Please see edits below from C 28 (USA). (USA)</p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> Please see edits below from C 28 (USA). (USA)</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p>2.5.1 - <i>CONTINUED</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> 2.5.1 A telecommunication that may be exchanged during sessions of the ITU <del>Administrative</del> Council, conferences and meetings of the ITU between, on the one hand, representatives of Members of the <del>Administrative</del> Council, members of delegations, senior officials of the <del>permanent organs of the Union General Secretariat and of the three Bureaux and members of the Radio Regulations Board</del> and their authorized colleagues attending conferences and meetings of the ITU and, on the other, their administrations or recognized <del>private</del> operating agency or the ITU, and relating either to matters under discussion by the <del>Administrative</del> Council, conferences and meetings of the ITU or to public international telecommunications. <i>Source C 28 (USA).</i></p> <p><b>Option 4 SUP:</b> 2.5.1 <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1 and C 35 (CEPT), Iran and Russian Federation.</i></p>	<p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> Editorial updates to align with CS/CV. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 4 SUP:</b> Obsolete <i>Source C 35 (CEPT), Iran and Russian Federation.</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 2.5.2 A private telecommunication that may be exchanged during sessions of the ITU Administrative Council and conferences and meetings of the ITU by representatives of Members of the Administrative Council, members of delegations, senior officials of the permanent organs of the Union attending ITU conferences and meetings, and the staff of the Secretariat of the Union seconded to ITU conferences and meetings, to enable them to communicate with their country of residence. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 2.5.2 A private telecommunication that may be exchanged during sessions of the ITU <del>Administrative</del> Council and conferences and meetings of the ITU by representatives of Members of the <del>Administrative</del> Council, ... <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 2.5.2 A private telecommunication that may be exchanged during sessions of the ITU <del>Administrative</del> Council and conferences and meetings of the ITU by representatives of Members of the <del>Administrative</del> Council, members of delegations, <del>senior officials of the permanent organs of the Union</del> <u>senior officials of the General Secretariat and of the three Bureaux and members of the Radio Regulations Board</u> attending ITU conferences and meetings, ... <i>Source: C 28 (USA) and Secretariat (TD 8)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 SUP:</b> 2.5.2 <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1 and C35 (CEPT).</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> Maintain. ITRs should be self-contained instrument. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i> Please see edits below from C 28 (USA). <i>(USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> Editorial updates to align with CS/CV. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 SUP:</b> Obsolete <i>Source C 35 (CEPT).</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 2.6 <i>International route:</i> Technical facilities and installations located in different countries and used for telecommunication traffic between two international telecommunication terminal exchanges or offices. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> 2.6. <i>Source C 28 (USA), C 34 (Global Voice Group), and C 54 (Portugal)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b></p> <p>Does not account for the multitude of routing arrangements that currently exist under commercial arrangements, where the choice of international route is a commercial matter; no longer necessary. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>This definition does not longer reflect reality. <i>Source C 34 (Global Voice Group)</i></p> <p>CEPT considers that this definition is no longer required as it does not reflect reality (multitude of routing arrangements).. <i>Source: C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal, the definition should be retained, but perhaps revised. (<i>Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Russian Federation</i>)</p> <p>Some Member States reserved their position and indicated the right of a Member State to know the route of its traffic, at least for security purposes. (<i>Egypt</i>)</p> <p>Algeria reserves its right to propose revisions to this proposal.</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 2.7 Relation: Exchange of traffic between two terminal countries, always referring to a specific service if there is between their administrations*:</p> <p>a) a means for the exchange of traffic in that specific service: - over direct circuits (direct relation), or - via a point of transit in a third country (indirect relation), and</p> <p>b) normally, the settlement of accounts. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> 2.7 Relation: Exchange of traffic between two terminal countries, always referring to a specific service if there is between their administrations*:</p> <p>a) a means for the exchange of traffic in that specific service: - over direct circuits (direct relation), or - via a point of transit in a third country (indirect relation), and</p> <p>b) normally, the settlement of accounts <u>by manual or other billing systems as appropriate</u>. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b> 2.7. <i>Source C 28 (USA), C 34 (Global Voice Group), and C 54 (Portugal)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b></p> <p>Review to see if still required. <i>Source: C 35 (CEPT)</i></p> <p>The United States proposes to suppress Article 2.7 in its entirety because it does not reflect the existing competitive international telecommunication market. <i>Source: C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States reserved their position and indicated that the term “indirect relation” has to be also defined, in addition to a comprehensive definition of the term “hub”. <i>(Egypt)</i></p> <p>It was stated that the definition may need to be revised.</p> <p>Some Member States stated that this definition is still relevant. <i>(Côte d’Ivoire)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b></p> <p>Does not reflect the existing competitive international telecommunication market; no longer necessary. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>This definition does not longer reflect reality. <i>Source C 34 (Global Voice Group)</i></p> <p>CEPT considers that this definition is no longer required as it does not reflect reality (competitive market). <i>Source: C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some countries did not support this proposal. <i>(Iran, Russian Federation)</i></p>

---

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)  
CWG-WCIT12/TD-43E

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 2.8 <i>Accounting rate:</i> The rate agreed between administrations* in a given relation that is used for the establishment of international accounts. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> 2.8. <i>Source C 28 (USA), C 34 (Global Voice Group, and C 54 (Portugal).</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b></p> <p>Does not reflect the full range of arrangements in the market and is not necessary in light of proposed changes to Article 6. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>This definition does not longer reflect reality. <i>Source C 34 (Global Voice Group)</i></p> <p>CEPT considers that this definition is no longer required as it does not reflect reality (wide variety of arrangements). <i>Source: C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some countries did not support this proposal. <i>(Côte d’Ivoire, Iran, Russian Federation)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 2.9 <i>Collection charge:</i> The charge established and collected by an administration* from its customers for the use of an international telecommunication service. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> 2.9 <i>Collection charge:</i> The charge established and collected by an administration* /<b>ROA</b> from its customers for the use of an international telecommunication service. <i>Source C 28 (USA), C 34 (Global Voice Group).</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b> 2.9. <i>Source: C 16 (SG3RG-AFR), C 27 (SG3RG-AO), and C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD:</b> 2.9 <i>Collection charge:</i> The charge established and collected by an <b>administration or ROA operating agency</b> from its customers for the use of an international telecommunication service. (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> Editorial update. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b></p> <p>This term is included in Article 6.1.3 and therefore the definition should not be SUP. <i>Source: C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>As CEPT is proposing to delete provision 6.1.1 this definition seems no longer needed. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal. <i>(Côte d’Ivoire)</i></p>



Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 2.10 <i>Instructions</i>: A collection of provisions drawn from one or more CCITT Recommendations dealing with practical operational procedures for the handling of telecommunication traffic (e.g., acceptance, transmission, accounting). <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> 2.10 <i>Instructions</i>: A collection of provisions drawn from one or more <del>ITU-T-CCITT</del> Recommendations ... <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1 and C 28 (USA)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b></p> <p>Review to see if still required. <i>Source: C35 (CEPT) and Russian Federation</i></p> <p>Further review is required to see whether this provision is necessary. <i>Source: C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Attention was drawn to <a href="#">INF-2</a> which provides information on instructions: at present there are no instructions which are in force.</p> <p>Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>Editorial update. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States stated that the definition should be retained. <i>(Canada)</i></p> <p>Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> CS 1004. <i>Source C 31 (UAE).</i></p> <p><i>Public Correspondence:</i> Any telecommunication which the offices and stations must, by reason of their being at the disposal of the public, accept for transmission.</p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>ITRs should be self-contained instrument. <i>Source C 31 (UAE) and Russian Federation</i></p> <p>The United States does not support moving these definitions out of the CS/CV and into this treaty or duplicating them. The CS/CV are standalone treaties, and their provisions are integral in their entirety. Moving articles out of the CS/CV destabilizes their integrity. These definitions inform the application of both the ITRs and the Radio Regulations and should remain in the CS/CV. Furthermore, the definition for mobile service in CV 1003 pertains to radiocommunications, the focus of the Radio Regulations and not the ITRs. <i>Source: C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Definitions on Public Correspondence (CS 1004); Operating Agency (CS 1007); Telegram (CS 1013); Private Telegrams (CS 1015); Telegraphy (CS 1016); Telephony (CS 1017) ; Mobile service (CV 1003) are not needed since there are no articles in the ITRs which refer to these definitions. The argument that the ITRs should be self contained is in contradiction with the Preamble of the Treaty. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States do not support this proposal. <i>(Canada)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> CS 1007. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i></p> <p><i>Operating Agency:</i> Any individual, company, corporation or governmental agency which operates a telecommunication installation intended for an international telecommunication service or capable of causing harmful interference with such a service.</p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> See above</p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> CS 1008. <i>Source C 31 (UAE).</i></p> <p><i>Recognized Operating Agency:</i> Any operating agency, as defined above, which operates a public correspondence or broadcasting service and upon which the obligations provided for in Article 6 of the ITU Constitution are imposed by the Member State in whose territory the head office of the agency is situated, or by the Member State which has authorized this operating agency to establish and operate a telecommunication service on its territory.</p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> See above</p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> CS 1013. <i>Source C 31 (UAE).</i></p> <p><i>Telegram:</i> Written matter intended to be transmitted by telegraphy for delivery to the addressee. This term also includes radiotelegrams unless otherwise specified</p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> See above</p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> CS 1015. <i>Source C 31 (UAE).</i></p> <p><i>Private Telegrams:</i> Telegrams other than government or service telegrams</p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> See above</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> CS 1016. <i>Source C 31 (UAE).</i></p> <p><i>Telegraphy:</i> A form of telecommunication in which the transmitted information is intended to be recorded on arrival as a graphic document; the transmitted information may sometimes be presented in an alternative form or may be stored for subsequent use.</p> <p>Note: graphic document records information in a permanent form and is capable of being filed and consulted; it may take the form of written or printed matter or of a fixed image</p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> See above</p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> CS 1017. <i>Source C 31 (UAE).</i></p> <p><i>Telephony:</i> A form of telecommunication primarily intended for the exchange of information in the form of speech</p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> See above</p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> CV 1003. <i>Source C 31 (UAE).</i></p> <p><i>Mobile Service:</i> A radiocommunication service between mobile and land stations, or between mobile stations.</p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> See above</p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> CV 1006. <i>Source C 31 (UAE).</i></p> <p><i>Service Telecommunication:</i> A telecommunication that relates to public international telecommunications and that is exchanged among the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– administrations,</li> <li>– recognized operating agencies, and</li> <li>– the Chairman of the Council, the Secretary-General, the Deputy Secretary-General, the Directors of the Bureaux, the members of the Radio Regulations Board, and other representatives or authorized officials of the Union, including those working on official matters outside the seat of the Union.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> See above</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new 2.11 <i>Transit rate:</i> a rate set by the point of transit in a third country (indirect relation). <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1 and Russian Federation</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>It is not necessary or possible to define all routing options in a competitive environment where choice of route and payment option is a commercial matter. <i>Source: C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Definition is not needed since there are no articles in the ITRs which refer to these definitions. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States stated that this definition is required. <i>(Egypt, Russian Federation)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new 2.12 <i>Termination rate:</i> A rate set by the destination administration/ROA for terminating incoming traffic regardless of origin. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1 and Russian Federation</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>It is not necessary or possible to define all routing options in a competitive environment where choice of route and payment option is a commercial matter. <i>Source: C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Definition is not needed since there are no articles in the ITRs which refer to these definitions. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States stated that this definition is required. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new 2.13 <i>Spam:</i> information transmitted over telecommunication networks as text, sound, image, tangible data used in a man-machine interface bearing advertizing nature or having no meaningful message, simultaneously or during a short period of time, to a large number of particular addressees without prior consent of the addressee (recipient) to receive this information or information of this nature. (Spam should be distinguished from information of any type (advertisements inclusive) transmitted over broadcasting (non-addressed) networks (such as TV and/or radio broadcasting networks, etc.)). <i>Source: Russian Federation (C 22), Algeria and Egypt</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>The United States does not agree that a definition of SPAM should be added. Advances are made in this area continually and any attempt to address SPAM through the ITRs would be ineffective and would be outdated immediately. The most effective mechanisms for responding to SPAM are technological. To add an issue like SPAM also would change the technological neutrality of the treaty. <i>Source: C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Under editorial review, namely to evaluate compatibility with the EU/EEA legislation, and to reflect the work being developed at international level, e.g. OECD. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal: it is not sufficiently broad to cover existing national laws on spam. <i>(Australia)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support adding any definition of spam. <i>(Canada)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new 2.14 <i>Hub</i>: a transit center (or network operator) that offers to other operators a telecommunication traffic termination service to nominated destinations contained in the offer. <i>Source C 27 (SG3RG-AO).</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>The United States does not agree that the definition of “hub” should be added to the treaty as the treaty should be technology neutral and flexible. Adding terms like “hub” begins to insert issues of a granular technological, commercial operational nature. <i>Source: C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal, it is inconsistent with Resolution 171. <i>(Canada)</i></p> <p>Technical Definition not needed in the ITR as the concept is not being used in the Treaty. Not aligned with Criterion 1. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Attention was drawn to the criteria presented in <a href="#">C 54</a>.</p> <p>Some Member States stated that this definition is required because many of the fraudulent activities and inconveniences to the users are due to hubbing of international traffic. <i>Source: C56, 57 &amp; 58 (Egypt)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new 2.15 <i>Hubbing</i>: the routing of telecommunication traffic in hubbing mode consists in the use of hub facilities to terminate telecommunication traffic to other destinations, with full payment due to the hub. <i>Source C 27 (SG3RG-AO).</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>Agreed by SG3 in D.000. <i>Source C 27 (SG3RG-AO).</i></p> <p>The United States does not agree that the definition of “hubbing” should be added to the treaty as the treaty should be technology neutral and flexible. Adding terms like “hubbing” begins to insert issues of a granular technological, commercial operational nature. The proposed revision introduces a detailed provision that is contrary to Resolution 171 according to which the ITRs should reflect “...strategic and policy principle.” to ensure flexibility and to accommodate technological advances. <i>Source: C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal, it is inconsistent with Resolution 171. <i>(Canada)</i></p> <p>Technical Definition not needed in the ITR as the concept is not being used in the Treaty. Not aligned with Criterion 1. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States stated that this definition is required because many of the fraudulent activities and inconveniences to the users are due to hubbing of international traffic. <i>Source: C56, 57 &amp; 58 (Egypt)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADDI:</i> new 2.16 <i>Fraud:</i> use of any telecommunications facilities or services with the intention of avoiding payment, without correct payment, with no payment at all, by making someone else pay, or by using a wrongful or criminal deception in order to obtain a financial or personal gain from the use of those facilities or services. <i>Source C 41 (Pacific Islands), C 43 (SG3RG-AFR), and C 49 (UAE)</i></p>	<p><b><i>Option 1 ADDI:</i></b></p> <p>Opinion 6 of the Fourth World Telecommunications Policy Forum (Lisbon, 2009) contains the following definition of the term “fraud”:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Use of telecommunications facilities with the intention of avoiding payment; without correct payment, with no payment at all, or by making someone else pay.</p> <p>That definition does not fully account for fraud that involves the misuse/misappropriation of numbering resources. Therefore, we propose to expand that definition. <i>Source C 41 (Pacific Islands)</i></p> <p>The United States reserves its right to provide further text once draft text on the issues listed is provided. We observe that this proposal would add a new detailed regulatory issue to the ITRs, in contravention of PP Resolution 171 (Guadalajara), and outside the scope of the ITU mandate related to national legal, policy, and regulatory matters, and content. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Australia and Canada</i></p> <p>While this Administration has no difficulty to support this proposal, however, it seeks clarification on how this modified definition will be implemented and in which article it is cross referenced. <i>Source C 48 (Iran)</i></p> <p>Not supported. CEPT believes that fraud is outside the scope of Article 1 of the ITRs and also appears in-consistent with the purposes of the Union as set out in Article 1 of the Constitution. In fact, the purposes of the Union do not relate to fraud or other criminal issues. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States stated that a definition of fraud should be included, but reserved their position regarding the actual text of the definition. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p>2.16 - <i>CONTINUED</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 ADD2:</b> new 2.16 <i>Fraud:</i> Use of public international telecommunication services or facilities with the intention of avoiding payment, without correct payment, with no payment at all, or by making someone else pay, by misusing numbering resources or other deceptive practices, in order to obtain personal or financial gain. <i>Source C 47 (Cuba)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 ADD3:</b> new 2.16 <i>Fraud:</i> use of any telecommunications facilities or services with the intention of avoiding payment, without correct payment, with no payment at all, by making someone else pay, by using a wrongful or criminal deception in order to obtain a financial or personal gain from the use of those facilities or services or by intentional misrepresentation of identity which can lead to actual or potential disadvantage or financial harm to another individual or group. <i>Source C 57 (Egypt) and Côte d’Ivoire</i></p>	<p><b>Option 2 ADD2:</b></p> <p>The World Telecommunication Policy Forum (Lisbon, 2009) considered the possibility of including the issue of fraud in the subjects for possible consideration in the revision of the ITRs, and Opinion 6 of the Forum proposed that it be defined as “Use of telecommunications facilities with the intention of avoiding payment; without correct payment, with no payment at all, or by making someone else pay.”</p> <p>This text was a first attempt at a definition which could be expanded in order to identify the form that fraud in international telecommunications takes, with the definition referring to the misuse of numbering resources or other deceptive practices.</p> <p>The ITRs need to complement this definition by identifying the scope of the commitments made by members in regard to this issue, and to that end we propose that provisions be added to Article 6 of the ITRs.</p> <p><i>Source C46 (Cuba)</i></p> <p>Some Member States do not the support the addition of any definition of fraud. <i>(Australia, Canada, USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 ADD3:</b></p> <p>It has been noticed that the proposed definitions focus on fraudulent activities related to financial dimensions and the assurance of correct payment, Although, intentional misrepresentation of identity adds significantly to this problem, particularly with the increased use of the alternative calling procedures of international traffic including Hubbing where the call origin identifiers are not passed transparently or may be intentionally altered to mislead the destination party; it also causes other types of harm or disadvantage to the called party or to the terminating administration or operating agency or even the Member State, either actual or potential, thus it is proposed to address it explicitly in the definition. <i>Source C 57 (Egypt)</i></p> <p>Some Member States do not the support the addition of any definition of fraud. <i>(Australia, Canada, USA)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> new 2.17 <i>Global telecommunication service (GTS):</i> A service which enables communication to be established between an end-consumer subscriber and a subject or object whose physical location and national jurisdiction have no bearing on the service's use; which satisfies and complies with recognized and accepted international standards; and which is provided over the public telecommunication network by one or more recognized operating agencies (ROAs) using the identifiers of a ubiquitous network in two or more countries.</p> <p>A GTS is characterized by the existence of a single infrastructure complex, the location of whose components is distributed among two or more countries such that this complex cannot, in terms of its ownership or location, be attributed to any one country; and by a single GTS ROA, endowed by ITU with the status of GTS operator and operating in accordance with the ITRs and with the legislations of those ITU Member States on whose territories it provides access to the telecommunication service <i>Source: C 44 (Multiregional Transit Telecom)</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i></p> <p>Codes have been assigned to over 35 global telecommunication services (GTSs) recognized by ITU-T, and the Director of TSB publishes new or modified code assignments on the website, where this information is available to any organization needing to make changes.</p> <p>The adoption by WCIT-12 of an appropriate provision for inclusion in the ITRs, laying down and enshrining the principles and procedure for call setup when using global numbering would be an effective means of promoting the new services in the context of construction of the global information society using global numbering resources.</p> <p>The need to introduce an appropriate provision in the ITRs stems from the fact that TSB does not grant the applicant the right to implement its resource assignment without obtaining and meeting the requirements of the involved national administration, including the administrations of any subsequent countries in which the applicant wishes to provide service after the resource assignment has been made by the Director of TSB. It is important to give country codes for GTSs the same status and level of subscriber accessibility as is given to country codes for local telecommunication services, and to create opportunities for administrations and local telecommunication service ROAs to connect to GTSS and route traffic at the local level.</p> <p><i>Source: C 44 (Multiregional Transit Telecom)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this provision: it could jeopardize the sovereign right of Member States to regulate its telecommunications. <i>(Canada, Portugal and USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this provision: it is too detailed and technology-specific; it could distort market by forcing unneeded interconnections. <i>(USA)</i></p>



Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> new 2.18 <i>Calling Party Identification (CPI):</i> a supplementary service in which a series of digits, characters and symbols are conveyed transparently to the called party to identify uniquely the calling party originating the international call. <i>Source C 56 (Egypt) and Côte d'Ivoire</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>In the recent years, the transmission of international calling party numbers and other identifiers are becoming increasingly important. Despite the fact that all procedures related to the transmission of the cited identifiers are rather fully described in ITU-T Recommendations, practice in recent years shows that administrations and telecommunication operators significantly didn't apply these ITU-T Recommendations; additionally, failure of transmission of these identifiers due to the advent of new technologies has been increasingly observed. Also some telecommunication operators refrain from including or implementing CPND facilities in their networks for commercial/economic reasons. All of these practices and limitations are forming great challenges to malicious call tracing, national security, counter-terrorism and proper accounting and settlement.</p> <p>As a consequence of the current situation, there has been a request by a number of ITU Member States for explicit inclusion in the International Telecommunication Regulations (ITRs) of an article requiring unconditional transmission of international calling party number and other identifiers.</p> <p><i>Source C 56 (Egypt) and Cuba</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal: Member States should not be required to implement obligations regarding calling party number delivery. Technology evolves, the sovereign rights of Member States should not be restricted, economic arbitrage cannot be restricted. The topic is best dealt with in ITU-T Study Groups. <i>(Canada, Portugal, USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States supporting adding the topic of calling party identification to the ITRs, while recognizing that the ITRs should deal only with the international aspects of the issue, in particular to deal with fraud. Technical issues should be dealt with by ITU-T Study Groups, the ITRs should deal with the principle. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>Attention was drawn to the work of ITU-T Study Group 2 which adopted Recommendation E.157 in November 2009. There has not been any further work on the topic in SG2.</p> <p>Some Member States request that countries indicate whether they transmitted calling party identification. <i>(Iran)</i></p> <p>Some Member States stated that the issue is that some countries do not have the capabilities to ensure that calling party identification is delivered. <i>(Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States stated that the issue should be further studied. <i>(Italy, UAE)</i></p> <p>Some Member States stated that it was important to add provisions regarding numbering and calling party identification to the ITRs. <i>(UAE)</i></p> <p>Calling party identification is needed to respond to the concern to address rapidly the fraud and security issues, as already stated by other delegations. It must be stated that this was the reason that motivated the SG3RG-AFR proposal for revisions along these lines. <i>(Côte d'Ivoire)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new 2.19 <i>Calling Party Number (CPN):</i> The telephone number of the originator of an international call. <i>Source C 56 (Egypt) and Côte d'Ivoire</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> See 2.18 above</p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new 2.20 <i>International Calling Party Number Delivery (ICPND):</i> Calling Party Number delivery across boundaries of countries. <i>Source C 56 (Egypt) and Côte d'Ivoire</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> See 2.18 above.</p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD1:</b> new definitions for telecommunication operator, telecommunication service provider, emergency telecommunication, local telecommunication, personal data, fraud, international identification, international numbering, international naming, international addressing, network connection and interworking, accounting. <i>Source C 9 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 ADD2:</b> new definitions for telecommunications security, personal data, roaming, online child protection. Text to be supplied. <i>Source C 40 (Russian Federation)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD1:</b> The United States reserves its right to provide further text once draft text on the issues listed is provided. We observe that this proposal would add several new detailed regulatory issues to the ITRs, in contravention of PP Resolution 171 (Guadalajara), and outside the scope of the ITU mandate related to national legal, policy, and regulatory matters, and content). <i>Source: C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>CEPT reserves its position until text is provided. Definitions would only be needed if these issues are to be addressed in the ITRs. Need to avoid duplication and deviation in relation to existing definitions in CS/CV. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 ADD2:</b> The United States observes that this proposal would add several new detailed regulatory issues to the ITRs, in contravention of PP Resolution 171 (Guadalajara) and outside the scope of the ITU related to national legal, policy, and regulatory matters, and content. In particular, with respect to a new definition of telecommunications security, a treaty on International Telecommunications Regulations should not include provisions on the content of communications over telecommunications facilities (content), provisions related to criminal aspects (cybercrime), or provisions on national defense/ national security. (See PP Res 130). We reserve our right to provide further comments once draft text on the issues listed is provided. <i>Source: C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>CEPT reserves its position until text is provided. Definitions would only be needed if these issues are to be addressed in the ITRs. Need to avoid duplication and deviation in relation to existing definitions in CS/CV. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 3 ADD3:</b> new definition for the term “invoice”. Text to be supplied. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1</i></p> <p><b>Option 4 ADD4:</b> Need to add to ITR art. 2 definitions of spam, alternative calling procedures. Need to add to ITR art. 2 provision defining new account settlement procedures approved by ITU-T which are not reflected in current ITR version. Add to ITR Art. 2 definition of “user of the international network”. <i>Source Annex 3 of the Report of CWG on ITR submitted to Council 2005</i></p>	<p><b>Option 3 ADD3:</b> The item was proposed to the ITR-EG, but is yet to be agreed <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1</i></p> <p>The United States believes that the proposed revision introduces a detailed provision that is contrary to Resolution 171 according to which the ITRs should reflect “...strategic and policy principle.” to ensure flexibility and to accommodate technological advances. We reserve the right to provide further text once draft text on the issues listed is provided. <i>Source: C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>CEPT reserves its position until text is provided. Definitions would only be needed if these issues are to be addressed in the ITRs. Need to avoid duplication and deviation in relation to existing definitions in CS/CV. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p><b>Option 4 ADD4:</b> In reviewing this document, it was felt appropriate to consider the extensive works which have been done in this regard during the period between Plenipotentiary 2002 and plenipotentiary 2006. In this connection, it is worth to mention that further to Resolution 121, PP 02 Marrakesh, 2002, the Council Working on ITR established under this Resolution submitted a Report to the Council 2005 with three Attachments /Annexes. Annex three of that Report is relevant to the activities of the CWG-WCIT-12. This Administration proposed that the CWG –WCIT -12 carefully examine that document and include the relevant part of that document in the compilation of the proposal under study due to the fact that considerable amount of time and efforts of the membership and the secretariat have been devoted to carry out this task during three years of extensive activities between 2002 and 2005. <i>Source C 48 (Iran)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Article 3</b> <b>International Network</b></p> <p><i>Source none</i></p>	

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b></p> <p>3.1 Members shall ensure that administrations* cooperate in the establishment, operation and maintenance of the international network to provide a satisfactory quality of service. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 3.1 Members <u>States</u> shall ensure ... <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 3.1 Members <u>States</u> shall <u>encourage ensure</u> <del>that</del> administrations* <u>and ROAs to</u> cooperate in the establishment, ... <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i>.</p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> 3.1 <u>Members states</u> shall ensure that <u>administrations or ROAs operating agencies</u> cooperate in the establishment, ... (CEPT)</p>	<p>There is a need for cooperation in the maintenance of the international network to ensure a satisfactory level of service. <i>Source C 20 (CEPT)</i></p> <p>This Article fails to recognise the competitive environment that now prevails for the substantial majority of international telecoms traffic. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b></p> <p>CS: no. 5 and Art. 38 (which are broader than the ITRs)</p> <p>Could be maintained with a different wording, acknowledging, as a general principle, the establishment, operation and maintenance of the international network to provide a satisfactory quality of service. <i>Source: C 35 (CEPT)</i></p> <p>Some Member States stated that the use of the term “cooperate” should be revisited. <i>(Iran)</i></p> <p>Some Member States stated that the word “shall” should be used. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b></p> <p>In many countries, the network is owned by private companies and quality of service is not directly controlled by Member States. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>Under review by CEPT. The replacement of “ensure” to “encourage” seems positive. <i>Source C 54 (CEPT)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support the replacement of “ensure” by “encourage”. <i>(Iran)</i></p> <p>It was agreed that the use of the term “administration” needs to be reviewed in light of developments since 1988.</p>

---

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)  
CWG-WCIT12/TD-43E

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 3.2 Administrations* shall endeavour to provide sufficient telecommunication facilities to meet the requirements of and demand for international telecommunication services. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> ... demand for international telecommunication services <u>and shall endeavor to prevent misuse and misappropriation of numbering resources.</u> <i>Source: C 16 (SG3RG- AFR), Opinion 6 WTPF</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 3.2 <u>Member States Administrations*</u> shall endeavour to <u>establish policies that promote the provision of technical facilities that support provide sufficient telecommunication facilities to meet the requirements of and demand for</u> international telecommunication services. <i>Source C 28 (USA), C 34 (Global Voice Group).</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 SUP:</b> 3.2. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT).</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD 1:</b></p> <p>Text of proposal based on CWG-WCIT12 C1, Adds 1 and 2. <i>Source: C 16 (SG3RG- AFR)</i></p> <p>The United States believes that misuse and misappropriation of numbering resources should not be addressed in the ITRs. The United States recognizes that international cooperation is needed with respect to misuse and misappropriation of telephone numbering resources. However misuse and misappropriation manifest themselves so differently from country-to-country and touches upon national legal, policy, and regulatory procedures. Moreover, addressing these issues involves complex, technology-specific solutions that will continue to evolve with technological advances and market responses. These issues are better addressed nationally or bilaterally through discussions between or among by Member States. <i>Source: C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal: misuse and misappropriation are national regulatory matters. Such matters are best dealt in the ITU context through Recommendations and Resolutions. <i>(Canada)</i></p> <p>Some Member States stated that misuse of international numbering resources is not a national matter but an international matter. Resolutions have a lower status than treaties so the matter should be dealt with in the ITRs. <i>(Iran)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b></p> <p>Importance of Member States adopting policies that create incentives to invest in telecommunication networks. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal. <i>(Iran)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 SUP:</b></p> <p>This refers to work once undertaken by 'Plan Committees' which were abandoned in the early 1990s. There appears to be minimal, if any, justification in the current environment for a pro-active role for Member States in this area. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 3.3 Administrations* shall determine by mutual agreement which international routes are to be used. Pending agreement and provided that there is no direct route existing between the terminal administrations concerned, the origin administration has the choice to determine the routing of its outgoing telecommunication traffic, taking into account the interests of the relevant transit and destination administrations. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 3.3 Administrations* shall determine by mutual agreement which international routes are to be used. Pending agreement <del>and provided that there is no direct route existing between the terminal administrations concerned</del>, the origin administration has the choice to determine the routing of its outgoing telecommunication traffic, taking into account the interests of the relevant transit and destination administrations. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 3.3 <u>Member States Administrations*</u> shall <u>have the power to</u> determine <del>by mutual agreement</del> which <del>national international</del> routes are to be used <u>for the management of international communications</u>. <del>Pending agreement and provided that there is no direct route existing between the terminal administrations concerned, the origin administration has the choice to determine the routing of its outgoing telecommunication traffic, taking into account the interests of the relevant transit and destination administrations.</del> <i>Source C 34 (Global Voice Group).</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 SUP:</b> 3.3. <i>Source C 28 (USA) and C 35 (CEPT). (CEPT)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> The United States does not agree to this MOD. It is not appropriate in a competitive environment, where companies need flexibility to choose the most efficient route for their traffic. <i>Source: C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> This proposal is highly confusing as it has two interpretations: either (a) Member States will have power to determine which of their own national routes are to be used for the management of international communications, which is of course inherent in sovereignty and thus this proposal is unnecessary; or (b) Member States will have such power over other Member States' national routes, which is contrary to the purpose of the ITRs expressed in the Preamble recognizing the sovereign right of each country to regulate its telecommunications. In any case, the proposed edits would encroach on Member States' sovereign right to regulate their telecommunications, as recognized in the Preamble to the Constitution. <i>Source: C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 SUP:</b> Not appropriate in a competitive environment, where companies need flexibility to choose the most efficient route for their traffic. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>Potentially conflicts both with the current industry practice and with commitments made under the Fourth Protocol of the WTO Agreement. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p> <p>Some Member States do not support this proposal. <i>(Egypt, Russian Federation).</i></p> <p>A Member State shall have the right to know through where its traffic has been routed, for purposes of security and countering fraud. <i>(Egypt)</i></p>

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)  
CWG-WCIT12/TD-43E

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 3.4 Subject to national law, any user, by having access to the international network established by an administration *, has the right to send traffic. A satisfactory quality of service should be maintained to the greatest extent practicable, corresponding to relevant CCITT Recommendations. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 3.4 <u>Member States recognize the right of the public to correspond by means of the international service of public correspondence. The services, the charges and the safeguards shall be the same for all users in each category of correspondence without any priority or preference. Subject to national law, any user, by having access to the international network established by an administration *, has the right to send traffic.</u> A satisfactory quality of service should be maintained to the greatest extent practicable, corresponding to relevant <del>CCITT</del>ITU-T Recommendations. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 3.4 Subject to national law, any user, by having access to the international network established by an administration *, has the right to send traffic. A satisfactory quality of service should be maintained to the greatest extent practicable, corresponding to relevant <del>CCITT</del>ITU-T Recommendations. <u>Misuse and misappropriation of numbering resources should be prevented to the greatest extent practicable, by implementing the relevant ITU-T Resolutions and Recommendations and, as appropriate, by transposing them to national laws.</u> <i>Source: C 16 (SG3RG- AFR), Opinion 6 WTPF</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b></p> <p>CS: no 179 broader than ITR. No 13, generic</p> <p>Maintain. ITRs should be self-contained instrument. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i></p> <p>Align with 179 CS <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1</i></p> <p>The United States does not agree with this MOD. The proposed edits would encroach on a Member States’ sovereign right to regulate their telecommunications, as recognized in the Preamble to the Constitution. <i>Source: C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b></p> <p>Text of proposal based on CWG-WCIT12 C1, Adds 1 and 2. <i>Source: C 16 (SG3RG- AFR)</i></p> <p>The text added after “ITU-T Recommendations” is not necessary, as ITR Article 1.6 already provides that “administrations should comply with, to the greatest extent practicable, the relevant [ITU-T] recommendations.” <i>Source: C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>Some Member States stated that a specific reference to ITU-T Recommendations related to misuse was appropriate and should be added to the ITRs, given the reality of misuse. <i>(Iran, Korea, UAE)</i></p> <p>Some Member States stated that incorporation by reference of specific ITU-T Recommendations could be envisaged. <i>(UAE)</i></p> <p>Some Member States stated that the purpose of the proposed revision is to ensure that agreed provisions are enforced at the national level. <i>(UAE)</i></p> <p>The United States does not agree with this MOD. The proposed edits would encroach on a Member States’ sovereign right to regulate their telecommunications, as recognized in the Preamble to the Constitution. <i>Source: C 45 (USA), Canada</i></p>

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)  
CWG-WCIT12/TD-43E

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p>3.4 - <i>CONTINUED</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> 3.4 Subject to national law, any user, by having access to the international network established by an administration*<b>ROA</b>, has the right to send traffic. A satisfactory quality of service should be maintained to the greatest extent practicable, corresponding to relevant <b>CCITT</b> <b>ITU-T</b> Recommendations. <i>Source C 28 (USA).</i></p> <p><b>Option 4 SUP:</b> 3.4. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT).</i></p>	<p>Member States have to be requested in the ITRs to transfer to their national laws and administrative regulations those provisions of the ITRs that reference obligations on the Member State or address fraudulent practices or possible harm to another Member State. (Appropriate text and its citation in the ITR shall be provided and will be subject to further review). <i>Source C58 (Egypt)</i></p> <p>Attention was drawn to the liaison from ITU-T SG2, <a href="#">TD 37</a>.</p> <p>The Chairman of ITU-T SG2 stated that neither SG2 nor the TSB has the power to take measures against misuse, and that it is for this reason that the matter was brought to the attention of CWG-WCIT through the cited liaison, recognizing that the matter raises delicate issues.</p> <p>Regarding misuse, see also comments below.</p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> Editorial update. <i>Source C 28 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 4 SUP:</b> If kept, align with Art 33 of CS where the provision is worded more strongly. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT).</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p>

---

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)  
CWG-WCIT12/TD-43E



Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD1:</b> new 3.5 Member States shall ensure that administrations, recognized operating agencies, and operating agencies which operate in their territory and provide international telecommunications services offered to the public apply the ITU-T Resolutions and Recommendations relating to naming, numbering, addressing and identification. <i>Source C 16 (SG3RG-AFR), Opinion 6 WTPF</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 ADD2:</b> new 3.5 Notwithstanding the provisions of Art.1, §1.4 and §1.6, and to enshrine the purpose set out in the Preamble; in Art. 1, §1.3; in Art.3, §3.3.; and taking into account Art.3, §3.1, Members shall require, subject to national law, that administrations, recognized operating agencies, and private operating agencies which operate in their territory and provide international telecommunications services offered to the public, apply the ITU-T Recommendations and national laws relating to naming, numbering, addressing and identification, including any Instructions forming part of, or derived from, said Recommendations. <i>Source Annex 3 of the Report of CWG on ITR submitted to Council 2005</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 ADD3:</b> new 3.5 Member States shall ensure that the legal and regulatory frameworks and instruments applicable in their territories shall mandate Administrations, Recognized Operating Agencies, and Operating Agencies which operate in their territory and provide international telecommunications services offered to the public to apply the ITU-T Resolutions and Recommendations relating to naming, numbering, addressing and identification. <i>Source C 56 (Egypt) and Côte d'Ivoire</i></p> <p>CWG-WCIT12/TD-43E</p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD1:</b> Text of proposal based on CWG-WCIT12 C1, Adds 1 and 2. <i>Source: C 16 (SG3RG-AFR)</i></p> <p>The United States does not agree with this text as it dictates application of ITU-T Recommendations and Resolutions and interfere with commercial network management. In addition, this proposal appears to give recommendations the same legal status as provisions of the ITRs, and is contrary to ITR Article 1.4. ITR Article 1.6 already provides that “administrations should comply with, to the greatest extent practicable, the relevant [ITU-T] recommendations. <i>Source: C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 ADD2:</b> In reviewing this document, it was felt appropriate to consider the extensive works which have been done in this regard during the period between Plenipotentiary 2002 and plenipotentiary 2006. In this connection, it is worth to mention that further to Resolution 121, PP 02 Marrakesh, 2002, the Council Working on ITR established under this Resolution submitted a Report to the Council 2005 with three Attachments /Annexes. Annex three of that Report is relevant to the activities of the CWG-WCIT-12. This Administration proposed that the CWG –WCIT -12 carefully examine that document and include the relevant part of that document in the compilation of the proposal under study due to the fact that considerable amount of time and efforts of the membership and the secretariat have been devoted to carry out this task during three years of extensive activities between 2002 and 2005. <i>Source C 48 (Iran)</i></p> <p>The United States does not agree with this text as it dictates application of ITU-T Recommendations and Resolutions and interferes with commercial network management. In addition, this proposal appears to give recommendations the same legal status as provisions of the ITRs, and is contrary to ITR Article 1.4. ITR Article 1.6 already provides that “administrations should comply with, to the greatest extent practicable, the relevant [ITU-T] recommendations.” <i>(USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 ADD3:</b> In the recent years, the transmission of international calling party numbers and other identifiers are becoming increasingly important. Despite the fact that all procedures related to the transmission of the cited identifiers are rather fully described in ITU-T Recommendations, practice in recent years shows that administrations and telecommunication operators significantly didn't apply these ITU-T Recommendations; additionally, failure of transmission of these identifiers due to the advent of new technologies has been increasingly observed. Also some telecommunication operators refrain from including or implementing CPND facilities in their networks for commercial/economic reasons. All of these practices and limitations are forming great challenges to malicious call tracing, national security, counter-terrorism and proper accounting and settlement.</p> <p>As a consequence of the current situation, there has been a request by a number of ITU Member States for explicit inclusion in the International Telecommunication Regulations (ITRs) of an article requiring unconditional transmission of international calling party number and other identifiers.</p> <p><i>Source C 56 (Egypt)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD1:</b> new 3.6 International calling party number delivery shall be provided taking into account/in accordance with relevant ITU-T Recommendations. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1 and Côte d'Ivoire</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 ADD2:</b> new 3.6 International calling party number delivery shall be provided in accordance with relevant ITU-T Recommendations, to the greatest extent practicable. <i>Source C 16 (SG3RG-AFR) and C 27 (SG3RG-AO) and Côte d'Ivoire</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 ADD3:</b> new 3.6 International calling party number delivery shall be provided in accordance with relevant ITU-T Recommendations, to the greatest extent practicable. Member States may provide for data privacy by authorizing the masking of information other than the country code and national destination code, but that masked information shall be made available to duly authorized law enforcement agencies. <i>Source C 25 (SG3RG-LAC) and Côte d'Ivoire</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD1:</b></p> <p>The United States believes that this text is not necessary, as ITR Article 1.6 already provides that “administrations should comply with, to the greatest extent practicable, the relevant [ITU-T] recommendations.” Networks, signaling systems, and national numbering plans are not managed, designed, or built the same way. Operators need the flexibility to manage their own networks and apply Recommendations as appropriate. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Egypt draws attention to its position as expressed in C 56.</p> <p><b>Option 2 ADD2:</b></p> <p>Text of proposal based on CWG-WCIT12 C1, Adds 1 and 2. <i>Source C 16 (SG3RG-AFR)</i></p> <p>The United States believes that this ADD is not necessary, as ITR Article 1.6 already provides that “administrations should comply with, to the greatest extent practicable, the relevant [ITU-T] recommendations.” Networks, signaling systems, and national numbering plans are not managed, designed nor built the same way. Operators need the flexibility to manage their own networks and apply Recommendations as appropriate. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Egypt draws attention to its position as expressed in C 56.</p> <p><b>Option 3 ADD3:</b></p> <p>Taking into account the economic consequences of misuse of numbering resources, SG3RG-LAC proposes the inclusion of articles related to misuse of numbering resources and calling party identification. <i>Source C 25 (LAC).</i></p> <p>The United States believes that this ADD is not necessary, as ITR Article 1.6 already provides that “administrations should comply with, to the greatest extent practicable, the relevant [ITU-T] recommendations.” Networks, signaling systems, and national numbering plans are not managed, designed nor built the same way. Operators need the flexibility to manage their own networks and apply Recommendations as appropriate. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Egypt draws attention to its position as expressed in C 56.</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p>3.6 - <i>CONTINUED</i></p> <p><b>Option 4 ADD4:</b> new 3.6 International calling party number delivery shall be provided in accordance with relevant ITU-T Recommendations, to the greatest extent practicable. Member States may provide for data privacy by authorizing the masking of information other than the country code and national destination code. <i>Source C 30 (UAE) and C 42 (Pacific Islands) and Côte d'Ivoire</i></p> <p><b>Option 5 ADD5:</b> new 3.6 Members shall ensure, consistent with technical capabilities and national legal and regulatory frameworks, that telecommunication administrations and operators cooperate in the implementation and application of the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Administrations and operators originating calls must provide the prefix designating the calling country code, in conformity with the relevant ITU-T Recommendations.</li> <li>– Transit administrations and operators must cooperate in identifying and transmitting to termination administrations and operators the code identifying the calling line corresponding to the traffic they receive.</li> <li>– Members will be able to respect the privacy of the data of the calling user, provided those data involve neither the code of the country of origin nor the national destination code.</li> </ul> <p><i>Source C 47 (Cuba) and Côte d'Ivoire</i></p> <p>CWG-WCIT12/TD-43E</p>	<p><b>Option 4 ADD4:</b></p> <p>The operative parts of WTS Resolution 65 and of E.157 include the language “consistent with technical capabilities and national legal and regulatory frameworks”. It is clear that all transmission of calling party identification must be consistent with technical capabilities; however it would be desirable to harmonize national legal and regulatory frameworks in order to ensure the seamless and transparent international transmission of calling party identification. Since the ITRs is a treaty, it is appropriate to envisage an article whose effect would be to encourage harmonization of national legal and regulatory frameworks so as to achieve the goal mentioned above. <i>Source C 30 (UAE) and C 42 (Pacific Islands)</i></p> <p>The United States believes that this proposal is not necessary, as ITR Article 1.6 already provides that “administrations should comply with, to the greatest extent practicable, the relevant [ITU-T] recommendations.” Networks, signaling systems, and national numbering plans are not managed, designed nor built the same way. Operators need the flexibility to manage their own networks and apply Recommendations as appropriate. Data privacy is outside the scope of the ITU’s mandate from a national legal, policy, and regulatory perspective. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Egypt draws attention to its position as expressed in C 56.</p> <p><b>Option 5 ADD5:</b></p> <p>Since the entry into force of the current version of the ITRs, world standardization assemblies and the ITU-T study groups have approved provisions that have helped update the international regulations, and within this context the World Telecommunication Standardization Assembly (Johannesburg, 2008) approved Resolution 65 “Calling party number delivery”, in which the WTS expressed its concern “that there appears to be a trend to suppress the transmission across international boundaries of calling party identification, in particular the country code and the national destination code” and recognized “that such practices have an unfavorable effect on security and economic issues”.</p> <p>Not only are the implications of this issue financial, but they also relate to the need to ensure confidence and security in the use of ICTs, and realization of these objectives is facilitated by binding provisions calling for the dispatch and receipt of the code identifying the country of origin of calls.</p> <p><i>Source C 47 (Cuba)</i></p> <p>The United States believes that this proposal is not necessary, as ITR Article 1.6 already provides that “administrations should comply with, to the greatest extent practicable, the relevant [ITU-T] recommendations.” Networks, signaling systems, and national numbering plans are not managed, designed nor built the same way. Operators need the flexibility to manage their own networks and apply Recommendations as appropriate. Data privacy is outside the scope of the ITU’s mandate from a national legal, policy, and regulatory perspective. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>Egypt draws attention to its position as expressed in C 56.</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p>3.6 - <i>CONTINUED</i></p> <p><b>Option 6 ADD6:</b> new 3.6 International calling party number delivery shall be provided in accordance with relevant ITU-T Recommendations. Member States, in certain specific circumstances, may provide for data privacy by authorizing the masking of information other than the country code and national destination code. <i>Source C 48 (Iran) and Côte d'Ivoire</i></p> <p><b>Option 7 ADD7:</b> new 3.6 Pursuant to article 3.5, international calling party number delivery shall be provided in accordance with relevant ITU-T Recommendations. Member States may provide for data privacy by authorizing the masking of information other than the country code and the national destination code, but that masked information shall be made available to duly authorized law enforcement agencies. <i>Source C 56 (Egypt) and Côte d'Ivoire</i></p>	<p><b>Option 6 ADD6:</b></p> <p>The term “to the greatest extent practicable” appearing in ADD2, ADD3, and ADD4 above has a subjective connotation and may be misused and thus should be deleted. The term “in certain specific circumstances” would further limit the masking and thus was added to the text. <i>Source C 48 (Iran)</i></p> <p>The United States believes that this proposal is not necessary, as ITR Article 1.6 already provides that “administrations should comply with, to the greatest extent practicable, the relevant [ITU-T] recommendations.” Networks, signaling systems, and national numbering plans are not managed, designed nor built the same way. Operators need the flexibility to manage their own networks and apply Recommendations as appropriate. Data privacy is outside the scope of the ITU’s mandate from a national legal, policy, and regulatory perspective. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>Egypt draws attention to its position as expressed in C 56.</p> <p><b>Option 7 ADD7:</b></p> <p>In the recent years, the transmission of international calling party numbers and other identifiers are becoming increasingly important. Despite the fact that all procedures related to the transmission of the cited identifiers are rather fully described in ITU-T Recommendations, practice in recent years shows that administrations and telecommunication operators significantly didn’t apply these ITU-T Recommendations; additionally, failure of transmission of these identifiers due to the advent of new technologies has been increasingly observed. Also some telecommunication operators refrain from including or implementing CPND facilities in their networks for commercial/economic reasons. All of these practices and limitations are forming great challenges to malicious call tracing, national security, counter-terrorism and proper accounting and settlement.</p> <p>As a consequence of the current situation, there has been a request by a number of ITU Member States for explicit inclusion in the International Telecommunication Regulations (ITRs) of an article requiring unconditional transmission of international calling party number and other identifiers.</p> <p><i>Source C 56 (Egypt)</i></p> <p>The United States believes that this proposal is not necessary, as ITR Article 1.6 already provides that “administrations should comply with, to the greatest extent practicable, the relevant [ITU-T] recommendations.” Networks, signaling systems, and national numbering plans are not managed, designed nor built the same way. Operators need the flexibility to manage their own networks and apply Recommendations as appropriate. Data privacy is outside the scope of the ITU’s mandate from a national legal, policy, and regulatory perspective. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>Egypt draws attention to its position as expressed in C 56.</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADDI:</i> new 3.7 Member States shall ensure that international naming, numbering, addressing and identification resources are used only by the assignees and only for the purposes for which they were assigned; and that unassigned resources are not used. The provisions of the relevant ITU-T Recommendations shall be applied. <i>Source C 25 (LAC), C 30 (UAE) and C 42 (Pacific Islands)</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 ADDI:</i></p> <p>Taking into account the economic consequences of misuse of numbering resources, SG3RG-LAC proposes the inclusion of articles related to misuse of numbering resources and calling party identification. <i>Source C 25 (LAC).</i></p> <p>While the measures provided for in E.156 and WTS Resolution 61 are effective, they are not sufficiently effective and numbering misuse continues to occur. The root cause of certain types of misuse appears to be the fact that such misuse is not prohibited by the national laws of certain countries, so operators based in those countries can freely engage in the misuse, making the misuse very difficult to stop. The most effective measure would appear to be to ensure that all countries prohibit misuse of international numbering resources. This can be achieved by agreeing an appropriate article in the new ITRs. <i>Source C 30 (UAE) and C 42 (Pacific Islands)</i></p> <p>The United States believes that this proposal is not necessary, as ITR Article 1.6 already provides that “administrations should comply with, to the greatest extent practicable, the relevant [ITU-T] recommendations.” The issue of misuse is being studied in ITU-T Study Group 2 and that work has shown that the term misuse has different connotations and that developing a solution to the problems encountered involves complex technical issues. Therefore, this issue should not be included in the ITRs, where precision of language is essential, but should continue to be studied in the ITU-T and addressed nationally by Member States. In addition, networks, signaling systems, and national numbering plans are not managed, designed nor built the same way. Operators need the flexibility to manage their own networks and apply Recommendations as appropriate. Data privacy is outside the scope of the ITU’s mandate from a national legal, policy, and regulatory perspective. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>Egypt draws attention to its position as expressed in C 56.</p> <p>General policy principles may be acceptable, subject to editorial review. To be kept within ITU mandate.</p> <p>In relation to “The provisions of the relevant ITU-T Recommendations shall be applied”, the proposals do not comply with CEPT criteria for accepting proposals (criterion 2 – “Consistency with the Preamble and Article 1 of the CS”), bearing in mind that ITU recommendations are non binding, and the voluntary application nature of the ITU-T recommendations cannot be changed by means of the ITR revision.</p> <p><i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p>3.7 - CONTINUED</p> <p><b>Option 2 ADD2:</b> new 3.7 Members shall ensure, consistent with technical capabilities and national legal and regulatory frameworks, that telecommunication administrations and operators under their jurisdiction neither participate in the misuse/misappropriation of numbering resources not assigned to them or assigned to other administrations and operators, nor use these resources using procedures that do not conform to the relevant ITU-T Recommendations' assignment criteria. <i>Source C 47 (Cuba)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 ADD3:</b> new 3.7 Member States shall ensure that international naming, numbering, addressing and identification resources are used only by the assignees and only for the purposes for which they were assigned; and that unassigned resources shall not be used. The provisions of the relevant ITU Recommendations shall be applied/ shall apply. <i>Source C 48 (Iran)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 2 ADD2:</b></p> <p>Opinion 6 of the World Telecommunication Policy Forum (Lisbon, 2009) considered that in the course of preparing for the WCIT the membership might wish to consider modifying Article 3.2 to include reference to preventing misuse and misappropriation of numbering resources, considering among other issues the misuse of numbering, naming and addressing resources, and the use of a numbering resource when its use does not conform to the assignment criteria or when an unassigned numbering resource is used in the provision of a telecommunication service. <i>Source C 47 (Cuba)</i></p> <p>The United States believes that this proposal is not necessary, as ITR Article 1.6 already provides that "administrations should comply with, to the greatest extent practicable, the relevant [ITU-T] recommendations." The issue of misuse is being studied in ITU-T Study Group 2 and that work has shown that the term misuse has different connotations and that developing a solution to the problems encountered involves complex technical issues. Therefore, this issue should not be included in the ITRs, where precision of language is essential, but should continue to be studied in the ITU-T and addressed nationally by Member States. In addition, networks, signaling systems, and national numbering plans are not managed, designed nor built the same way. Operators need the flexibility to manage their own networks and apply Recommendations as appropriate. Data privacy is outside the scope of the ITU's mandate from a national legal, policy, and regulatory perspective. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>Egypt draws attention to its position as expressed in C 56.</p> <p><b>Option 3 ADD3:</b></p> <p>Reformulate the proposal in ADD1 above, recognizing that the term "shall" has its unique legal connotation which is more appropriate in a treaty text. <i>Source C 48 (Iran)</i></p> <p>The United States believes that this proposal is not necessary, as ITR Article 1.6 already provides that "administrations should comply with, to the greatest extent practicable, the relevant [ITU-T] recommendations." The issue of misuse is being studied in ITU-T Study Group 2 and that work has shown that the term misuse has different connotations and that developing a solution to the problems encountered involves complex technical issues. Therefore, this issue should not be included in the ITRs, where precision of language is essential, but should continue to be studied in the ITU-T and addressed nationally by Member States. In addition, networks, signaling systems, and national numbering plans are not managed, designed nor built the same way. Operators need the flexibility to manage their own networks and apply Recommendations as appropriate. Data privacy is outside the scope of the ITU's mandate from a national legal, policy, and regulatory perspective. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>Egypt draws attention to its position as expressed in C 56.</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADDI:</i> new 3.8 regarding Internet address allocation distribution. Text to be defined. <i>Source C 40 (Russian Federation) and Côte d'Ivoire</i></p>	<p><b><i>Option 1 ADDI:</i></b></p> <p>Oblige ITU to allocate/distribute some part of IPv6 addresses (as same way/principle as for telephone numbering) <i>Source C 40 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>The United States reserves its right to provide further text once draft text on the issue listed is provided. We note that a system already exists for allocation and assignment of Internet Protocol (IP) addresses, and that this function is performed by entities in the Internet technical community. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Australia, Canada</i></p> <p>CEPT reserves its position until text is provided. As a principle, CEPT does not agree that ITU has a role in internet address allocation. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal) and Australia, Canada</i></p>
<p><b><i>Option 0 NOC:</i></b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Article 4</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>International Telecommunication Services</b></p> <p><i>Source none</i></p>	

