



**Working Methods  
for the Committee for ITU Policy  
(and its sub-ordinate entities)**

**Edition 0  
Copenhagen, 9 July 2009**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

PART 1 WORKING PROCEDURES FOR CEPT CO-ORDINATION in the preparation of, and during ITU Conferences and Assemblies.....	3
PART 2 WORKING PROCEDURES FOR CEPT CO-ORDINATION in the preparation of contributions to meetings of ITU groups.....	5
PART 3 Definition of an European Common Proposal (ECP) .....	6

**PART 1**  
**WORKING PROCEDURES FOR CEPT CO-ORDINATION**  
**in the preparation of, and during ITU Conferences and**  
**Assemblies<sup>1</sup>**

1. The Chairman of the Com-