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b></p> <p>4.1 Members shall promote the implementation of international telecommunication services and shall endeavour to make such services generally available to the public in their national network(s). <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 4.1 Members <del>States</del> shall, <u>to the greatest extent practicable, establish policies to</u> promote the <u>development implementation</u> of international telecommunication services <del>that are and shall endeavour to make such services</del> generally available to the public <del>in their national network (s)</del>. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i>.</p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 4.1 Members <del>States</del> shall, <u>to the greatest extent practicable, establish policies to</u> promote the <u>development implementation</u> of international telecommunication services <del>and shall endeavour to make such services generally available</del> <u>to foster the general availability</u> to the public <del>of such services in their national network (s)</del>. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i>.</p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> 4.1 <del>Members</del> <u>states</u> shall promote the implementation of international telecommunication services and shall endeavour to make such services generally available to the public in their national network(s). (CEPT)</p>	<p>There is a need for sufficient telecommunication facilities to meet the requirements of, and demand for, international telecommunication services. All users and consumers to have the right to send traffic via the international network. A wide range of international services to be promoted. <i>Source C 20 (CEPT)</i>.</p> <p>Review and update. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p> <p>Maintain. ITRs should be self-contained instrument. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> Editorial update to align with CS Art 1.1.c <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b></p> <p>A new text is proposed. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member Stated did not support this proposal. (<i>Iran</i>)</p>



Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 4.2 Members shall ensure that administrations* cooperate within the framework of these Regulations to provide by mutual agreement, a wide range of international telecommunication services which should conform, to the greatest extent practicable, to the relevant CCITT Recommendations. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 4.2 Member-s <u>States</u> shall ensure that administrations* cooperate within the framework of these Regulations to provide by mutual agreement, a wide range of international telecommunication services which should conform, to the greatest extent practicable, to the relevant <u>ITU-TECIT</u> Recommendations. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 4.2 Member-s <u>States</u> shall <u>encourage ensure</u> <del>that</del> administrations* <u>ROAs to</u> cooperate within the framework of these Regulations to provide by mutual agreement, a wide range of international telecommunication services which should conform, to the greatest extent practicable, to the relevant <u>ITU-T</u> <del>CCITT</del> Recommendations. <i>Source C 28 (USA).</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 SUP:</b> 4.2. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT).</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> Editorial update to align with CS/CV <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i> Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 SUP:</b> It refers again to “mutual agreement”. The best way for providing choice and innovation in the provision of international services is by facilitating competition in the provision of such services. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p>

---

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> text of CS 186-189A. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Establishment, Operation and Protection of Telecommunication Channels and Installations</b></p> <p>1 Member States shall take such steps as may be necessary to ensure the establishment, under the best technical conditions, of the channels and installations necessary to carry on the rapid and uninterrupted exchange of international telecommunications.</p> <p>2 So far as possible, these channels and installations must be operated by the methods and procedures which practical operating experience has shown to be the best. They must be maintained in proper operating condition and kept abreast of scientific and technical progress.</p> <p>3 Member States shall safeguard these channels and installations within their jurisdiction.</p> <p>4 Unless other conditions are laid down by special arrangements, each Member State shall take such steps as may be necessary to ensure maintenance of those sections of international telecommunication circuits within its control.</p> <p>5 Member States recognize the necessity of taking practical measures to prevent the operation of electrical apparatus and installations of all kinds from disrupting the operation of telecommunication installations within the jurisdiction of other Member States.</p>	<p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i></p> <p>Maintain. ITRs should be self-contained instrument. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i></p> <p>The proposed revision is unnecessary because ITRs are already subject to the CV provisions that are listed here. The General Provisions Relating to Telecommunications in CS Chapter VI (CS179-193) inform the supplication of both the ITRs and the Radio Regulations. We support retaining these provisions in the CS and do not support transferring them to or duplicating them in the ITRs. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>The proposed provisions are included in Article 38 of the CS (“establishment, operation and protection of telecommunication channels and installations”). Need to avoid duplication. These provisions include technical considerations. Therefore, the proposal does not meet “criterion 1” described above, as it does not refer to high level strategic and policy issues. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 4.3 Subject to national law, Members shall endeavour to ensure that administrations* provide and maintain, to the greatest extent practicable, a minimum quality of service corresponding to the relevant CCITT Recommendations with respect to: <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> ... a minimum quality of service corresponding to the relevant <del>ITU-T CCITT</del> Recommendations with respect to: ... <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1 and Egypt</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 4.3 Subject to national law, Member-s <del>States</del> shall endeavour to ensure that ROAs <del>administrations*</del> provide and maintain, to the greatest extent practicable, a <del>satisfactory minimum</del> quality of service corresponding to the relevant <del>ITU-T CCITT</del> Recommendations with respect to: <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i>.</p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> 4.3 Subject to national law, <del>Members states</del> shall endeavour to ensure that <del>administrations or recognized private operating agency(ies)</del> operating agencies provide and maintain, to the greatest extent practicable, a minimum quality of service corresponding to the relevant CCITT Recommendations with respect to: ... (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b></p> <p>Could be maintained with a different wording, to reflect present reality of competitive and liberalized markets. Editorial review needed to align with contribution from Germany (CWG-WCIT12/C-53) to the 5th Council Working Group on “Considerations for the revision of the ITRs”. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal. (<i>Canada</i>)</p> <p>Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. (<i>Russian Federation</i>)</p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b></p> <p>Editorial update to align with CS/CV <i>Source C 28 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>Could be maintained with a different wording, to reflect present reality of competitive and liberalized markets. Editorial review needed to align with contribution from Germany (CWG-WCIT12/C-53) to the 5th Council Working Group on “Considerations for the revision of the ITRs”. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. (<i>Russian Federation</i>)</p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal, drawing attention to the increasingly observable deterioration of the quality of service in many international connections, in particular VoIP based, which was commensurate with the current trend of commercialization of the telecommunications sector, and QoS should not go below a certain minimum level. (<i>Egypt</i>)</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 4.3 a) access to the international network by users using terminals which are permitted to be connected to the network and which do not cause harm to technical facilities and personnel; <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> 4.3a) access to the international network by users using terminals which are permitted to be connected to the network and which do not cause harm to technical facilities and personnel; <u>harm to technical facilities and personnel shall be construed to include spam, malware, etc. as defined in relevant ITU-T Recommendations (as the case may be), as well as malicious code transmitted by any telecommunication facility or technology, including Internet and Internet Protocol. Furthermore, the said provision shall be construed to prohibit connection of terminals that cause harm to technical facilities or personnel.</u> <i>Source Opinion 6 WTPF and Côte d’Ivoire</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b></p> <p>The United States believes that this MOD is not necessary. The proposed language does not make sense in the context of the original text of 4.3 a) which concerns harm to the network caused by “terminals.” In addition, this text suggests that the ITU has a role in content related issues. We do not believe it does. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal: it could be difficult to implement and involve removal of compromised computers from the Internet. <i>(Australia)</i></p> <p>Attention was drawn to Art. 42 of the Constitution.</p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 4.3 b) international telecommunication facilities and services available to customers for their dedicated use; <i>Source none</i></p>	<p>Some Member States reserved their position regarding use of the term “customer” versus “user”. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 4.3 c) at least a form of telecommunication which is reasonably accessible to the public, including those who may not be subscribers to a specific telecommunication service; and <i>Source none</i></p>	<p>4.3 c) should be reviewed and updated. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 4.3 d) a capability for interworking between different services, as appropriate, to facilitate international communications.</p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> 4.3 d) a capability for interworking between different services, as appropriate, to facilitate international communications <u>services</u>. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i>.</p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> Editorial update to be consistent with title of Article 4. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new 4.4 Additional provisions relating to global telecommunication services (GTS)</p> <p>Given the particular characteristics of GTSs, which display both the features of international telecommunication services and their own specific features in the form of ubiquitous access in accordance with local legislations and of their own specially assigned country codes allowing subscribers to have a single worldwide number, a national legislation may create special conditions for GTSs, designed to ensure operational efficiency and quality of service for subscribers and characterized by a commitment on the part of administrations* to achieving consistency between, on the one hand, the rules governing connection and call management for any local operator having established a direct connection to a GTS at the local level and, on the other hand, the domestic rules governing connection and call management for a local call.</p> <p><i>Source C 45 (Multiregional Transit Telecom)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>Given that global numbering resources are an important factor in the provision of new innovative services aimed at overcoming the digital divide and constructing the global information society by 2015, it is proposed that this text be added to the ITRs. <i>Source C 45 (Multiregional Transit Telecom)</i></p> <p>See comments under 2.17 above.</p> <p>We believe the proposed provision introduces a detailed provision that is contrary to Resolution 171 (Guadalajara, 2010) according to which the ITRs should reflect “...strategic and policy principles” to ensure flexibility and to accommodate technological advances. GTS is not a term that we recognize from the work that has been done to date in the ITU. Global rules for interconnection – as put forward here – may distort markets by forcing the implementation of high-cost interconnections for services that, within certain countries, may not be driven by consumers. <i>Source USA</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new 4.5 Calling Party Identification is a basic right to any called party telecommunicated internationally, unless national legal and regulatory frameworks of the originating country conditionally restrict this identification excluding the Country Code and the National Destination Code. Member States shall endeavor to ensure that Administrations, ROAs and OAs which operate in their territory and provide international telecommunications services offered to the public to provide the delivery of the Calling Party Number to the called party. <i>Source C 56 (Egypt) and Côte d’Ivoire</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>In the recent years, the transmission of international calling party numbers and other identifiers are becoming increasingly important. Despite the fact that all procedures related to the transmission of the cited identifiers are rather fully described in ITU-T Recommendations, practice in recent years shows that administrations and telecommunication operators significantly didn’t apply these ITU-T Recommendations; additionally, failure of transmission of these identifiers due to the advent of new technologies has been increasingly observed. Also some telecommunication operators refrain from including or implementing CPND facilities in their networks for commercial/economic reasons. All of these practices and limitations are forming great challenges to malicious call tracing, national security, counter-terrorism and proper accounting and settlement.</p> <p>As a consequence of the current situation, there has been a request by a number of ITU Member States for explicit inclusion in the International Telecommunication Regulations (ITRs) of an article requiring unconditional transmission of international calling party number and other identifiers.</p> <p><i>Source C 56 (Egypt)</i></p> <p>See comments above regarding calling party identification.</p>

<b>Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)</b>	<b>Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting</b>
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Article 5</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Safety of Life and Priority of Telecommunication</b></p> <p><i>Source none</i></p>	

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b></p> <p>5.1 Safety of life telecommunications, such as distress telecommunications, shall be entitled to transmission as of right and shall, where technically practicable, have absolute priority over all other telecommunications, in accordance with the relevant Articles of the Convention and taking due account of relevant CCITT Recommendations. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 5.1 Safety of life telecommunications, <del>such as</del> <u>including</u> distress telecommunications, <u>emergency telecommunication services and telecommunications for disaster relief</u>, shall be entitled to transmission as of right and shall, where technically practicable, have absolute priority over all other telecommunications, in accordance with the relevant Articles of the <u>Constitution and</u> Convention and taking due account of/in accordance with relevant <u>ITU-T</u> <del>CCITT</del> <u>[Resolutions and]</u> Recommendations. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 5.1: Align with CS 191. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i></p> <p>CS 191: International telecommunication services must give absolute priority to all telecommunications concerning safety of life at sea, on land, in the air or in outer space, as well as to epidemiological telecommunications of exceptional urgency of the World Health Organization.</p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> 5.1 <u>Member States shall adopt policies that, to the greatest extent practicable, ensure that s</u>safety of life telecommunications, such as distress telecommunications, <u>are shall be</u> entitled to transmission as of right and, where technically practicable, have absolute priority over all other telecommunications, in accordance with the relevant Articles of the <u>Constitution and</u> Convention and taking due account of relevant <u>CCITT ITU-T</u> Recommendations. <i>Source C 28 (USA).</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b></p> <p>Safety of life telecommunications to have absolute priority over all other telecommunications. <i>Source C 20 (CEPT).</i></p> <p>Should be reviewed in light of Art 40 of CS. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p> <p>Some participants propose to add “resolutions” in front of “Recommendations”. Some participants did not agree with the proposed change. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1</i></p> <p>The priority of safety of life telecommunications is established in all the instruments of the Union. Distress (emergency), urgency, and safety communications are recognized as safety of life telecommunications. The United States opposes expanding the definition of safety of life telecommunication to include the broad category of telecommunications for disaster relief. While the United States recognizes that telecommunications are critical to disaster relief, not all disaster relief communications concern safety of life. Those that do are covered within the current definition. Furthermore, such a change to the definition of safety of life telecommunications in the ITRs could have implications for other instruments of the Union, particularly the Radio Regulations. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>No support. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b></p> <p>Maintain so that ITRs is self-contained. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i></p> <p>No support. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal) and USA</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b></p> <p>Clarifies role of Member States <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>Editorial update to align with CS/CV. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>Proposal is acceptable. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 5.2 Government telecommunications, including telecommunications relative to the application of certain provisions of the United Nations Charter, shall, where technically practicable, enjoy priority over telecommunications other than those referred to in No. 39, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Convention and taking due account of relevant CCITT Recommendations. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> ... in accordance with the relevant provisions of the <u>Constitution and</u> Convention and taking due account of relevant <del>CCITT</del> <u>ITU-T</u> Recommendations. <i>Source C 28 (USA).</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b> 5.2. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT).</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> Editorial update to align with CS/CV. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i> Note that the reference to No. 39 will change. Maintain so that ITRs is self-contained. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i> Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b> Obsolete. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 5.3 The provisions governing the priority enjoyed by all other telecommunications are contained in the relevant CCITT Recommendations. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> 5.3 The provisions governing the priority enjoyed by <u>any</u> <del>all</del> other telecommunications <u>services</u> are contained in the relevant <del>CCITT</del> <u>ITU-T</u> Recommendations. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1., C 28 (USA).</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b> 5.3. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> Maintain so that ITRs is self-contained. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i> Replace the word “all”, with “any” to align with French version. <i>Source C 28 (USA) and TD 21 Rev.1.</i> Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b> Obsolete. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p>



Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new 5.4 Notwithstanding the provisions of Art.1, §1.4 and §1.6, and to enshrine the purpose set out in the Preamble; in Art. 1, §1.3; in Art.3, §3.3.; and taking into account Art.3, §3.1, Member States shall encourage administrations, recognized operating agencies, and operating agencies which operate in their territory and provide international telecommunications services offered to the public, to apply the ITU-T Recommendations relating to safety of life, priority telecommunications, disaster recovery and emergency telecommunications, including any Instructions forming part of, or derived from, said Recommendations. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>Requirement for Member States to enforce the application of ITU-T recommendations. <i>Source Opinion 6 of WTPF</i></p> <p>The United States believes that the ADD is not necessary, as ITR Articles 1.6 and 5.2 already cover this issue. If the intent of the proposal is to give greater status to certain recommendations, we disagree with the proposal. <i>Source C 45 (USA).</i></p> <p>Not supported. CEPT considers that a requirement for Administrations to enforce ITU Recommendations is inconsistent with criterion 2: “Compliance with Article 1 of the CS”, bearing in mind that ITU Recommendations are of voluntary application. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new 5.5 regarding absence of unified emergency number. Text to be defined. <i>Source C 40 (Russian Federation)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>Unified regional emergency numbers for all telecom services in all telecom networks including IP networks and VoIP phones and notification to customers of this number in any roaming region. <i>Source C 40 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>The United States reserves its position until the text is defined. We note that ITU-T Study Group 2 has already addressed the issue of suggested possible emergency codes in ITU-T Recommendation E.161. The studies conducted in SG2 have proven that “harmonization” or “unification” is not feasible, and the choice of emergency numbers is a national and/or regional matter. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>CEPT reserves its right to comment when text is provided. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new 5.6 regarding emergency notification. Text to be defined. <i>Source C 40 (Russian Federation)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>The United States reserves its position until the text is defined and would like to better understand what is meant by “emergency notification.” Numbering systems are different around the world. Countries have adopted national and regional emergency numbers, policies, regulations, and national outreach programs. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>CEPT reserves its right to comment when text is provided. However, this topic does not seem to be related to high level strategic and policy issues (CEPT criterion 1). <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Article 6</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Charging and Accounting</b></p> <p><i>Source none</i></p>	
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i></p> <p>6.1 <i>Collection charges</i></p> <p>6.1.1 Each administration* shall, subject to applicable national law, establish the charges to be collected from its customers. The level of the charges is a national matter; however, in establishing these charges, administrations should try to avoid too great a dissymmetry between the charges applicable in each direction of the same relation. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 MOD1:</i> 6.1.1 Each administration* <u>and operating agency</u> [shall/could], subject to applicable national law ... <i>Source TD 21 Rev..</i></p>	<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> No change. Still relevant. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 MOD1:</i></p> <p>These detailed regulatory provisions are counterproductive in today’s competitive communications market. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States believe that the verb “shall” is appropriate for the international treaty (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>

---

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)  
CWG-WCIT12/TD-43E

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p>6.1.1 - <i>CONTINUED</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b></p> <p><b><u>International Telecommunication Service Arrangements Charging and Accounting</u></b></p> <p><i>Collection charges</i></p> <p><del>6.1.1— Each administration<sup>*</sup> shall, subject to applicable national law, establish the charges to be collected from its customers. The level of the charges is a national matter; however, in establishing these charges, administrations should try to avoid too great a dissymmetry between the charges applicable in each direction of the same relation. Subject to applicable national law, the terms and conditions of arrangements between ROAs for the provision of international telecommunication services shall be subject to mutual commercial agreement. Source C 28 (USA)</del></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b></p> <p><b><u>Pricing Charging and Accounting</u></b></p> <p>6.1 <i>Collection charges</i></p> <p>6.1.1 Each <del>administration</del><sup>*</sup>-ROA shall, subject to applicable national law, establish the <u>collection</u> charges to be <u>offered to collected from</u> its customers. The level of the charges is a national matter; <u>and as such could be regulated by the Member State in line with the principles in these Regulations</u>. <del>great a dissymmetry between the charges applicable in each direction of the same relation. Source C 34 (Global Voice Group)</del></p>	<p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b></p> <p>Detailed regulatory provisions governing charging and accounting for international telecommunication services are not appropriate for a competitive market. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>The original text of provisions 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 are not relevant in competitive markets. The proposed language is flexible and can therefore accommodate technological advances and market developments. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b></p> <p>The United States believes that this MOD is not necessary, because the CS Preamble contains text recognizing “the sovereign right of each country to regulate its telecommunications.” We also note that many national regulators have removed price regulations in light of increased competition in their domestic and in the international market. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>

---

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)  
CWG-WCIT12/TD-43E

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p>6.1.1 - CONTINUED</p> <p><b>Option 4 SUP:</b> 6.1.1 Source C 16 (SG3RG-AFR), C 27 (SG3RG-AO), C 24 (SG3RG-LAC), C35 (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 4 SUP:</b></p> <p>SG3RG-AFR proposes that all articles of the ITRs that deal with accounting be deleted, <b>provided</b> that appropriate articles are added to ensure that Member States implement national legislation that ensures that operators transmit calling party identification. Further, it is essential to ensure that small operators in developing countries are protected against abuse of significant market power by major international operators, so a new article to this effect would have to be adopted. <b>Thus a new article 6.7 forms an integral part of this proposal.</b> Source C 16 (SG3RG-AFR)</p> <p>It is inappropriate for Member States in an international treaty to make commitments which dictate the detail of how private operators conduct their commercial activities with operators in other countries in the current liberalised and competitive international telecommunications market. However, this does not prevent other Member States imposing such rules on a national basis if they so choose. CEPT recognises that Art. 37 and 38 of the CV anticipate that the 'Administrative Regulations' will contain certain provisions relating to accounting and the monetary unit to be used. However, the ITU basic Instruments themselves are due to be reviewed shortly and in CEPT's view the existing Articles in the Convention do not of themselves justify the continuance of Article 6 and Appendices 1&amp;2 of the ITRs, all of which should be deleted. Source C 35 (CEPT)</p> <p>The United States reserves its right to provide further text once draft text on the issues listed is provided. Provisions concerning market power would result in detailed regulatory provisions, in contravention of PP Resolution 171 (Guadalajara). Market power determinations are made by national authorities with the expertise to undertake a competent analysis of competition issues. Source C 45 (USA)</p> <p>Some Member States reserve their right to revisit the issues or the whole of Article 6 and submit further proposals, in particular following the regional preparatory meetings (Egypt).</p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal (Russian Federation).</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 6.1.2 The charge levied by an administration* on customers for a particular communication should in principle be the same in a given relation, regardless of the route chosen by that administration. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> 6.1.2 The charge levied by an administration* <u>or operating agency</u> on customers for a particular communication should in principle be the same in a given relation, regardless of the route chosen by that administration <u>or operating agency</u>. <i>Source fourth meeting</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b> 6.1.2. <i>Source C 16 (SG3RG-AFR), C 27 (SG3RG-AO), C 24 (SG3RG-LAC), C 28 (USA), C 34 (Global Voice Group), C35 (CEPT)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> No change. Still relevant. It is believed reasonable to retain item 6.1.2 as it supports a stable platform for negotiations reflected in hundreds of agreements affecting billions of dollars. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> These detailed regulatory provisions are counterproductive in today's competitive communications market. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b> See comments above re SUP of 6.1.1 <i>Source C 16 (SG3RG-AFR) and Source C 35 (CEPT)</i> The original text of provisions 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 are not relevant in competitive markets. The proposed language is flexible and can therefore accommodate technological advances and market developments. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i> Eliminate as the concept of route is also eliminated. <i>Source C 34 (Global Voice Group)</i> Some Member States did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 6.1.3 Where, in accordance with the national law of a country, a fiscal tax is levied on collection charges for international telecommunication services, this tax shall normally be collected only in respect of international services billed to customers in that country, unless other arrangements are made to meet special circumstances. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 6.1.3 <del>Where in accordance with the national law of a country, a</del> Countries are free to levy fiscal taxes on <del>is levied on collection charges for</del> international telecommunication services <u>in accordance with their national laws, but international double taxation must be avoided; this tax shall normally be collected only in respect of international services billed to customers in that country, unless other arrangements are made to meet special arrangements.</u> <i>Source C 18 (SG3RG-AFR), C 24 (SG3RG-LAC), C 27 (SG3RG-AO), and C 32 (Brazil)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 6.1.3 Article 6.1.3 of the International Telecommunications Regulations should be clarified and should stipulate that administrations shall not apply taxes to incoming international calls, so as to avoid double taxation. <i>Source C 26 Rev. 1 (GSMA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> 6.1.3 Member States to only collect fiscal taxes in respect of international services billed to customers in that country. <i>Source C 20 (CEPT)</i></p> <p><b>Option 4 MOD4:</b> 6.1.3 TEXT TO BE PROVIDED <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b></p> <p>Ensure the ability to tax different operators in different countries is not affected. <i>Source C 24 (SG3RG-LAC)</i></p> <p>Double taxation in roaming services is a big obstacle to the service charge reduce. <i>Source C 32 (Brazil)</i></p> <p>The United States does not agree with language that would expand the scope of Article 6.1.3. Also, it is not clear what is intended by the term “double taxation”. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b></p> <p>Discriminatory taxation of telecommunications services deters the adoption and use of broadband, mobile and other advanced ICT sector tools that are major drivers of development and growth in the information-based economy of the 21st century. <i>Source C 26 Rev. 1 (GSMA)</i></p> <p>It is not clear what is intended by the term “double taxation”. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>The Russian Federation supports in general the idea of this proposal. However, to date there is no specific text to discuss. (<i>Russian Federation</i>)</p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b></p> <p>Review and strengthen provisions. The need to avoid double taxation on international telecoms services is an important principle. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p> <p>The Russian Federation supports in general the idea of this proposal. It is suggested to provide a more detailed text of 6.1.3. (<i>Russian Federation</i>)</p> <p><b>Option 4 MOD4:</b> Specific amendment proposal by CEPT is under review for later presentation. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p>6.1.3 - <i>CONTINUED</i></p> <p><b>Option 5 MOD5:</b> <del>6.1.3</del> <u>6.2</u> Where, in accordance with the national law of a country, a fiscal tax is levied on collection charges for international telecommunication services, this tax shall normally be collected only in respect of international services billed to customers in that country, unless other arrangements are made to meet special circumstances.</p> <p><u>ADD: 6.2.1 Where an ROA has a duty or fiscal tax levied on its share of charges for providing international telecommunication services or other remunerations, it shall not in turn impose any such duty or fiscal tax on other ROAs.</u></p> <p><u>ADD: 6.2.2 The payment charges imposed in the debtor country (taxes, clearing charges, commissions, etc.) shall be borne by the debtor. Any such charges imposed in the creditor country, including payment charges imposed by intermediate banks in third countries, shall be borne by the creditor.</u></p> <p><i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 6 MOD6:</b> 6.1.3 Where, in accordance with the national law of a country, a fiscal tax is levied on collection charges for international telecommunication services <u>which is to be included in the collected charges or added to the collected charges</u>, this tax shall <del>normally</del> be collected only in respect of international <u>telecommunication</u> services <del>billed</del> <u>presented for payment</u> to customers in that country, unless other arrangements are made to meet special circumstances. <u>This rule also applies in case payments for international telecommunication services and any other services integral to them are made through specialized payment agencies in accordance with arrangements with administrations*.</u> <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 7 SUP:</b> 6.1.3. <i>Source C 34 (Global Voice Group)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 5 MOD5:</b></p> <p>6.2.1 was moved from 1.6 in Appendix 1 <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>6.2.2 was moved from 3.3.4 in Appendix 1 <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>Under review by CEPT. Further clarification of the rationale of this proposal is needed. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>The USA reserved its right to provide further proposals.</p> <p><b>Option 6 MOD6:</b></p> <p>Russian Federation supports the concerns of a number of participants that discriminatory taxation of telecommunications services deters the adoption and use of advanced ICT sector tools, and that provisions of item 6.1.3 should be reviewed and strengthened. The need to avoid double taxation on international telecommunication services is an important principle. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>As a general matter, we do not support the inclusion of this text as it attempts to dictate how and through whom a Member State may process or manage fiscal taxes. More specifically, it is not clear what “specialized payment agencies” are as this is a new term in the context of this treaty and in the context of ITU-T Recommendations. <i>(USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 7 SUP:</b></p> <p>National authorities are free to impose taxes on all telecommunications traffic, whether incoming or outgoing. <i>Source C 34 (Global Voice Group)</i></p> <p>The United States supports retaining the text of 6.1.3. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Not supported. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal) and Russian Federation</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 6.2 Accounting rates</p> <p>6.2.1 For each applicable service in a given relation, administrations* shall by mutual agreement establish and revise accounting rates to be applied between them, in accordance with the provisions of Appendix 1 and taking into account relevant CCITT Recommendations and relevant cost trends. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 6.2 Accounting, <u>transit and termination</u> rates</p> <p><del>6.2.1</del> For each applicable service in a given relation, administrations* <u>or operating agencies</u> shall by mutual agreement establish and revise accounting, <u>transit and termination</u> rates to be applied between them, in accordance with the provisions of Appendix 1 and taking into account relevant <u>ITU-T <del>CCITT</del></u> Recommendations and relevant cost trends. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> The proposed edits would expand substantially the scope of the charging and accounting provisions of Article 6. These detailed regulatory provisions are counterproductive in today’s competitive communications market. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal. <i>(Portugal and Russian Federation)</i></p>

---

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)  
CWG-WCIT12/TD-43E



Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p>6.2 - CONTINUED</p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b></p> <p>6.2. <del>Accounting rates Wholesale prices</del></p> <p>6.2.1 <del>Each ROA shall, subject to applicable national law, agree with other ROAs under commercial agreement, the terms and conditions, including prices, for the provision of international communications services. Member States shall have the power to regulate the terms and conditions of the services provided in their territory in line with the principles in these Regulations. For each applicable service in a given relation, administrations* shall by mutual agreement establish and revise accounting rates to be applied between them, in accordance with the provisions of Appendix 1 and taking into account relevant CCITT Recommendations and relevant cost trends.</del> Source C 34 (Global Voice Group)</p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD 3:</b> <del>6.2.1</del> For each applicable service in a given relation, administrations* shall by mutual agreement establish and revise accounting rates to be applied between them, in accordance with the provisions of Appendix 1 and taking into account relevant <del>ITU-TECH</del> Recommendations and relevant cost trends. Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</p> <p><b>Option 4 SUP:</b> 6.2 and 6.2.1. Source C 16 (SG3RG-AFR), C 27 (SG3RG-AO), C 24 (SG3RG-LAC), C 28 (USA), C35 (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b></p> <p>The United States believes that this MOD is not necessary, because the CS Preamble contains text recognizing “the sovereign right of each country to regulate its telecommunications. Source C 45 (USA)</p> <p>Some Member States took the view that the ITRs should not impose obligations directly on ROAs. (Iran)</p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal. (Portugal and Russian Federation)</p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b></p> <p>Editorial update. Still relevant.</p> <p>Mutual agreement is an important part of the foundation for negotiations between administrations*. This is a fundamental and heavily used article by operators on a daily basis to provide services around the world. Source: TD 21 Rev.1. Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</p> <p>Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. (Russian Federation)</p> <p><b>Option 4 SUP:</b></p> <p>This provision has been replaced by the proposed new 6.1, concerning arrangements for the provision of international telecommunication services. Source C 28 (USA)</p> <p>See comments above re SUP of 6.1.1 Source C 16 (SG3RG-AFR) and Source C 35 (CEPT)</p> <p>Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (Russian Federation).</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 6.3 <i>Monetary unit</i></p> <p>6.3.1 In the absence of special arrangements concluded between administrations<sup>*</sup>, the monetary unit to be used in the composition of accounting rates for international telecommunication services and in the establishment of international accounts shall be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- either the monetary unit of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), currently the Special Drawing Right (SDR), as defined by that organization;</li> <li>- or the gold franc, equivalent to 1/3.061 SDR. <i>Source none</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> <del>6.3.1</del> In the absence of special arrangements concluded between administrations<sup>*</sup> <u>or operating agencies</u>, the monetary unit to be used in the composition of accounting rates for international telecommunication services and in the establishment of international accounts shall be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- either the monetary unit of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), currently the Special Drawing Right (SDR), as defined by that organization;</li> <li>- <u>or freely convertible currencies or other currencies agreed by debtors and creditors or the gold franc, equivalent to 1/3.061SDR</u>. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1 and C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b> 6.3 and 6.3.1. <i>Source C 16 (SG3RG-AFR), C 24 (SG3RG-LAC), C 27 (SG3RG-AO), C 28 (USA), C 34 (Global Voice Group), C35 (CEPT)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> Maintain so that ITRs is self-contained. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i></p> <p>This proposal introduces new terminology that is not defined in the ITRs (e.g., debtor and creditor) and would thus increase the ambiguity of this provision. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>This article provides a backstop for determining monetary unit, when special arrangements have not been concluded between administrations*. Provision regarding gold franc is obsolete. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1. Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b> See comments above re SUP of 6.1.1 <i>Source C 16 (SG3RG-AFR) and Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p> <p>Obsolete provision. <i>Source C 28 (USA), C 34 (Global Voice Group)</i></p>

---

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)  
CWG-WCIT12/TD-43E

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 6.3.2 In accordance with relevant provisions of the International Telecommunication Convention, this provision shall not affect the possibility open to administrations* of establishing bilateral arrangements for mutually acceptable coefficients between the monetary unit of the IMF and the gold franc. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> 6.3.2. Source C 16 (SG3RG-AFR), C 24 (SG3RG-LAC), C 27 (SG3RG-AO), C 28 (USA), C 34 (Global Voice Group), C 35 (CEPT), C 55 (Russian Federation), TD 21 Rev.1</p>	<p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b></p> <p>See comments above re SUP of 6.1.1 <i>Source C 16 (SG3RG-AFR)</i> and <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p> <p>Obsolete provision. <i>Source C 28 (USA), C 34 (Global Voice Group)</i></p> <p>Delete since no longer relevant in light of change to 6.3.1. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>=&gt;SUP agreed</b></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 6.4 <i>Establishment of accounts and settlement of balances of account</i></p> <p>6.4.1 Unless otherwise agreed, administrations* shall follow the relevant provisions as set out in Appendices 1 and 2. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> <del>6.4.1</del> Unless otherwise agreed, administrations* <u>or operating agencies</u> shall <u>apply follow</u> the relevant provisions as set out in Appendices 1 and 2. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> <del>6.4.1</del> Unless otherwise agreed, ... <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> 6.4: align with CV 497, 498. CV 497: The settlement of international accounts shall be regarded as current transactions and shall be effected in accordance with the current international obligations of the Member States and Sector Members concerned in those cases where their governments have concluded arrangements on this subject. Where no such arrangements have been concluded, and in the absence of special agreements made under Article 42 of the Constitution, these settlements shall be effected in accordance with the Administrative Regulations. CV 498: Administrations of Member States and Sector Members which operate international telecommunication services shall come to an agreement with regard to the amount of their debits and credits. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i></p> <p><b>Option 4 SUP:</b> 6.4 and 6.4.1. <i>Source C 16 (SG3RG-AFR), C 24 (SG3RG-LAC), C 27 (SG3RG-AO), C 28 (USA)C 34 (Global Voice Group), C35 (CEPT)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> Editorial update. Still relevant. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> Maintain so that ITRs is self-contained. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i> Not supported. Provisions proposed by UAE are included in article 37 of the CV (“Rendering and Settlement of Accounts”). Need to avoid duplication. It refers to technical issues that should not be included in an international treaty. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p><b>Option 4 SUP:</b> See comments above re SUP of 6.1.1 <i>Source C 16 (SG3RG-AFR) and Source C 35 (CEPT)</i> Obsolete provision, as well as Appendix 1. <i>Source C 34 (Global Voice Group)</i> The United States had proposed to suppress Appendices 1 and 2 and consequently Articles 6.4 and 6.4.1. The United States is now reviewing Appendix 2. Any changes to that Appendix may require corresponding changes to Article 6.4.1. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal <i>(Russian Federation).</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 6.5 <i>Service and privilege telecommunications</i></p> <p>6.5.1 Administrations* shall follow the relevant provisions as set out in Appendix 3. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> <del>6.5.1</del> Administrations* <u>and operating agencies</u> shall <u>apply follow</u> the relevant provisions as set out in Appendix 3. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> <del>6.5.1</del> Administrations* shall ... <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> <del>6.5.3</del> <i>Service and privilege telecommunications</i> 6.5.3.1 Administrations* <u>/ROAs</u> shall ... <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 4 SUP:</b> 6.5.1. <i>Source C 16 (SG3RG-AFR), C 24 (SG3RG-LAC), C 27 (SG3RG-AO), C35 (CEPT)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> The United States does not support expanding the scope of this provision to include “operating agencies”. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> Editorial update. Still relevant. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> Editorial update to align with CS/CV. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 4 SUP:</b> Obsolete <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>

---

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’1 Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD1:</b> new 6.6 Notwithstanding the provisions of Art.1, §1.4 and §1.6, and to enshrine the purpose set out in the Preamble; in Art. 1, §1.3; in Art.3, §3.3.; and taking into account Art.3, §3.1, Members States shall, as appropriate, encourage administrations, recognized operating agencies, and private operating agencies which operate in their territory and provide international telecommunications services offered to the public, to apply the ITU-T Recommendations relating to charging and accounting and alternate calling procedures, including any Instructions forming part of, or derived from, said Recommendations. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 ADD2:</b> new 6.6 Notwithstanding the provisions of Art.1, §1.4 and §1.6, and to enshrine the purpose set out in the Preamble; in Art. 1, §1.3; in Art.3, §3.3.; and taking into account Art.3, §3.1, Members States shall, as appropriate, encourage administrations*, which operate in their territory and provide international telecommunications services, to apply the ITU-T Recommendations relating to charging and accounting and alternate calling procedures, including any Instructions forming part of, or derived from, said Recommendations. <i>Source TD 21, Rev. 1, C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD1:</b></p> <p>The United States believes this ADD is unnecessary, in light of Article 1.6. Moreover, adding the term “private operating agencies” would expand the scope of recommendations already adopted by the ITU-T. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Not supported. The proposal does not comply with CEPT criteria for accepting proposals (criterion 2 – “Consistency with the Preamble and Article 1 of the CS”, bearing in mind that ITU recommendations are applied on a voluntary basis. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States provided amended versions of this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p> <p><b>Option 2 ADD2:</b></p> <p>Reference to the relevant ITU-T Recommendations in the ITRs will increase the role of those Recommendations. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>The United States believes this ADD is unnecessary, in light of Article 1.6. Moreover, adding the term “private operating agencies” would expand the scope of recommendations already adopted by the ITU-T. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Not supported. The proposal does not comply with CEPT criteria for accepting proposals (criterion 2 – “Consistency with the Preamble and Article 1 of the CS”, bearing in mind that ITU recommendations are applied on a voluntary basis. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p><i>EDITORIAL NOTE: the only difference between the two proposals is the replacement of “encourage administrations, recognized operating agencies, and private operating agencies” by “encourage administrations*”.</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> new 6.7: Member States shall ensure that each party in a negotiation or agreement related to or arising out of international connectivity matters including those for the Internet will have standing to have recourse to the competition authorities of the other party's country. <i>Source C 16 (SG3RG-AFR), C 27 (SG3RG-AO)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>Based on Add 24 to WTSA-08 Document 47 and is consistent with 2.5 of the World Trade Organization (WTO) Reference Paper. <i>Source C16 (SG3RG-AFR)</i></p> <p>The United States believes this ADD is unnecessary and outside the scope of the ITU's mandate. The proposed text would dictate the jurisdiction and procedures of sovereign nations' competition authorities, and thus would be outside the scope of the ITRs. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>This proposal does not seem to be in line with the Purposes of the Union as set out in Art. 1 of the CS (see criterion 2) and also it does not seem to be related with the purpose of the ITR as presented in article 1 of the said Treaty (criterion 5). However, further explanation on the rationale of this proposal is needed. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal: there are differences in how competition authorities operate in different countries based on different regulatory frameworks. The jurisdictions of many regulatory authorities are limited to domestic markets. For these reasons it may be problematic for competition authorities to undertake to enforce the decisions of another country's competition authority. We also note that the use of the term 'Internet' is imprecise – it is unclear whether it refers to carriage services or content services. <i>(Australia)</i></p> <p>Some Member States reserve their right to propose revised text for such an article. <i>(Egypt, Russian Federation)</i></p>
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> new 6.8 When evaluating significant market power and its abuse, national competition authorities should also take into account international market share and international market power. <i>Source C 27(SG3RG-AO)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>The ITRs should not constrain the ability of national regulatory authorities to undertake analysis based upon national policy and law, taking into account national market conditions. In addition, the proposed language conflicts with the important principle stated in the Preamble to the ITRs that “the sovereign right of each country to regulate its telecommunications is fully recognized”. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>Not supported. Setting guidance for national competition authorities is not part of the ITRs scope (not in line with criterion 5 – “Exclusion of areas not related to the Purpose and Scope of the ITRs). It is also not in line with criterion 1, as it is not a high level policy issue, it is rather a technical issue. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal: it would be inconsistent with many countries' competition regulatory frameworks which can only take account of domestic markets. <i>(Australia)</i></p> <p>Egypt reserves its right to revert to these articles after discussion within the African group.</p> <p>Some Member Stated did not support this proposal <i>(Russian Federation)</i>.</p>

<b>Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)</b>	<b>Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting</b>
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> new 6.9 Member States shall take measures to ensure that foreign creditors for telecommunications accounts can obtain payment quickly and efficiently. <i>Source C 27 (SG3RG-AO).</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i></p> <p>This proposal addresses issues that are already addressed in several ITU-T Recommendations. We believe that this ADD also is inconsistent with PP Resolution 171 (Guadalajara) which provides that the ITRs should contain “strategic and policy principles” and be “of relevance to be included in an international treaty.” We do not believe this text conforms to that requirement. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>Not supported. This proposal does not seem to be related with the purpose of the ITR as presented in article 1 of the said Treaty (criterion 5). <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>



Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD1:</b> new No. 6.10 Subject to national law, members shall ensure that administrations collaborate in preventing and controlling fraud in international telecommunications by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Identifying and transmitting to the transit and destination administrations and operators the pertinent information required for the purposes of payment for the routing of international traffic, in particular the calling line code.</li> <li>– Following up requests by administrations of other countries to investigate calls that cannot be billed, and helping to resolve outstanding accounts.</li> <li>- Respecting the right of members to decide the payment procedure for international telecommunications terminating on their territory. <i>Source C 47 (Cuba)</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Option 2 ADD2:</b> new 6.10 Subject to national law, members shall ensure that administrations collaborate in preventing and controlling fraud in international telecommunications by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Identifying and transmitting to the transit and destination administrations and operators the pertinent information required for the purposes of payment for the routing of international traffic, in particular the originating Country Code, National Destination Code and the Calling Party Number.</li> <li>– Following up requests by administrations of other countries to investigate calls that cannot be billed, and helping to resolve outstanding accounts.</li> <li>- Following up requests by other Member States and Administrations to identify the source of calls originated from their territories exerting potential fraudulent activity. <i>Source C 57 (Egypt)</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD1:</b></p> <p>The ITRs need to complement the definition of fraud by identifying the scope of the commitments made by members in regard to this issue. <i>Source C 47 (Cuba) and C 49 (UAE)</i></p> <p>See comments above on calling party identification, misuse and fraud.</p> <p>Some Member States supported the proposal in principle but reserved their right to propose alternate text. (<i>Russian Federation</i>)</p> <p><b>Option 2 ADD2:</b></p> <p>Egypt is in line with proposal submitted by UAE and Cuba (to further complement the definition of fraud in the ITRs by identifying the scope of the commitments made by members in regard to this issue; specifically Egypt supports and adds to these proposals an addition to Article 6 of the ITRs. <i>Source C 57 (Egypt)</i></p> <p>See comments above on calling party identification, misuse and fraud.</p> <p>Some Member States supported the proposal in principle but reserved their right to propose alternate text. (<i>Russian Federation</i>)</p>

<b>Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)</b>	<b>Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting</b>
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> new 6.11 The ITU Standardization Sector shall be responsible for disseminating the regulatory frameworks in place in administrations having an impact on matters related to fraud. <i>Source C 47 (Cuba) and C 57 (Egypt)</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i></p> <p>The ITRs need to complement the definition of fraud by identifying the scope of the commitments made by members in regard to this issue. <i>Source C 47 (Cuba), C49 (UAE) and C 57 (Egypt)</i></p> <p>The Russian Federation stated that the resource implications of this proposal should be evaluated, for example by asking TSAG.</p> <p>See comments above regarding fraud.</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no MOD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 MOD:</i> article 6 to be replaced as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>6. Economic and policy issues</b></p> <p>1. Member States shall ensure transparency with respect to retail and wholesale prices, costs, and quality of service.</p> <p>2. Member States should foster continued investment in high-bandwidth infrastructures.</p> <p>3. Member States shall [take measures to] ensure that prices are oriented on costs. Regulatory measures may be imposed to the extent that this cannot be achieved through market mechanisms.</p> <p>4. Member States shall take measures to ensure that an adequate return is provided on investments in network infrastructures. If this cannot be achieved through market mechanisms, then other mechanisms may be used.</p> <p>5. Member States shall [take measures to] ensure that fair compensation is received for carried traffic (e.g. interconnection or termination). Regulatory measures may be imposed to the extent that this cannot be achieved through market mechanisms.</p> <p>6. The right to create universal service funds or universal service obligations is reserved.</p> <p>[7. new article on taxation to be inserted here. Text to be supplied.] <i>Source C 25 (SG3RG-LAC); for 6.5 also C 27 (SG3RG-AO)</i></p>	<p><b><i>Option 1 MOD:</i></b></p> <p>Current provisions in Article 6 are difficult to apply in the current liberalized and privatized telecommunications environment. The new ITRs should take into account the differences in negotiating power between commercial operators and the very different needs of the ITU Member States, in particular the differences between developed and developing countries. <i>Source C 25 (SG3RG-LAC)</i></p> <p>The proposed article could require changes in national laws and regulations that are quite stable. As a consequence these issues are not appropriate to the ITRs. <i>Source C 33 (Brazil) and C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>The United States reserves its right to provide further text once draft text on the issues listed is provided. In accordance with PP Resolution 171 (Guadalajara), the ITRs should contain “strategic and policy principles” and be “of relevance to be included in an international treaty.” This proposal would add several new issues to the ITRs and would result in detailed legal, policy, and regulatory provisions that should be the province of national regulators and policy-makers in some cases, and in other cases are outside the competence of the ITU. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>6(2), 6(3) 6(4), 6(5) and 6(6) are too detailed to be included in an International treaty and relate to national matters. Therefore, proposal is not in line with criterion 5 – “Exclusion of areas not related to the Purpose and Scope of the ITRs”; 6(3) Is also not in line with criterion 1, as it is not a high level policy statement, and private companies should have the right to compete and make their economic decisions. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States do not support replacing the existing article 6 with the proposed text, but they could support adding selected elements of the proposal to the current text of article 6. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new articles regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Determination of basic principles and structure of tariff formation/establishment. Determination of tariff limits.</li> <li>- Roaming tariffs.</li> <li>- International roaming and traffic taxation</li> <li>- Non-transparency and complexity of roaming tariffs for customers.</li> <li>- Non-transparency and complexity of additional paid service tariffs.</li> </ul> <p>Text to be defined. <i>Source C 40 (Russian Federation)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>Necessity to notify customers about tariffs for basic services at the time of entering a service zone. Necessity to notify customers about additional service tariffs. Possibility to switch off all additional paid services (i.e. short paid number services, money transfers, bill payments) and or voice/data connection either direct or after exceeding a limit. <i>Source C 40 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>The United States reserves its right to comment on specific text once provided. We note, however, that at least some of the topics listed are the province of national regulators and appear to be outside the scope of the ITRs as established in PP Resolution 171 (Guadalajara). <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>CEPT reserves its position until text is provided. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States agree in principle to include provisions regarding international roaming. <i>(Côte d'Ivoire)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new provisions regarding accounting rates for calls terminating on mobile networks and transiting via the fixed network. Text to be supplied. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>The United States reserves its right to comment on specific text, if provided. The proposed edits would expand substantially the scope of the charging and accounting provisions of Article 6. The United States is of the view that those detailed regulatory provisions are counterproductive in today's competitive market. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Not supported - technical detail (see Criterion 1 - General compliance with the key principles indicated in CEPT Contribution 35). <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> provisions for settlement of disputes between international operators. <i>Source Opinion 6 WTPF</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>The United States reserves its right to comment on specific text, if provided. The intent of this "addition" expands the scope of the ITU and interferes with commercial operational matters. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Not supported. The involvement of the ITU in the settlement of disputes between international operators is inconsistent with the purposes of the ITU as set out in Article 1 of the ITU Constitution and would have substantial resource implications. In addition, there are existing expert international forums which are capable of, and do, perform this function already. In addition, this provision could be inconsistent with fundamental principle of sovereignty embodied in ITU basic instruments (see criterion 4 – "Exclusion of areas related to Member States' application of legal or policy principles which are within their sovereign rights"). <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>The Russian Federation reserves its right to comment on specific text if provided.</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> CV 496.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Charges and Free Services</b></p> <p>The provisions regarding charges for telecommunications and the various cases in which free services are accorded are set forth in the Administrative Regulations. <i>Source C 31 (UAE).</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i></p> <p>ITRs should be self-contained instrument. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i></p> <p>The proposed ADD is unnecessary because ITU Member States are already subject to the CV provisions that are listed here. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Not supported. Provisions proposed by UAE are included in articles:  36 (“charges and free service”)  37 of the CV (“Rendering and Settlement of Accounts”).  38 (“monetary unit”);  39 (“Intercommunication”);  40 (“secret language”).</p> <p>As above, UAE proposal refer to technical issues that should not be included in an international treaty.</p> <p><i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>The Russian Federation reserves its right to comment on this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> CV 497, 498, 499.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Rendering and Settlement of Accounts</b></p> <p>1 The settlement of international accounts shall be regarded as current transactions and shall be effected in accordance with the current international obligations of the Member States and Sector Members concerned in those cases where their governments have concluded arrangements on this subject. Where no such arrangements have been concluded, and in the absence of special agreements made under Article 42 of the Constitution, these settlements shall be effected in accordance with the Administrative Regulations.</p> <p>2 Administrations of Member States and Sector Members which operate international telecommunication services shall come to an agreement with regard to the amount of their debits and credits.</p> <p>3 The statement of accounts with respect to debits and credits referred to in No. 498 above shall be drawn up in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Regulations, unless special arrangements have been concluded between the parties concerned. <i>Source C 31 (UAE).</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> See above</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> CV 500.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Monetary Unit</b></p> <p>In the absence of special arrangements concluded between Member States, the monetary unit to be used in the composition of accounting rates for international telecommunication services and in the establishment of international accounts shall be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– either the monetary unit of the International Monetary Fund</li> <li>– or the gold franc,</li> </ul> <p>both as defined in the Administrative Regulations.</p> <p>The provisions for application are contained in Appendix 1 of these International Telecommunication Regulations. <i>Source C 31 (UAE).</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> See above</p>
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> CV 501, 502, 503.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Intercommunication</b></p> <p>1 Stations performing radiocommunication in the mobile service shall be bound, within the limits of their normal employment, to exchange radiocommunications reciprocally without distinction as to the radio system adopted by them.</p> <p>2 Nevertheless, in order not to impede scientific progress, the provisions of No. 1 above shall not prevent the use of a radio system incapable of communicating with other systems, provided that such incapacity is due to the specific nature of such system and is not the result of devices adopted solely with the object of preventing intercommunication.</p> <p>3 Notwithstanding the provisions of No. 1 above, a station may be assigned to a restricted international service of telecommunication, determined by the purpose of such service, or by other circumstances independent of the system used. <i>Source C 31 (UAE).</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> See above</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> CV 504, 505, 506.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Secret Language</b></p> <p>1 Government telegrams and service telegrams may be expressed in secret language in all relations.</p> <p>2 Private telegrams in secret language may be admitted between all Member States with the exception of those which have previously notified, through the Secretary-General, that they do not admit this language for that category of correspondence.</p> <p>3 Member States which do not admit private telegrams in secret language originating in or destined for their own territory must let them pass in transit, except in the case of suspension of service provided for in Article 35 of the Constitution. <i>Source C 31 (UAE).</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> See above</p>
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Article 7 Suspension of Services</b></p> <p><i>Source none</i></p>	



Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 7.1 If a Member exercises its right in accordance with the Convention to suspend international telecommunication services partially or totally, that Member shall immediately notify the Secretary-General of the suspension and of the subsequent return to normal conditions by the most appropriate means of communication. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> 7.1 If a Member <u>State</u> exercises its right in accordance with the <u>Constitution and</u> Convention to suspend international telecommunication services partially or totally, that Member <u>States</u> shall immediately notify ... <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1 and C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD:</b> 7.1 If a <u>Member state</u> exercises its right in accordance with the Convention to suspend international telecommunication services partially or totally, that <u>Member state</u> shall immediately notify the Secretary-General of the suspension and of the subsequent return to normal conditions by the most appropriate means of communication. (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> Editorial update to align with CS/CV <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i> Review and align with Art 35 of CV. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i> Maintain. ITRs should be self-contained instrument. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i></p> <p>The United States has no comment on the CEPT proposal at this time. The United States does not support the UAE proposal to move articles out of the CS/CV and into this treaty. The CS/CV is a standalone treaty, and its provisions are integral in its entirety. Moving articles out of the CS/CV destabilizes its integrity. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 7.2 The Secretary-General shall immediately bring such information to the attention of all other Members, using the most appropriate means of communication. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> 7.2 The Secretary-General shall immediately bring such information to the attention of all other Members <u>States</u>, using the most appropriate means of communication. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1 and C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD:</b> 7.2 The Secretary-General shall immediately bring such information to the attention of all other <u>Members states</u>, using the most appropriate means of communication. (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> Editorial update to align with CS/CV <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i> Review and align with Art 35 of CV. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> CS 180, 181.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Stoppage of Telecommunications</b></p> <p>1 Member States reserve the right to stop, in accordance with their national law, the transmission of any private telegram which may appear dangerous to the security of the State or contrary to its laws, to public order or to decency, provided that they immediately notify the office of origin of the stoppage of any such telegram or any part thereof, except when such notification may appear dangerous to the security of the State.</p> <p>2 Member States also reserve the right to cut off, in accordance with their national law, any other private telecommunications which may appear dangerous to the security of the State or contrary to its laws, to public order or to decency. <i>Source C 31 (UAE).</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i></p> <p>ITRs should be self-contained instrument. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i></p> <p>The proposed ADD is unnecessary because ITU Member States are already subject to the CS provisions that are listed here. The General Provisions Relating to Telecommunications in CS Chapter VI (CS179-193) inform the application of both the ITRs and the Radio Regulations. We support retaining these provisions in the CS and do not support transferring or duplicating them in the ITRs. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Not supported. Provisions proposed by UAE are included in articles: 34 (“stoppage of telecommunication” 35 (“suspension of services”) 36 (“responsability”) 37 (“secrecy of telecommunications”)</p> <p>Such provisions relate to non-strategic topics.</p> <p><i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p>
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> CS 182.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Suspension of Services</b></p> <p>Each Member State reserves the right to suspend the international telecommunication service, either generally or only for certain relations and/or for certain kinds of correspondence, outgoing, incoming or in transit, provided that it immediately notifies such action to each of the other Member States through the Secretary-General. <i>Source C 31 (UAE).</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> See above</p>
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> CS 183.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Responsibility</b></p> <p>Member States accept no responsibility towards users of the international telecommunication services, particularly as regards claims for damages. <i>Source C 31 (UAE).</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> See above</p>

<b>Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)</b>	<b>Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting</b>
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> CS 184, 185.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Secrecy of Telecommunications</b></p> <p>1 Member States agree to take all possible measures, compatible with the system of telecommunication used, with a view to ensuring the secrecy of international correspondence.</p> <p>2 Nevertheless, they reserve the right to communicate such correspondence to the competent authorities in order to ensure the application of their national laws or the execution of international conventions to which they are parties. <i>Source C 31 (UAE).</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> See above</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Article 8</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Dissemination of Information</b></p> <p>Using the most suitable and economical means, the Secretary-General shall disseminate information, provided by administrations, of an administrative, operational, tariff or statistical nature concerning international telecommunication routes and services. Such information shall be disseminated in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Convention and of this Article, on the basis of decisions taken by the Administrative Council or by competent administrative conferences, and taking account of conclusions or decisions of Plenary Assemblies of the International Consultative Committees. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 MOD1:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Dissemination of Information Security of telecommunication facilities and services: Quality of telecommunication services</u></b> <i>Source C 9 (Russian Federation) and China</i></p> <p><i>Option 2 MOD2:</i> 8 Using the most suitable and economical means, the Secretary-General shall disseminate information, provided by administrations, of an <del>administrative, operational tariff or a</del> statistical nature concerning international telecommunication <del>routes and</del> services. Such information shall be disseminated in accordance with the relevant provisions of the <u>Constitution and</u> Convention and of this Article, on the basis of decisions taken by the <del>Administrative</del> Council or by <del>relevant competent administrative</del> conferences, and taking account of conclusions or decisions of Plenary Assemblies of the International Consultative Committees. <i>Source C 28 (USA).</i></p> <p><i>Option 3 SUP:</i> 8. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1 and C 35 (CEPT)</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 MOD1:</i></p> <p>The purpose of the change is to address all security issues in this article. <i>(Russian Federation and China)</i></p> <p>Maintain so that ITRs is self-contained. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i></p> <p>The United States reserves its right to comment on specific text once provided. The United States does not support the UAE proposal; it is inconsistent with CV #29-32. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal. <i>(Australia, Canada, Portugal, USA)</i></p> <p><i>Option 2 MOD2:</i></p> <p>Delete references to information that may be proprietary in a competitive market. <i>Source C 28 (USA). Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>Editorial updates to align with CS/CV. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal: it is inconsistent with transparency requirements. <i>(Egypt)</i></p> <p><i>Option 3 SUP:</i></p> <p>Proposed for deletion since fully covered by 98 and 99 CV. ... <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p>Many references are out of date and Articles 5 (o) and (p) of CV contain similar text. If kept, The CWG should review Article 8 in order to update it taking into account the text of Article 5 of the CV. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
8 - CONTINUED	
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new 8.1 regarding personal data protection. Text to be defined. <i>Source C 40 (Russian Federation) and Algeria</i></p>	<p>The United States reserves its right to comment on specific text once provided. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>CEPT reserves its position until text is provided. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new 8.2 regarding targeted cyber attacks, online crimes. Text to be defined. <i>Source C 40 (Russian Federation) and Algeria</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>A treaty on International Telecommunications Regulations should not include provisions on the content of communications over telecommunications facilities (content), provisions related to criminal aspects (cybercrime), or provisions on national defense/ national security. (See PP Res 130). We reserve our right to provide further comments once draft text on the issues listed is provided. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>CEPT reserves its position until text is provided. Proposal not in line with criterion 4 – “Exclusion of areas related to Member States' application of legal or policy principles which are within their sovereign rights” <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>The Russian Federation stated that the text that it would propose would not regard content.</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new 8.3 regarding misuse of international resources of naming, numbering, addresses and identification. Text to be defined. <i>Source C 40 (Russian Federation) and Algeria</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>The United States reserves its right to comment on specific text once provided. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>CEPT reserves its position until text is provided. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Australia reserves its position until text is provided but considers that it would not be appropriate to include issues relating to addressing, numbering and identification resources. Many countries, including Australia, have arrangements through other mechanisms including MOUs, law enforcement agreements, and other international organizations to address misuse of these resources. Although Australia continues to believe that this is an issue that should be appropriately dealt with by law enforcement agencies within each administration, we recognise that some administrations may not have sufficient resources to police the issue.</p> <p>Some Member States supported the proposal in principle but reserved their right to comment on specific text. <i>(Egypt)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new 8.4 regarding absence of identification of the origin of traffic/caller. Text to be defined. <i>Source C 40 (Russian Federation)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>The United States reserves its right to comment on specific text once provided. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>CEPT reserves its position until text is provided. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States supported the proposal in principle but reserved their right to comment on specific text. <i>(Egypt)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> new 8.5</p> <p>a) Member-States have the responsibility and right to protect the network security of the information and communication infrastructure within their state, to promote the international cooperation to fight against network attacks and disruptions.</p> <p>b) Member-States have the responsibility to require and supervise that enterprises operating in their territory use ICTs in a rational way and endeavour to ensure the effective functioning of ICTs, in secure and trustworthy conditions.</p> <p>c) User information in information and communication network should be respected and protected. Member-states have the responsibility to require and supervise that enterprises operating in their territory protect the security of user information. <i>Source China</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i></p> <p>With the rapid development of ICTs, the use of ICTs and relevant services maybe is inter-national and inter-regional. In order to build the confidence in secure use of ICTs and relevant services among the member states and users, protect the security of information and communication infrastructure, prevent the misuse of ICTs, respect and protect user information, build a fair, secure and trustworthy cyberspace. We propose to add new articles on network and information security in ITRs. <i>Source C 59 (China)</i></p> <p>China proposes to add these elements in articles related to network and information security in the ITRs (probably article 8). <i>Source China</i></p>
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> CS 190.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Notification of Infringements</b></p> <p>In order to facilitate the application of the provisions of Article 6 of the Constitution, Member States undertake to inform and, as appropriate, assist one another with regard to infringements of the provisions of the Constitution, of the Convention and of the Administrative Regulations. <i>Source C 31 (UAE).</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i></p> <p>ITRs should be self-contained instrument. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i></p> <p>The proposed revision is unnecessary because the ITRs are already subject to the CS provision that is listed here. . The General Provisions Relating to Telecommunications in CS Chapter VI (CS179-193) inform the application of both the ITRs and the Radio Regulations. We support retaining these provisions in the CS and do not support transferring or duplicating them in the ITRs. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>Not needed. Corresponds to CS Article 41 (“Notification of Infrigements”) [<i>sic</i>, the correct reference is Article 39]. Need to avoid duplication. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p>
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Article 9</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Special Arrangements</b></p> <p><i>Source none</i></p>	

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 9.1 a) Pursuant to Article 31 (Nairobi, 1982), special arrangements may be entered into on telecommunication matters which do not concern Members in general. Subject to national laws, Members may allow administrations* or other organizations or persons to enter into such special mutual arrangements with Members, administrations or other organizations or persons that are so allowed in another country for the establishment, operation, and use of special telecommunication networks, systems and services, in order to meet specialized international telecommunication needs within and/or between the territories of the Members concerned, and including, as necessary, those financial, technical, or operating conditions to be observed. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 9.1 a) <del>Pursuant to Article 31 (Nairobi, 1982)</del> Pursuant to Article 42 of the Constitution, special arrangements ... <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD2:</b> 9.1 a) Pursuant to Article 31 (Nairobi, 1982), special arrangements may be entered into on telecommunication matters which do not concern Members in general. Subject to national laws, Members may allow administrations<sup>*</sup>/ROAs or other organizations or persons ... <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p>	<p><i>EDITORIAL NOTE: Article 31 of the ITU Convention (Nairobi, 1982) (replaced by Article 42, no. 193, of the present Constitution) stated the following:</i></p> <p>Members reserve for themselves, for the private operating agencies recognized by them and for other agencies duly authorized to do so, the right to make special arrangements on telecommunication matters which do not concern Member States in general. Such arrangements, however, shall not be in conflict with the terms of this Convention or of the Administrative Regulations annexed thereto, so far as concerns the harmful interference which their operation might be likely to cause to the radio services of other countries.</p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> Maintain so that ITRs is self-contained. <i>Source C 31 (UAE)</i></p> <p>Review. In the current international telecommunications environment the special arrangements described in Article 9 now represent the normal means of providing and operating international telecommunication services. Certain parts of this text could conflict with commitments made under the Fourth Protocol of the WTO Agreement. Is the appellation ‘special arrangements’ still appropriate? Does it conflict with WTO obligations or Article 42 of the CV? <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p> <p>The United States supports this editorial change. The United States does not support the UAE proposal; it is inconsistent with CV #29-32. Regarding the CEPT comment, see United States proposed new Article 1.9. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Australia states that members will need to ensure that they maintain measures to prevent major suppliers from engaging in cartels, anti-competitive horizontal agreements and other anti competitive practices (addressed by section 1.1 of the Telecommunications Reference Paper). Provided that the special arrangements do not involve anti-competitive practices, and Members maintain measures to prevent such practices, there are unlikely to be concerns.</p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD2:</b> Editorial update to align with CS/CV <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p>

---

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)  
CWG-WCIT12/TD-43E



Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>9.1 a) - CONTINUED</b></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 9.1 a) Pursuant to Article 31 of the International Telecommunication Convention (Nairobi, 1982), special arrangements may be entered into on telecommunication matters which do not concern <i>Members states</i> in general. Subject to national laws, <i>Members states</i> may allow <i>administrations or ROAs</i> operating agencies or other organizations or persons to enter into such special mutual arrangements with <i>Members, administrations or ROAs</i> operating agencies or other organizations or persons that are so allowed in another country for the establishment, operation, and use of special telecommunication networks, systems and services, in order to meet specialized international telecommunication needs within and/or between the territories of the <i>Members states</i> concerned, and including, as necessary, those financial, technical, or operating conditions to be observed. (CEPT)</p>	

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 9.1 b) Any such special arrangements should avoid technical harm to the operation of the telecommunication facilities of third countries. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 9.1 b) Any such special arrangements <del>shall</del> <b>should</b> avoid technical harm ... <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1, Côte d’Ivoire, Egypt and Russian Federation</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 9.1 b) Any such special arrangements should avoid technical harm to the operation of the telecommunication facilities <del>of third countries</del>. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> 9.1 b) Any such special arrangements should avoid <del>financial and/or</del> technical harm ... <i>Source Opinion 6 WTPF, Côte d’Ivoire, Cuba</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD 1:</b></p> <p>One of the most significant provisions dealing with infrastructure protection. <i>Source C 39 Malaysia, Egypt and Russian Federation</i></p> <p>The United States does not support changing from “should” to “shall” as proposed in this MOD. It cannot be guaranteed that a special arrangement will avoid technical harm; thus, we cannot agree to “shall.” We agree that technical harm to all telecommunication facilities should be avoided, but instances of force majeure may overtake the ability of an entity to avoid some technical harm. See no. 189A of the Constitution. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD 2:</b></p> <p>Technical harm to all telecommunication facilities should be avoided, not just of third countries. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States do not support this proposal, they suggest “including third countries”. <i>(Egypt)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD 3:</b></p> <p>The United States does not agree to the inclusion of “financial” harm as it is ambiguous and outside the scope of the ITRs. If the intent of the proposed MOD is to avoid an impact on the revenues of recognized operating agencies, we would oppose the proposal. The ITRs should not protect the revenues of any entity or interfere with competitive market forces. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>Not supported. CEPT notes that the ‘development and efficient operation of technical facilities’ is explicitly covered by Article 1.3 of the ITRs. However, CEPT considers that the issue of financial harm is not in line with the purpose and scope of the ITRs in Article 1 (do not comply with “criterion 1”). <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States support this proposal in principle but reserve their right to propose alternate text. <i>(Egypt)</i></p> <p>Some Member States reserved their position pending clarification. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 9.2 Members should, where appropriate, encourage the parties to any special arrangements that are made pursuant to No. 58 (9.1) to take into account relevant provisions of CCITT Recommendations. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 9.2 <del>Members</del> <u>Member States</u> should, where appropriate, encourage the parties to any special arrangements that are made pursuant to <u>9.1 above No. 58(9.1)</u> to take into account relevant provisions of <u>ITU-T CCITT</u> Recommendations. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 9.2 ... to take into account relevant provisions of <u>ITU-T CCITT</u> Recommendations. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> 9.2 <u>Members states</u> should, where appropriate, encourage the parties to any special arrangements that are made pursuant to No. 58 to take into account relevant provisions of CCITT Recommendations. (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b></p> <p>Review. In the current international telecommunications environment the special arrangements described in Article 9 now represent the normal means of providing and operating international telecommunication services. Certain parts of this text could conflict with commitments made under the Fourth Protocol of the WTO Agreement. Is the appellation 'special arrangements' still appropriate? Does it conflict with WTO obligations or Article 42 of the CV? <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p> <p>The United States supports this editorial change. Regarding the CEPT comment, see United States proposed new Article 1.9. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b></p> <p>Editorial update to align with CS/CV. <i>Source C 28 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD of new articles. <i>Source none</i></p>	

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 1 ADD1:</b> new articles on cybersecurity and cybercrime based on 12 (a) and 12 (b) of the Geneva Plan of action, for example:</p> <p>Member States shall cooperate to enhance user confidence, build trust, and protect both data and network integrity; consider existing and potential threats to ICTs; and address other information security and network security issues.</p> <p>Member States in cooperation with the private sector, should prevent, detect and respond to cyber-crime and misuse of ICTs by: developing guidelines that take into account ongoing efforts in these areas; considering legislation that allows for effective investigation and prosecution of misuse; promoting effective mutual assistance efforts; strengthening institutional support at the international level for preventing, detecting and recovering from such incidents; and encouraging education and raising awareness. <i>Source C 27 (SG3RG-AO) and Algeria, Egypt, and Russian Federation</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD1:</b></p> <p>Core mandate of the ITU does not include aspects of cybersecurity relating to national defence, national security, content and cybercrime. Based on Resolves 3 of PP Resolution 130 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010). <i>Source C 29 (USA and Australia and Canada)</i></p> <p>The United States notes that proposals to include cybersecurity are inconsistent with the principles expressed in PP Resolution 130 which provides that core mandate of the ITU does not include aspects of cybersecurity relating to national defense, national security, content and cybercrime. We are of the view that, in accordance with PP Resolution 171 (Guadalajara), the ITRs should contain “strategic and policy principles” and be “of relevance to be included in an international treaty.” This proposal addresses a detailed regulatory issue in contravention of PP Resolution 171; it also proposes to expand the scope of the ITRs into national policy, legal, and regulatory matters and invokes jurisdictional issues. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Australia and Canada</i></p> <p>Further review is required. However, only aspects of cybersecurity that protect networks from (technical) considerable harm would be accepted to be addressed in the ITRs. The term "cybersecurity" for ITU should be limited to what is meant by Resolves 3 of Resolution 130 (Guadalajara, 2010). As a consequence of this, any kind of payload inspection (aiming at content level) should be out of scope. Proposal from SG3RG-AO is not in line with CEPT criterion 4: “Exclusion of areas related to Member States' application of legal or policy principles which are within their sovereign rights”. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Australia considers that amendments to the ITRs should be consistent with the ITU’s existing mandate and responsibilities. While the ITU plays a very valuable role in the technical and capacity building aspects of cyber security, Australia does not support an expansion of the ITU’s role into matters of cybercrime or national defence/security matters involving cyber security.</p> <p>Australia also considers that activities related to online child protection, which have the potential to cross into criminal matters, are well outside the ITU’s mandate.</p> <p>Australia supports Resolution 130 of the 2010 ITU Plenipotentiary conference, “that the ITU shall focus resources and programmes on those areas of cyber security within its core mandate, notably the technical and deployment spheres...”.</p> <p>Australia is of the view that it would be more appropriate for discussions on cyber security policy to be held elsewhere within the United Nations framework such as the United Nations General Assembly.</p> <p>Some Member States reserved their right to propose alternate text. <i>(Algeria, Egypt, Russian Federation)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 2 ADD2:</b> new articles on cybersecurity and cybercrime based on 39-42 of the Tunis Agenda, for example:</p> <p>Member States shall cooperate to strengthen security while enhancing the protection of personal information, privacy and data.</p> <p>Member States shall cooperate with other stakeholders to develop necessary legislation for the investigation and prosecution of cybercrime.</p> <p>Member States should cooperate to take actions to counter spam, including through consumer and business education; appropriate legislation, law-enforcement authorities and tools; the <b>continued</b> development of technical and self-regulatory measures; best practices; and international cooperation.</p> <p>Member States shall take measures to ensure Internet stability and security, to fight cybercrime and to counter spam, while protecting and respecting the provisions for privacy and freedom of expression as contained in the relevant parts of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. <i>Source C 27 (SG3RG-AO) and Egypt (regarding spam)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 2 ADD2:</b></p> <p>Countermeasures against spam including phishing and malware. <i>Source Opinion 6 WTPF</i></p> <p>A treaty on International Telecommunications Regulations should not include provisions on the content of communications over telecommunications facilities (content), provisions related to criminal aspects (cybercrime), or provisions on national defense/ national security. (See PP Res 130). The United States does not agree that SPAM should be included in the ITRs. Measures to counter spam are evolving too rapidly to be addressed in a stable document such as a treaty like the ITRs. Advances are made in this area continually and any attempt to address SPAM through the ITRs would be ineffective and would be outdated immediately. The most effective mechanisms for responding to SPAM are technological. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>Further review is required. However, only aspects of cybersecurity that protect networks from (technical) considerable harm would be accepted to be addressed in the ITRs. The term "cybersecurity" for ITU should be limited to what is meant by Resolves 3 of Resolution 130 (Guadalajara, 2010). As a consequence of this, any kind of payload inspection (aiming at content level) should be out of scope. Proposal from SG3RG-AO is not in line with CEPT criterion 4: "Exclusion of areas related to Member States' application of legal or policy principles which are within their sovereign rights". <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States reserved their right to propose alternate text. ( <i>Egypt</i>)</p>
<p><b>Option 3 ADD3:</b> new article. Members States shall ensure transparency of end-user prices, in particular to avoid surprising bills for international services (e.g mobile roaming and data roaming). <i>Source C 27 (SG3RG-AO) and Egypt</i></p>	<p><b>Option 3 ADD3:</b> This appears to be a national regulatory matter and therefore is not appropriate for a treaty. We reserve our right to comment when text is provided. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 4 ADD4:</b> new article. Member States should consider measures to favour special interconnection rates for landlocked countries. <i>Source C 27 (SG3RG-AO)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 4 ADD4:</b></p> <p>The level of charging and accounting rates is addressed in ITU-T study groups and should continue to be addressed at that level and not in the ITRs. The work involves detailed cost analysis and consideration of policy matters that are more appropriately addressed in a study group recommendation than in a treaty. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Canada</i></p> <p>Not supported. This proposal is linked to discussions on Network externalities. Consensus was never reached. The issue should continue to be dealt with in SG3. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States reserved their position, taking into consideration that many of the African countries are landlocked (<i>Egypt</i>).</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 5 ADD5:</b> new articles regarding compliance. Text to be defined. <i>Source C 39 (Malaysia)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 5 ADD5:</b></p> <p>It is suggested that a Sub-Working group be established and submit reports back to CWG-WCIT . <i>Source C 39 (Malaysia)</i></p> <p>The United States reserves its comments until the text is defined. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States reserved their position until text is provided. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal) and Russian Federation</i></p>
<p><b>Option 6 ADD6:</b> new provisions relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the settlement of disputes</li> <li>- quality of service</li> <li>- Information security</li> <li>- Security of signaling and traffic information; billing information; control and security of data; managing synchronization of call count</li> <li>- Prohibitions on alternative calling arrangements</li> <li>- Calling number transmitting service</li> <li>- Internet governance</li> <li>- New accounting rate methods</li> <li>- IP telephony</li> <li>- International mobile roaming</li> <li>- International mobile satellite service</li> <li>- Universal service</li> <li>- User of international networks <i>Source Annex 3 of the Report of CWG on ITR submitted to Council 2005</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Option 6 ADD6:</b></p> <p>In reviewing this document, it was felt appropriate to consider the extensive works which have been done in this regard during the period between Plenipotentiary 2002 and plenipotentiary 2006. In this connection, it is worth to mention that further to Resolution 121, PP 02 Marrakesh, 2002, the Council Working on ITR established under this Resolution submitted a Report to the Council 2005 with three Attachments /Annexes. Annex three of that Report is relevant to the activities of the CWG-WCIT-12. This Administration proposed that the CWG –WCIT-12 carefully examine that document and include the relevant part of that document in the compilation of the proposal under study due to the fact that considerable amount of time and efforts of the membership and the secretariat have been devoted to carry out this task during three years of extensive activities between 2002 and 2005. <i>Source C 48 (Iran)</i></p> <p>Some Member States reserved their position until text is provided. <i>(Canada, Portugal and USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States supported the proposal in principle but reserved their position until text is provided. <i>(Algeria, Egypt and Russian Federation)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 7 ADD7:</b> new provision relating to International Internet Connectivity. <i>Source C 48 (Iran) and Côte d’Ivoire</i></p>	<p><b>Option 7 ADD7:</b></p> <p>Another important issue relating to International Internet Interconnectivity should also to be added to the list of topics to be studied .This issue was at the centre of highlights of PP-10. A brief summary of the matter is reproduced and attached for easy reference in Attachment 2 of <a href="#">C 48</a>. <i>Source C 48 (Iran)</i></p> <p>Some Member States reserved their position until text is provided. <i>(Canada, Portugal and USA)</i></p> <p>Some Member States supported the proposal in principle but reserved their position until text is provided. <i>(Algeria, Egypt and Russian Federation)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Article 10</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Final Provisions</b></p> <p><i>Source none</i></p>	
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b></p> <p>10.1 These Regulations, of which Appendices 1, 2 and 3 form integral parts, shall enter into force on 1 July 1990 at 0001 hours UTC. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 10.1 These <u>revised</u> Regulations, of which Appendices 1, 2 and 3 form integral parts, shall enter into force on <u>INSERT DATE AND TIME 1 July 1990 at 0001</u>hours UTC. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD2:</b> 10.1 These Regulations, <del>of which Appendices 1, 2 and 3 form integral parts,</del> shall enter into force on <u>INSERT DATE AND TIME 1 July 1990 at 0001</u>hours UTC. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD 1:</b></p> <p>This entire article is subject to legal review.</p> <p>This entire article is subject to legal review. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Need to align with CEPT proposals: SUP appendices. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>The Russian Federation supports maintaining the date and time in article 10, but does not support the addition of “revised”.</p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD 1:</b></p> <p>Need to align with CEPT proposals: SUP appendices. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal: the Appendices should not be deleted. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><i>Option 3 SUP 10.1 through 10.4 and MOD3:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Article 10</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>Entry into force and provisional application</u>Final Provisions</b></p> <p><u>These Regulations, which complement the provisions of the Constitution and Convention of the International Telecommunication Union, shall enter into force on 1 January 2015 and shall be applied as of that date pursuant to Article 54 of the Constitution.</u> <i>Source C 50 (UAE)</i></p>	<p><i>Option 3 SUP and MOD3:</i></p> <p>The ITRs were agreed in 1988. Subsequent to that, provisions were added to the Constitution regarding the entry into force of revisions of the Administrative Regulations and regarding notifications of consent to be bound by such revisions. Those provisions were added to Article 54 of the Constitution in 1998.</p> <p>Consequently, it would appear that paragraphs 3 and 4 of Article 10 may no longer be needed. It may be more appropriate to align the final provisions of the ITRs with Article 59 of the Radio Regulations (Entry into force and provisional application of the Radio Regulations).</p> <p>The practice for the Radio Regulation is that they enter into force two years after they are adopted, and the ITRs themselves came into force two years after they were adopted.</p> <p>Article 54 of the Constitution contains provisions regarding reservations, so it does not appear necessary to include such provisions in the ITRs: a reference to Article 54 should be sufficient.</p> <p>Similarly, Article 54 of the Constitution specifies that the Secretary General shall inform Member States, so it does not seem necessary to include such a provision in the ITRs.</p> <p><i>Source C 50 (UAE)</i></p> <p>Some Member States stated that, if the ITRs are self-contained, then they should be self-contained everywhere; the reference to Art. 54 CS is not consistent with that principle. <i>(Iran and Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States reserved their position. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>Some Member States reserved their position regarding the exact date of entry into force. <i>(Iran)</i></p>
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> 10.2 On the date specified in No.61 (10.1), the Telegraph Regulations (Geneva, 1973) and the Telecommunication Regulations (Geneva, 1973) shall be replaced by these Telecommunication Regulations (Melbourne, 1988) pursuant to the International Telecommunication Convention. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 SUP:</i> 10.2. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 SUP:</i> This entire article is subject to legal review. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>



Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 10.3 If a Member makes reservations with regard to the application of one or more of the provisions of these Regulations, other Members and their administrations* shall be free to disregard the said provision or provisions in their relations with the Member which has made such reservations and its administrations. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> 10.3 Align French and English translations, which are at present inconsistent. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD:</b> 10.3 If a <i>Member state</i> makes reservations with regard to the application of one or more of the provisions of these Regulations, other <i>Members states</i> and their <i>administrations or ROAs</i> operating agencies shall be free to disregard the said provision or provisions in their relations with the <i>Member State</i> which has made such reservations and its <i>administrations or ROAs</i> operating agencies. (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> This entire article is subject to legal review. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i> CEPT asks ITU secretariat to provide consistency between different texts. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i> It was clarified that the possible inconsistency is due to fact that the French text says “ne sont pas obligés d’observer” whereas the English says “shall be free to disregard”.</p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 10.4 Members of the Union shall inform the Secretary-General of their approval of the International Telecommunication Regulations adopted by the Conference. The Secretary-General shall inform members promptly of the receipt of such notifications of approval. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> 10.4 <i>Members states</i> of the Union shall inform the Secretary-General of their approval of the International Telecommunication Regulations adopted by the Conference. The Secretary-General shall inform <i>Members states</i> promptly of the receipt of such notifications of approval. (CEPT)</p>	<p>This entire article is subject to legal review. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>

---

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> The revision of the ITRs in the future may need to be done in a more flexible and timely manner. Text to be supplied. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>This entire article is subject to legal review. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>CEPT reserves its position until text is provided. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>It might be feasible to organize a short WCIT back-to-back with future Plenipotentiary Conferences, if partial revisions are required. <i>(Iran)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new 10.5 A total revision of these Regulations as a whole as well as substantive revisions of individual articles may only be undertaken by a World Conference on International Telecommunications. <i>Source C 24 (SG3RG-LAC)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>This entire article is subject to legal review. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Under review. Proposal to be clarified. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal: only the WCIT should revise the ITRs. <i>(Iran)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new 10.6 Any plenipotentiary conference shall have the power to make editorial changes to individual articles of these Regulations in order to maintain consistency with the Constitution, Convention, Resolutions of the World Telecommunication Standardization Assembly, and/or ITU-T Recommendations. <i>Source C 24 (SG3RG-LAC)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>This entire article is subject to legal review. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Under review. Proposal to be clarified. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal: only the WCIT should revise the ITRs and the WCIT is subordinate to the Plenipotentiary, so it cannot instruct the Plenipotentiary. <i>(Iran)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new 10.7 The plenipotentiary conference shall itself determine whether particular changes to individual articles are editorial. <i>Source C 24 (SG3RG-LAC)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>This entire article is subject to legal review. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Under review. Proposal to be clarified. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal: only the WCIT should revise the ITRs. <i>(Iran)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> new 10.8 Plenipotentiary decisions regarding changes to these Regulations shall be taken in accordance with the process for amending the Constitution. <i>Source C 24 (SG3RG-LAC)</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i></p> <p>his entire article is subject to legal review. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p>Under review. Proposal to be clarified. <i>Source C 54 (Portugal)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal: only the WCIT should revise the ITRs. <i>(Iran)</i></p>
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the delegates of the Members of the International Telecommunication Union named below have, on behalf of their respective competent authorities, signed one copy of the present Final Acts in the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish languages. This copy shall remain in the archives of the Union. The Secretary-General shall forward one certified copy to each Member of the International Telecommunication Union. Done at Melbourne, 9 December 1988. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 MOD:</i> ... Done at <u>INSERT PLACE AND DATE Melbourne, 9 December 1988</u>. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 MOD:</i> This entire article is subject to legal review. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">APPENDIX 1</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>General Provisions Concerning Accounting</b></p> <p><i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> Appendix 1. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> Replace Appendices 1, 2 and 3 of ITRs with provisions that confer the same legal status as the ITRs on the ITU D-series Recommendations that have updated the content of the replaced provisions. <i>Source C 48 (Iran)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 SUP:</b> Appendix 1. <i>Source C 16 (SG3RG-AFR), C 25 (SG3RG-LAC), C 27 (SG3RG-AO), C 28 (USA) and C 34 (Global Voice Group), C 35 (CEPT)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> The General Provisions Concerning Accounting are integrated by indirect reference into large numbers of agreements, and are used by the carriers during their discussions and negotiations. It makes sense to maintain Appendix 1 and to consider it taking into account/in accordance with relevant D-series Recommendations of ITU-T. Specific revisions are presented below. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD 2:</b></p> <p>The degree to which we should go into details is yet to be discussed. <i>(Iran)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal, see comments above at 1.4. <i>(USA)</i></p> <p>The Russian Federation reserves its right to comment on this proposal <i>(Russian Federation)</i>.</p> <p><b>Option 3 SUP:</b></p> <p>The vast majority of international traffic is exchanged based on commercial arrangements between ROAs. Accounting rates reflect only a small percentage of the exchanged traffic. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>Obsolete provision. <i>Source C 34 (Global Voice Group)</i></p> <p>It is inappropriate for Member States in an international treaty to make commitments which dictate the detail of how private operators conduct their commercial activities with operators in other countries in the current liberalised and competitive international telecommunications market. However, this does not prevent other Member States imposing such rules on a national basis if they so choose. CEPT recognises that Art. 37 and 38 of the CV anticipate that the 'Administrative Regulations' will contain certain provisions relating to accounting and the monetary unit to be used. However, the ITU basic Instruments themselves are due to be reviewed shortly and in CEPT's view the existing Articles in the Convention do not of themselves justify the continuance of Article 6 and Appendices 1&amp;2 of the ITRs, all of which should be deleted. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal <i>(Côte d'Ivoire, Russian Federation)</i></p>

**Option 0 NOC:**

1. Accounting rates

1.1 For each applicable service in a given relation, administrations\* shall by mutual agreement establish and revise accounting rates to be applied between them, taking into account the Recommendations of the CCITT and trends in the cost of providing the specific telecommunication service, and shall divide such rates into terminal shares payable to the administrations\* of terminal countries, and where appropriate, into transit shares payable to the administrations\* of transit countries. *Source none*

**Option 1 MOD:** 1.1 ... , taking into account the Recommendations of the ~~CEPT~~ ITU-T and trends in the cost ... *Source C 55 (Russian Federation) and TD 21 Rev.1*

**Option 2 SUP:** 1.1. *Source C 45 (USA)*

**Option 3 MOD:** 1.1 For each applicable service in a given relation, ~~administrations or ROAs~~ operating agencies shall by mutual agreement establish and revise accounting rates to be applied between them, taking into account the Recommendations of the CCITT and trends in the cost of providing the specific telecommunication service, and shall divide such rates into terminal shares payable to the ~~administrations or ROAs~~ operating agencies of terminal countries, and where appropriate, into transit shares payable to the ~~administrations or ROAs~~ operating agencies of transit countries. (CEPT)

**Option 1 MOD:**

Some participants stated that it was not appropriate to include material at this level of detail in the ITRs, it should therefore be included in ITU-T Recommendations. *Source TD 21 Rev.1.*

Editorial update. Still relevant. *Source C 55 (Russian Federation)*

Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. *(Russian Federation)*

Some Member States stated that references to ITU-T Recommendations should be more specific or at least include “relevant” and/or “latest”. *(Iran)*

**Option 2 SUP:** Some Member Stated did not support this proposal *(Russian Federation)*.

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 1.2 Alternatively, in traffic relations where CCITT cost studies can be used as a basis, the accounting rate may be determined in accordance with the following method:</p> <p>a) administrations* shall establish and revise their terminal and transit shares taking into account the Recommendations of the CCITT;</p> <p>b) the accounting rate shall be the sum of the terminal shares and any transit shares. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> 1.2 Alternatively, in traffic relations where <del>CCITT</del> <b>ITU-T</b> cost studies can be used as a basis, the accounting rate may be determined in accordance with the following method:</p> <p>a) administrations* shall establish and revise their terminal and transit shares taking into account the Recommendations of the <del>CCITT</del> <b>ITU-T</b>; ... <i>Source C55 (Russian Federation) and TD 21Rev.1</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b> 1.2. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD:</b> 1.2 Alternatively, in traffic relations where CCITT cost studies can be used as a basis, the accounting rate may be determined in accordance with the following method:</p> <p>a) <del>administrations or ROAs</del> <b>Operating agencies</b> shall establish and revise their terminal and transit shares taking into account the Recommendations of the CCITT;... (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> Editorial update. Still relevant. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i> Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i> Some Member States stated that references to ITU-T Recommendations should be more specific or at least include “relevant” and/or “latest”. <i>(Iran)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal <i>(Russian Federation)</i>.</p>

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)  
CWG-WCIT12/TD-43E

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 1.3 When one or more administrations* acquire, either by flat rate remuneration or other arrangements, the right to utilize a part of the circuit and/or installations of another administration*, the former have the right to establish their share as mentioned in 1.1 and 1.2 above, for this part of the relation. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> 1.3. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD:</b> 1.3 When one or more <del>administrations of ROA operating agency</del> acquire, either by flat rate remuneration or other arrangements, the right to utilize a part of the circuit and/or installations of another <del>administration or ROA operating agency</del>, the former have the right to establish their share as mentioned in 1.1 and 1.2 above, for this part of the relation. (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> No change. Still relevant. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 1.4 In cases where one or more routes have been established by agreement between administrations* and where traffic is diverted unilaterally by the administration* of origin to a route which has not been agreed with the administration* of destination, the terminal shares payable to the administration* of destination shall be the same as would have been due to it had the traffic been routed over the agreed primary route and the transit costs are borne by the administration* of origin, unless the administration* of destination is prepared to agree to a different share. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> 1.4. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD:</b> 1.4 In cases where one or more routes have been established by agreement between <del>administrations or ROAs</del> operating agencies and where traffic is diverted unilaterally by the <del>administration or recognized private operating agency(ies)</del> operating agency of origin to a route which has not been agreed with the <del>administration or recognized private operating agency(ies)</del> operating agency of destination, the terminal shares payable to the <del>administration or recognized private operating agency(ies)</del> operating agency of destination shall be the same as would have been due to it had the traffic been routed over the agreed primary route and the transit costs are borne by the <del>administration or recognized private operating agency(ies)</del> operating agency of origin, unless the <del>administration or recognized private operating agency(ies)</del> operating agency of destination is prepared to agree to a different share. (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> No change. Still relevant. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i> Some Member States supporting retaining this provision but reserved their right to propose revisions. <i>(Egypt)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal <i>(Russian Federation)</i>.</p>



Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 1.5 In cases where the traffic is routed via a transit point without authorization and/or agreement to the transit share, the transit administration* has the right to set the level of the transit share to be included in the international accounts. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> 1.5. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD:</b> 1.5 In cases where the traffic is routed via a transit point without authorization and/or agreement to the transit share, the transit <del>administration or recognized private operating agency(ies)</del> operating agency has the right to set the level of the transit share to be included in the international accounts. (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> No change. Still relevant. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 1.6 Where an administration* has a duty or fiscal tax levied on its accounting rate shares or other remunerations, it shall not in turn impose any such duty or fiscal tax on other administrations*. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> 1.6. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD:</b> 1.6 Where an <del>administration or recognized private operating agency(ies)</del> operating agency has a duty or fiscal tax levied on its accounting rate shares or other remunerations, it shall not in turn impose any such duty or fiscal tax on other <del>administrations or recognized private operating agency(ies)</del> operating agencies. (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> No change. Still relevant. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>

---

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)  
CWG-WCIT12/TD-43E

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 2. Establishment of accounts</p> <p>2.1 Unless otherwise agreed, the administrations* responsible for collecting the charges shall establish a monthly account showing all the amounts due and send it to the administrations* concerned.. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> 2.1. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD:</b> 2.1 Unless otherwise agreed, the <del>administrations or recognized private operating agency(ies)</del> operating agency responsible for collecting the charges shall establish a monthly account showing all the amounts due and send it to the <del>administrations or recognized private operating agency(ies)</del> operating agencies concerned. (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> No change. Still relevant. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 2.2 The accounts shall be sent as promptly as possible and, except in cases of force majeure, before the end of the third month following that to which they relate. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 2.2 The accounts shall be sent <u>[taking into account/in accordance with] relevant ITU-T Recommendations as promptly as possible and, except in cases of force majeure, before the end of the third month following that to which they relate.</u> <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 2.2 The accounts shall be sent <u>in accordance with relevant ITU-T Recommendations</u> as promptly as possible and, except in cases of force majeure, <u>before the end of the 50 days period</u> <del>third month following that</del> the month to which they relate. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 SUP:</b> 2.2. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b></p> <p>In discussing this provision, it was felt that the time period specified in the ITRs may not reflect current practice, in particular in application of Article 9. Therefore, the time periods may need to be reduced accordingly as appropriate. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p>Some participants support shortening the time periods in 2.2, ranging from 5 to 20 days following the month to which they relate, as the case may be. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p>Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>Some Member States provided their own version of this proposal, see below <i>(Russian Federation)</i>.</p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b></p> <p>The time period specified in this paragraph may not reflect current practice, in particular in application of Article 9.</p> <p>According to D.195 Recommendation of ITU-T “Time-scale for settlement of accounts for international telecommunication services” monthly accounts for traffic on direct circuits is sent within 50 days. If parties bilaterally agree, this period can be reduced, e.g. to 30 days. At the same time taking into account that Appendix 1 of ITRs prevails over ITU-T Recommendation, it is proposed to fix a reasonable time-scale in this paragraph. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal <i>(Russian Federation)</i>.</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 2.3 In principle an account shall be considered as accepted without the need for specific notification of acceptance to the administration* which sent it. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> 2.3. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD:</b> 2.3 In principle an account shall be considered as accepted without the need for specific notification of acceptance to the <del>administration or recognized private operating agency(ies)</del> operating agency which sent it. (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> No change. Still relevant. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 2.4 However, any administration* has the right to question the contents of an account for a period of two calendar months after the receipt of the account, but only to the extent necessary to bring any differences within mutually agreed limits. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 2.4 However, any administration* has the right to question the contents of an account <u>[taking into account/in accordance with] relevant ITU-T Recommendations for a period of two calendar months after the receipt of the account, but only to the extent necessary to bring any difference within mutually agreed limits.</u> <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 2.4 However, any administration* has the right to question the contents of an account <u>in accordance with relevant ITU-T Recommendations but before the end of the 50 days period for a period of two calendar months</u> after the receipt of the account, but only to the extent necessary to bring any differences within mutually agreed limits. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 SUP:</b> 2.4. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 4 MOD4:</b> 2.4 However, any <u>administration or recognized private operating agency(ies) operating agency</u> has the right to question the contents of an account for a period of two calendar months after the receipt of the account, but only to the extent necessary to bring any differences within mutually agreed limits. (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b></p> <p>In discussing this provision, it was felt that the time period specified in the ITRs may not reflect current practice, in particular in application of Article 9. Therefore, the time periods may need to be reduced accordingly as appropriate. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i> Some participants support shortening the time periods in 2.4, to 15 days after the receipt of the account. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p>Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>Some Member States provided their own version of this proposal, see below <i>(Russian Federation)</i>.</p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b></p> <p>The time period specified in this paragraph may not reflect current practice, in particular in application of Article 9. According to D.195 Recommendation of ITU-T “Time-scale for settlement of accounts for international telecommunication services” monthly accounts for traffic on direct circuits is sent within 50 days. If parties bilaterally agree, this period can be reduced, e.g. to 30 days. At the same time taking into account that Appendix 1 of ITRs prevails over ITU-T Recommendation, it is proposed to fix a reasonable time-scale in this paragraph.</p> <p><i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>Some Member States stated that specific time periods should be shown in square brackets. <i>(Iran)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal <i>(Russian Federation)</i>.</p>

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)  
CWG-WCIT12/TD-43E

---

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)

CWG-WCIT12/TD-43E

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 2.5 In relations where there are no special agreements, a quarterly settlement statement showing the balances of the monthly accounts for the period to which it relates shall be prepared as soon as possible by the creditor administration* and shall be sent in duplicate to the debtor administration*, which, after verification, shall return one of the copies endorsed with its acceptance. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 2.5 In relations where there are no special agreements, <u>settlement statements showing the balances of the monthly accounts for the period to which they relate shall be sent [taking into account/in accordance with] relevant ITU-T Recommendations a quarterly settlement statement showing the balances of the monthly accounts for the period to which it relates shall be prepared as soon as possible by the creditor administration* and shall be sent in duplicate to the debtor administration*, which, after verification, shall return one of the copies endorsed with its acceptance.</u> <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 2.5 ... and shall be sent <u>in accordance with the provision of 2.2 above</u> in duplicate ... <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 SUP:</b> 2.5. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 4 MOD4:</b> 2.5 In relations where there are no special agreements, a quarterly settlement statement showing the balances of the monthly accounts for the period to which it relates shall be prepared as soon as possible by the creditor <u>administration or recognized private operating agency(ies) operating agency</u> and shall be sent in duplicate to the debtor <u>administration or recognized private operating agency(ies) operating agency</u>, which, after verification, shall return one of the copies endorsed with its acceptance. (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b></p> <p>In discussing this provision, it was felt that the term “as soon as possible” specified in the ITRs may not reflect current practice. Therefore, time periods may need to be specified accordingly as appropriate. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p>Some participants support replacing “as soon as possible” in 2.5 with a range of 5 or 30 days after the end of the month. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p>Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>Some Member States provided their own version of this proposal, see below <i>(Russian Federation).</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b></p> <p>The time period specified in this paragraph may not reflect current practice, in particular in application of Article 9.</p> <p>The terms and conditions of this paragraph could be a subject of a commercial agreement. However taking into account modification of the provision of 2.2 above it is proposed to fix a reasonable time-scale in this paragraph.</p> <p><i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal <i>(Russian Federation).</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 2.6 In indirect relations where a transit administration* acts as an accounting intermediary between two terminal points, it shall include accounting data for transit traffic in the relevant outgoing traffic account to administrations* beyond it in the routing sequence as soon as possible after receiving that data from the originating administration*. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> 2... in the routing sequence <del>as soon as possible</del> <b>no later than 30 days</b> after receiving that data from the originating administration*. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b> 2.6. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD:</b> 2.6 In indirect relations where a transit <del>administration or recognized private operating agency(ies)</del> <b>operating agency</b> acts as an accounting intermediary between two terminal points, it shall include accounting data for transit traffic in the relevant outgoing traffic account to <del>administrations or recognized private operating agency(ies)</del> <b>operating agencies</b> beyond it in the routing sequence as soon as possible after receiving that data from the originating <del>administration or recognized private operating agency(ies)</del> <b>operating agency.</b> (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b></p> <p>In discussing this provision, it was felt that “as soon as possible” specified in the ITRs may not reflect current practice, in particular in application of Article 9. Therefore, time periods may need to be specified accordingly as appropriate. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p>Some participants support replacing “as soon as possible” in 2.6 with a range of 5 or 30 days after the end of the month. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p>The time period specified in this paragraph may not reflect current practice, in particular in application of Article 9. The terms and conditions of this paragraph could be a subject of a commercial agreement. However it is believed useful to fix a reasonable time-scale in this paragraph. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>Some Member States stated that specific time periods should be shown in square brackets. (<i>Iran</i>)</p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>

---

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)



Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b></p> <p>3. Settlement of balances of accounts</p> <p>3.1 Choice of the currency of payment</p> <p>3.1.1 The payment of balances of international telecommunication accounts shall be made in the currency selected by the creditor after consultation with the debtor. In the event of disagreement, the choice of the creditor shall prevail in all cases subject to the provisions in 3.1.2 below. If the creditor does not specify a currency, the choice shall rest with the debtor. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> 3.1.1. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> No change. Still relevant. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 3.1.2 If a creditor selects a currency with a value fixed unilaterally or a currency the equivalent value of which is to be determined by its relationship to a currency with a value also fixed unilaterally, the use of the selected currency must be acceptable to the debtor.. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> 3.1.2. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> No change. Still relevant. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b></p> <p>3.2 Determination of the amount of payment</p> <p>3.2.1 The amount of the payment in the selected currency, as determined below, shall be equivalent in value to the balance of the account. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> 3.2.1. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> No change. Still relevant. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 3.2.2 If the balance of the account is expressed in the monetary unit of the IMF, the amount of the selected currency shall be determined by the relationship in effect on the day before payment, or by the latest relationship published by the IMF, between the monetary unit of the IMF and the selected currency.. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> 3.2.2. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> No change. Still relevant. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 3.2.3 However, if the relationship of the monetary unit of the IMF to the selected currency has not been published, the amount of the balance of account shall, at a first stage, be converted into a currency for which a relationship has been published by the IMF, using the relationship in effect on the day before payment or the latest published relationship. The amount thus obtained shall, at a second stage, be converted into the equivalent value of the selected currency, using the closing rate in effect on the day prior to payment or the most recent rate quoted on the official or generally accepted foreign exchange market of the main financial centre of the debtor country.. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> 3.2.3. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> No change. Still relevant. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 3.2.4 If the balance of the account is expressed in gold francs, the amount shall, in the absence of special arrangements, be converted into the monetary unit of the IMF in accordance with the provisions of section 6.3 of the Regulations. The amount of payment shall then be determined in compliance with the provisions of 3.2.2. above. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> 3.2.4. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> Delete since no longer relevant in light of change to 6.3.1. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>=&gt; SUP agreed.</b></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 3.2.5 If, in accordance with a special arrangement, the balance of the account is expressed neither in the monetary unit of the IMF nor in gold francs, the payment shall also be the subject of this special arrangement and:</p> <p>a) if the selected currency is the same as the currency of the balance of account, the amount of the selected currency shall be the amount of the balance of account;</p> <p>b) if the selected currency for payment is different from the currency in which the balance is expressed, the amount shall be determined by converting the balance of account to its equivalent value in the selected currency in accordance with the provisions of 3.2.3 above. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> 3.2.5 If, in accordance with a special arrangement, the balance of the account is <b>not</b> expressed <b>neither</b> in the monetary unit of the IMF <b>nor in gold francs</b>, the payment shall also be the subject of this special arrangement and:</p> <p>...</p> <p><i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> 3.2.5. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> Modify in light of change to 6.3.1. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b></p> <p>3.3 <i>Payment of balances</i></p> <p>3.3.1 Payment of balances of account shall be effected as promptly as possible, but in no case later than two calendar months after the day on which the settlement statement is despatched by the creditor administration<sup>*</sup>. Beyond this period, the creditor administration<sup>*</sup> may, subject to prior notification in the form of a final demand for payment, and unless otherwise agreed, charge interest at a rate of up to 6% per annum, reckoned from the day following the date of expiry of the said period. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> 3.3.1 Payment of balances of account shall be effected <del>[taking into account/in accordance with] relevant ITU-T Recommendations as promptly as possible, but in no case later than two calendar months after the day on which the settlement statement is despatched by the creditor administration<sup>*</sup>. Beyond this period, the creditor administration<sup>*</sup> may, subject to prior notification in the form of a final demand for payment, and unless otherwise agreed, charge interest at a rate of up to 6% per annum, reckoned from the day following the date of expiry of the said period.</del> <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> 3.3.1 Payment of balances of account shall be effected as promptly as possible, but in no case later than <u>50 days</u> <del>two calendar months</del> after the day .. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 SUP:</b> 3.3.1. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b></p> <p>In discussing this provision, it was felt that the time period specified in the ITRs may not reflect current practice, in particular in application of Article 9. Therefore, the time periods may need to be reduced accordingly as appropriate. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p>Some participants support shortening the time periods in 3.3.1 to a range of 5 or 30 days after the end of the month. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p>Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>Some Member States provided their own version of this proposal, sell below <i>(Russian Federation).</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b></p> <p>The time period specified in par. 3.3.1. doesn't reflect the current practice, in particular in application of Article 9. The terms and conditions of this paragraph could be a subject of a commercial agreement. However it is believed useful to fix a reasonable time-scale in this paragraph. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>Some Member States stated that specific time periods should be shown in square brackets. <i>(Iran)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal <i>(Russian Federation).</i></p>

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)  
CWG-WCIT12/TD-43E

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>3.3.1 - CONTINUED</b></p> <p><b>Option 4 MOD:</b> 3.3.1 Payment of balances of account shall be effected as promptly as possible, but in no case later than two calendar months after the day on which the settlement statement is despatched by the creditor <del>administration or recognized private operating agency(ies)</del> operating agency. Beyond this period, the creditor <del>administration or recognized private operating agency(ies)</del> operating agency may, subject to prior notification in the form of a final demand for payment, and unless otherwise agreed, charge interest at a rate of up to 6% per annum, reckoned from the day following the date of expiry of the said period. (CEPT)</p>	
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 3.3.2 The payment due on a settlement statement shall not be delayed pending settlement of a query on that account. Adjustments which are later agreed shall be included in a subsequent account.. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> 3.3.2. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> No change. Still relevant. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 3.3.3 On the date of payment, the debtor shall transmit the amount of the selected currency as computed above by a bank cheque, transfer or any other means acceptable to the debtor and the creditor. If the creditor expresses no preference, the choice shall fall to the debtor.. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> 3.3.3. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> No change. Still relevant. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 3.3.4 The payment charges imposed in the debtor country (taxes, clearing charges, commissions, etc.) shall be borne by the debtor. Any such charges imposed in the creditor country, including payment charges imposed by intermediate banks in third countries, shall be borne by the creditor.. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> 3.3.4. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> No change. Still relevant. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> no ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> new 3.3.5 Provided the periods of payment are observed, administrations* have a right by mutual agreement settle their balances of various kinds by offsetting:</p> <p>* credits and debits in their relations with other administrations*;</p> <p>* any other mutually agreed settlements, if appropriate.</p> <p>This rule also applies in case payments are made through specialized payment agencies in accordance with arrangements with administrations*. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b> Settlements by offsetting are widely used in the relations between recognized operating agencies. It is believed reasonable to include modified provisions regarding settlement of balances and any other mutually agreed settlements by offsetting to Paragraph 3.3. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 3.4 <i>Additional provisions</i></p> <p>3.4.1 Provided the periods of payment are observed, administrations* may by mutual agreement settle their balances of various kinds by offsetting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– credits and debits in their relations with other administrations*; and/or</li> <li>– debts arising from postal services, if appropriate. <i>Source none</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> 3.4.1 ...</p> <p>– <del>any other mutually agreed settlements, if appropriate debts arising from postal services, if appropriate.</del> <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b> 3.4.1. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD:</b> 3.4.1 Provided the periods of payment are observed, <del>administrations or recognized private operating agency(ies)</del> operating agencies may by mutual agreement settle their balances of various kinds by offsetting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– credits and debits in their relations with other <del>administrations or recognized private operating agency(ies)</del> operating agencies; and/or ... (CEPT)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> Some Member States reserved their right to propose revisions for the title “Additional provisions”. (<i>Iran, UAE</i>)</p> <p>Some Member States questioned the use of the term “if appropriate”. (<i>Iran</i>)</p> <p>Some Member States proposed that the term “if appropriate”, it could be replaced by “as appropriate”. (<i>UAE</i>)</p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b> Delete since no longer relevant in light of new 3.3.5. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p>

---

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)  
CWG-WCIT12/TD-43E

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 3.4.2 If, between the time the remittance (bank transfer, cheques, etc.) is effected and the time the creditor is in receipt of that remittance (account credited, cheque encashed, etc.), a variation occurs in the equivalent value of the selected currency calculated as indicated in paragraph 3.2, and if the difference resulting from such variations exceeds 5% of the amount due as calculated following such variations, the total difference shall be shared equally between debtor and creditor. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> 3.4.2. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> No change. Still relevant. However, change the number to 3.4.1 in light of deletion above. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 3.4.3 If there should be a radical change in the international monetary system which invalidates or makes inappropriate one or more of the foregoing paragraphs, administrations* are free to adopt, by mutual agreement, a different monetary basis and/or different procedures for the settlement of balances of accounts, pending a revision of the above provisions. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> 3.4.3. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD:</b> 3.4.3 If there should be a radical change in the international monetary system which invalidates or makes inappropriate one or more of the foregoing paragraphs, <del>administrations or recognized private operating agency(ies)</del> <b>operating agencies</b> are free to adopt, by mutual agreement, a different monetary basis and/or different procedures for the settlement of balances of accounts, pending a revision of the above provisions. Stations; the number of such names and addresses shall be limited taking into account the relevant CCITT Recommendations. (CEPT)</p>	<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> No change. Still relevant. However, change the number to 3.4.2 in light of deletion above. <i>Source C 55 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> Some Member Stated did not support this proposal (<i>Russian Federation</i>).</p>



Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">APPENDIX 2</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Additional Provisions Relating to Maritime Telecommunications</b></p> <p><i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1: Additional Provisions Relating to Maritime Telecommunications</b> <i>Source Iran</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> Review Appendices 1, 2 and 3 of ITRs taking into account/in accordance with relevant D-series Recommendations of ITU-T. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b> Replace Appendices 1, 2 and 3 of ITRs with provisions that confer the same legal status as the ITRs on the ITU D-series Recommendations that have updated the content of the replaced provisions. <i>Source C 48 (Iran)</i></p> <p><b>Option 4 SUP:</b> Appendix 2. <i>C 35 (CEPT)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b></p> <p>Some participants stated that it was not appropriate to include material at this level of detail in the ITRs, it should therefore be included in ITU-T Recommendations. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p>Review Appendices 1, 2 and 3 of ITRs taking into account/in accordance with relevant D-series Recommendations of ITU-T. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 MOD3:</b></p> <p>The degree to which we should go into details is yet to be discussed. <i>(Iran)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal, see comments above at 1.4. <i>(USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 4 SUP:</b></p> <p>It is inappropriate for Member States in an international treaty to make commitments which dictate the detail of how private operators conduct their commercial activities with operators in other countries in the current liberalised and competitive international telecommunications market. However, this does not prevent other Member States imposing such rules on a national basis if they so choose. CEPT recognises that Art. 37 and 38 of the CV anticipate that the 'Administrative Regulations' will contain certain provisions relating to accounting and the monetary unit to be used. However, the ITU basic Instruments themselves are due to be reviewed shortly and in CEPT's view the existing Articles in the Convention do not of themselves justify the continuance of Article 6 and Appendices 1&amp;2 of the ITRs, all of which should be deleted. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p> <p>In C 28 the United States proposed to SUP Appendix 2. We no longer propose this. However, we reserve our position as we are reviewing this Appendix in light of recent technological and administrative developments. <i>Source C 45 (USA) and Australia and Canada</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal: the provisions are used and are referenced in other instruments. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal <i>(Côte d'Ivoire)</i></p>

Possible revisions of 1988 Int’l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b></p> <p>1. <i>General</i></p> <p>The provisions contained in Article 6 and Appendix 1, taking into account the relevant CCITT Recommendations, shall also apply to maritime telecommunications in so far as the following provisions do not provide otherwise. <i>Source none</i></p>	
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b></p> <p>2. <i>Accounting authority</i></p> <p>2.1 Charges for maritime telecommunications in the maritime mobile service and the maritime mobile-satellite service shall in principle, and subject to national law and practice, be collected from the maritime mobile station licensee:</p> <p>a) by the administration that has issued the licence; or</p> <p>b) by a recognized private operating agency; or</p> <p>c) by any other entity or entities designated for this purpose by the administration referred to in a) above. <i>Source none</i></p>	
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b></p> <p>2.2 The administration or the recognized private operating agency or the designated entity or entities listed in paragraph 2.1 are referred to in this Appendix as the “accounting authority”. <i>Source none</i></p>	
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b></p> <p>2.3 References to administration* contained in Article 6 and Appendix 1 shall be read as “accounting authority” when applying the provisions of Article 6 and Appendix 1 to maritime telecommunications. <i>Source none</i></p>	

---

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)  
CWG-WCIT12/TD-43E

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 2.4 Members shall designate their accounting authority or authorities for the purposes of implementing this Appendix and notify their names, identification codes and addresses to the Secretary-General for inclusion in the List of Ship Stations; the number of such names and addresses shall be limited taking into account the relevant CCITT Recommendations. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> 2.4 ... taking into account the relevant <del>CEPT</del> <u>ITU-T</u> Recommendations. <i>Source TD 21Rev.1</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 3. <i>Establishment of accounts</i> 3.1 In principle, an account shall be considered as accepted without the need for specific notification of acceptance to the accounting authority that sent it. <i>Source none</i></p>	
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 3.2 However, any accounting authority has the right to question the contents of an account for a period of six calendar months after dispatch of the account. <i>Source none</i></p>	
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 4. <i>Settlement of balances of account</i> 4.1 All international maritime telecommunication accounts shall be paid by the accounting authority without delay and in any case within six calendar months after dispatch of the account, except where the settlement of accounts is undertaken in accordance with paragraph 4.3 below. <i>Source none</i></p>	

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 4.2 If international maritime telecommunication accounts remain unpaid after six calendar months, the administration that has licensed the mobile station shall, on request, take all possible steps, within the limits of applicable national law, to ensure settlement of the accounts from the licensee. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> 4.2 If international maritime telecommunication accounts remain unpaid after six calendar months, the <del>administration member state</del> that has licensed the mobile station shall, on request, take all possible steps, within the limits of applicable national law, to ensure settlement of the accounts from the licensee. (CEPT)</p>	
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 4.3 If the period between the date of dispatch and receipt exceeds one month, the receiving accounting authority should at once notify the originating accounting authority that queries and payments may be delayed. The delay shall, however, not exceed three calendar months in respect of payment, or five calendar months in respect of queries, both periods commencing from the date of receipt of the account. <i>Source none</i></p>	
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 4.4 The debtor accounting authority may refuse the settlement and adjustment of accounts presented more than eighteen calendar months after the date of the traffic to which the accounts relate. <i>Source none</i></p>	

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">APPENDIX 3</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Service and Privilege Telecommunications</b></p> <p><i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD1:</b> Review Appendices 1, 2 and 3 of ITRs taking into account/in accordance with relevant D-series Recommendations of ITU-T. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD2:</b> Replace Appendices 1, 2 and 3 of ITRs with provisions that confer the same legal status as the ITRs on the ITU D-series Recommendations that have updated the content of the replaced provisions. <i>Source C 48 (Iran)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 SUP:</b> Appendix 3. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD 1:</b></p> <p>Maintain most of the provisions of Appendix 3. <i>Source C 28 (USA)</i></p> <p>Some participants stated that it was not appropriate to include material at this level of detail in the ITRs, it should therefore be included ITU-T Recommendations. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 MOD 2:</b></p> <p>The degree to which we should go into details is yet to be discussed. <i>(Iran)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal, see comments above at 1.4. <i>(USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 3 SUP:</b></p> <p>Obsolete. <i>Source C 35 (CEPT)</i></p> <p>The concept of “privilege telecommunications” is no longer relevant. <i>(Iran)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal, the provisions may still be relevant, further study is required. <i>(Egypt, Russian Federation, UAE)</i></p> <p>Some Member States did not support this proposal <i>(Côte d’Ivoire)</i></p>
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b></p> <p>1. <i>Service telecommunications</i></p> <p>1.1 Administrations* may provide service telecommunications free of charge. <i>Source none</i></p>	

---

\* or recognized private operating agency(ies)  
CWG-WCIT12/TD-43E

Possible revisions of 1988 Int'l Telecom Regulations (ITRs)	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> 1.2 Administrations* may in principle forego inclusion of service telecommunications in international accounting, under the relevant provisions of the International Telecommunication Convention and the present Regulations, having due regard for the need for reciprocal arrangements. <i>Source none</i></p>	
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> <i>2. Privilege telecommunications</i> Administrations* may provide privilege telecommunications free of charge, and accordingly may forego the inclusion of such classes of telecommunication in international accounting, under the relevant provisions of the International Telecommunication Convention and the present Regulations. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> ... under the relevant provisions of the <del>International Telecommunication Convention</del> <u>Constitution and Convention</u> and the present Regulations. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1</i></p>	
<p><b>Option 0 NOC:</b> <i>3. Applicable provisions</i> The general operational, charging and accounting principles applicable to service and privilege telecommunications should take account of the relevant CCITT Recommendations. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> ... should take account of the relevant <del>CCITT ITU-T</del> Recommendations. <i>Source TD 21 Rev.1.</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> Some Member States proposed referring to ITU Recommendations. <i>(Russian Federation)</i></p>

WATTC-88 Resolutions, Recommendations, and Opinion	Possible revisions	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
		Some Member States proposed minimizing the number of Resolutions, etc. ( <i>Iran</i> )
<p><b>Resolution No. 1</b> Dissemination of Information Concerning International Telecommunication Services Available to the Public</p>	<p><i>Option 0 NOC</i> Source none</p> <p><i>Option 1 MOD:</i> text to be provided <i>Source C 8 and C9 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><i>Option 2 SUP:</i> Source TD 6 (ITR-EG)</p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b></p> <p><b>Revise</b> after establishing the final text of the ITRs. No longer relevant in its current form. <i>Source C 8 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Defer a decision</b> until completion of studies on the new text of the ITRs. Possible orientations could be found in the text of C9. <i>Source C9 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>The United States reserves its position until the text is provided. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b> The Resolution is out of date. Covered by no. 183 of the Constitution and 202 and 203 of the Convention. <i>Source TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i></p>
<p><b>Resolution No. 2</b> Cooperation of the Members of the Union in Implementing the International Telecommunication Regulations</p>	<p><i>Option 0 NOC</i> Source none</p> <p><i>Option 1 MOD:</i> MOD: text to be provided <i>Source C 8 and C9 (Russian Federation) and TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b></p> <p><b>Revise</b> after establishing the final text of the ITRs. Still relevant. <i>Source C 8 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Revise.</b> Develop towards promoting the idea of the need to align national regulations on the ITRs. <i>Source C9 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>Could still be relevant, and <b>could be retained</b>. Alternatively, it could be adopted by WTSA, WCIT or the plenipotentiary conference (as appropriate), and then updated as required by future assemblies or conferences. <i>Source TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i></p> <p>The United States reserves its position until the text is provided. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>

<b>WATTC-88 Resolutions, Recommendations, and Opinion</b>	<b>Possible revisions</b>	<b>Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting</b>
<p><b>Resolution No. 3</b> Apportionment of Revenues in Providing International Telecommunication Services</p>	<p><i>Option 0 NOC Source none</i> <i>Option 1 SUP: Source C 8 and C9 (Russian Federation) and TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> No longer relevant. <i>Source C 8 and C9 (Russian Federation) and TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i> The United States reserves its position until the text is provided. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>
<p><b>Resolution No. 4</b> The Changing Telecommunication Environment</p>	<p><i>Option 0 NOC Source none</i> <i>Option 1 SUP: Source C 8 and C9 (Russian Federation) and TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> No longer relevant. <i>Source C 8 and C9 (Russian Federation) and TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i> The United States reserves its position until the text is provided. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>
<p><b>Resolution No. 5</b> CCITT and World-Wide Telecommunications Standardization</p>	<p><i>Option 0 NOC Source none</i> <i>Option 1 SUP: Source C 8 and C9 (Russian Federation) and TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> No longer relevant. <i>Source C 8 and C9 (Russian Federation) and TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i></p>
<p><b>Resolution No. 6</b> Continued Availability of Traditional Services</p>	<p><i>Option 0 NOC Source none</i> <i>Option 1 MOD: text to be provided Source C 8 and C9 (Russian Federation) and TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b> <b>Revise</b> after establishing the final text of the ITRs. Still relevant. <i>Source C 8 (Russian Federation)</i> <b>Defer a decision</b> until completion of studies on ITRs Article 7. May depend on Article 7. <i>Source C9 (Russian Federation)</i> <b>Reconsider</b> in light of text of revised ITRs. Could still be relevant, but it could be adopted by WTSA, and then updated as required by future WTSAs. <i>Source TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i> The United States reserves its position until the text is provided. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>



WATTC-88 Resolutions, Recommendations, and Opinion	Possible revisions	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Resolution No. 7</b> Dissemination of Operational and Service Information Through the General Secretariat</p>	<p><i>Option 0 NOC Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 MOD: text to be provided Source C 9 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><i>Option 2 SUP: Source C 8 and TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b></p> <p><b>Update</b> to reflect current situation and/or merge with Resolution 1. <i>Source C 9 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>The United States reserves its position until the text is provided. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b> No longer relevant. <i>Source C 8 and TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i></p>
<p><b>Resolution No. 8</b> Instructions of International Telecommunication Services</p>	<p><i>Option 0 NOC Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 MOD: text to be provided Source C 8 and C9 (Russian Federation) and TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b></p> <p><b>Revise</b> after establishing the final text of the ITRs. Still relevant. <i>Source C 8 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>Defer a decision until completion of studies on the new text of the ITRs.. <i>Source C9 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Reconsider</b> in light of text of revised ITRs. Could still be relevant, but it could be adopted by WTSA, and then updated as required by future WTSAs. <i>Source TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i></p> <p>The United States reserves its position until the text is provided. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>

WATTC-88 Resolutions, Recommendations, and Opinion	Possible revisions	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><b>Recommendation No. 1</b> Application to the Radio Regulations of the Provisions of the International Telecommunication Regulations</p>	<p><i>Option 0 NOC Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 MOD: text to be provided Source C 8 and C9 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><i>Option 2 SUP: Source TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b></p> <p><b>Revise</b> after establishing the final text of the ITRs. No longer relevant in its current form. <i>Source C 8 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Defer a decision</b> until completion of studies on the new text of the ITRs.. <i>Source C9 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>The United States reserves its position until the text is provided. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p> <p><b>Option 2 SUP:</b></p> <p><b>Consider abrogating.</b> Not relevant because the actions called for have been carried out by the Administrative Council and the World Administrative Radio Conference. <i>Source TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i></p>
<p><b>Recommendation No. 2</b> Changes to Definitions Which Also Appear in Annex 2 to the Nairobi Convention</p>	<p><i>Option 0 NOC Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 SUP: Source C 8 and C9 (Russian Federation) and TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> No longer relevant. <i>Source C 8 and C9 (Russian Federation) and TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i></p>
<p><b>Recommendation No. 3</b> Expeditious Exchange of Accounts and Settlement Statements</p>	<p><i>Option 0 NOC Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 SUP: Source C 8 and C9 (Russian Federation) and TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 SUP:</b> No longer relevant. <i>Source C 8 and C9 (Russian Federation) and TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i></p>
<p><b>Opinion No. 1</b> Special Telecommunication Arrangements</p>	<p><i>Option 0 NOC Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 MOD: text to be supplied Source C 8 and C9 (Russian Federation) ) and TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 MOD:</b></p> <p><b>Revise</b> after approval of the final text of the ITRs. Still relevant. <i>Source C 8 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p><b>Defer a decision</b> until completion of studies on the new text of the ITRs.. <i>Source C9 (Russian Federation)</i></p> <p>The Opinion <b>could still be relevant</b>, but it could be adopted by WTSA, and then updated as required by future WTSAs. <i>Source TD 6 (ITR-EG)</i></p> <p>The United States took a reservation on this opinion. <i>Source C 45 (USA)</i></p>



Proposed new WCIT-12 Resolutions	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> No ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> New Resolution A</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Special measures for landlocked developing countries (LLDCs) for access the international optical fibre network</b></p> <p>The World Conference on International Telecommunications (Dubai, 2012), <i>considering</i></p> <p>resolution 65/172 of 20 December 2010 of the United Nations General Assembly on specific actions related to the particular needs and problems of landlocked developing countries;</p> <p>Resolution 30 (Rev. Guadalajara, 2010) of the Plenipotentiary Conference on special measures for the least developed countries, small island developing states, landlocked developing countries and countries with economies in transition, <i>considering further</i></p> <p>the Millennium Declaration and 2005 World Summit Outcome;</p> <p>the outcome of the Geneva (2003) and Tunis (2005) phases of the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS);</p> <p>the Almaty Declaration and Almaty Programme of Action Addressing the Special Needs of Landlocked Developing Countries within a New Global Framework for Transit Transport Cooperation for Landlocked and Transit Developing Countries,</p>	<p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i></p> <p>Measures are needed so that landlocked developing countries can achieve the objective of the Millennium Development Goals and of the WSIS, taking account of the difficulties and additional costs involved in order to access the international optical fibre network. <i>Source C 46 (Paraguay) and Costa Rica, Cuba, Egypt and Uruguay</i></p> <p>Some Member States expressed interest to this proposal and readiness to further consider it. <i>(Mexico, USA)</i></p>

<b>Proposed new WCIT-12 Resolutions</b>	<b>Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting</b>
<p>ADD Res A – CONTINUED</p> <p><i>recalling</i></p> <p>the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), which is an initiative intended to boost economic cooperation and development at regional level, given that many landlocked and transit developing countries are in Africa,</p> <p><i>reaffirming</i></p> <p>the right of access of landlocked countries to the sea and freedom of transit through the territory of transit countries by all means of transport, in accordance with applicable rules of international law,</p> <p><i>reaffirming further</i></p> <p>that transit countries, in the exercise of their full sovereignty over their territory, have the right to take all measures necessary to ensure that the rights and facilities provided for landlocked countries in no way infringe upon their legitimate interests,</p> <p><i>recognizing</i></p> <p>the importance of telecommunications and new information and communication technologies (ICT) to the development of LLDCs,</p> <p><i>noting</i></p> <p>that access to the international optical fibre network for LLDCs and the laying of optical fibre across transit countries are not indicated in the infrastructure development and maintenance priorities in the Almaty Programme of Action,</p> <p><i>concerned</i></p> <p>that this challenge confronting LLDCs continues to pose a threat to the development agenda of these countries,</p> <p><i>aware</i></p> <p>that optical fibre provides a cost-effective means of transport for telecommunications;</p> <p>that access to the international optical fibre network in landlocked countries will boost their integral development and their potential to create their own knowledge society,</p>	

<b>Proposed new WCIT-12 Resolutions</b>	<b>Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting</b>
<p>ADD Res A – CONTINUED</p> <p><i>aware further</i></p> <p>that the planning and laying of international optical fibre require close cooperation between landlocked and transit countries;</p> <p>that the investment of funds needed for such laying requires the investment of private sector capital,</p> <p><i>instructs the Secretary-General and the Director of the Telecommunication Development Bureau</i></p> <p>1 to ensure that studies on the telecommunication/ICT services situation in LLDCs stress the importance of access to the international optical fibre network;</p> <p>2 to propose to the ITU Council concrete measures with the aim of making real progress and providing effective assistance to LLDCs in respect to <i>instructs 1</i>;</p> <p>3 to provide the necessary administrative and operational structure to develop a strategic plan with practical criteria and guidelines to guide and promote regional, subregional, multilateral or bilateral projects to allow LLDCs greater access to the international optical fibre network,</p> <p><i>requests the Secretary-General</i></p> <p>to transmit the text of the present resolution to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, with a view to bringing it to the attention of the United Nations High Representative for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), Landlocked Developing Countries (LLDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDSs),</p> <p><i>instructs the Council</i></p> <p>to take appropriate measures to ensure that the Union continues to collaborate actively in the development of telecommunication/ICT services in LLDCs,</p> <p><i>encourages landlocked developing countries</i></p> <p>to continue to give high priority to those telecommunication/ICT activities and projects that promote integral socio-economic development, adopting technical cooperation activities financed from bilateral and multilateral sources, as this will result in benefits for the general public,</p>	

<b>Proposed new WCIT-12 Resolutions</b>	<b>Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting</b>
<p>ADD Res A – CONTINUED</p> <p><i>urges Member States</i></p> <p>1 to cooperate with landlocked countries by promoting regional, subregional, multilateral or bilateral telecommunication infrastructure integration projects providing LLDCs with greater access to the international optical fibre network;</p> <p>2 to include and/or maintain, in south-south cooperation programmes and triangular cooperation programmes involving donor participation, and in cooperation programmes between subregional and regional organizations, actions complementing the Almaty Programme of Action in order to assist transit and landlocked developing countries in their realization of these telecommunication infrastructure integration projects,</p> <p><i>invites Member States, Sector Members and Associates</i></p> <p>to continue to support the work of ITU-D in the studies on the telecommunication/ICT services situation in the LDCs, LLDCs, SIDSs and countries with economies in transition identified as such by the United Nations and requiring special measures for the development of telecommunications/ICTs.</p> <p><i>Source C 46 (Paraguay)</i></p>	

Proposed new WCIT-12 Resolutions	Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> No ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> New Resolution B</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Treatment of the Provisions of the Constitution and Convention related to the ITRs</b></p> <p>The World Conference on International Telecommunications (Dubai, 2012),</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>considering</i></p> <p>a) Resolution 163 (Guadalajara, 2010), Establishment of a Council working group on a stable ITU Constitution;</p> <p>b) that, pursuant to decisions taken at the conference, certain provisions of the International Telecommunications Regulations are identical or related to certain provisions of the Constitution or Convention,</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>resolves to invite the plenipotentiary conference</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">to consider whether the following provisions of the Constitution and Convention should suppressed from those instruments:</p> <p>* In the <b>CS</b>: 179 through 193, 1004, 1007, 1008 and 1011 through 1017;</p> <p>* In the <b>CV</b>: 496 through 506, 1003 and 1006.</p> <p><i>Source C 52 (UAE)</i></p>	<p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i></p> <p>It has been pointed out that some provisions of the current ITRs are similar to, or related to, provisions of the Constitution or Convention. Some Member States take the view that this situation is perfectly acceptable, other Member States take the view that it would be preferable to avoid overlap.</p> <p>In particular, it has been proposed that such provisions be deleted from the ITRs so that they would be found only in the Constitution or Convention.</p> <p>However, it has also been proposed that provisions that are currently found in the Constitution and Convention should added to the ITRs in order to ensure that the ITRs are a self-contained document. If that is done, then it might be appropriate to consider whether to delete such provisions from the Constitution and Convention.</p> <p>If the WCIT agreed such an approach, then WCIT could bring it to the attention of the 2014 Plenipotentiary Conference through a WCIT Resolution. That Resolution could invite the Plenipotentiary Conference to consider the matter in light of the work of CWG-STB-CS and the revised ITRs adopted by WTCT-12.</p> <p><i>Source C 52 (UAE)</i></p>



<b>Proposed new WCIT-12 Resolutions</b>	<b>Reasons from the source, comments from contributions and remarks from the meeting</b>
<p><i>Option 0 NOC:</i> No ADD. <i>Source none</i></p> <p><i>Option 1 ADD:</i> New Resolution C on Promoting compliance with ITRs. Text to be defined <i>Source C 39 (Malaysia)</i></p>	<p><b>Option 1 ADD:</b></p> <p>The need to promote compliance with ITRs will be given emphasis and appropriate assistances will be provided to strengthen national capacity in developing countries and countries in transition in support of compliance.</p> <p>In order to translate the proposal into reality legal options and approaches should be identified (new provisions of or separate guidelines which will underline approaches or procedures related to compliance attached to the ITRs to be introduced).</p> <p>The proposal could be further developed in new WCIT Resolution.</p> <p><i>Source C 39 (Malaysia)</i></p> <p>Some Member States supported this proposal and expressed readiness to further work on it ( <i>Egypt, UAE</i>)</p>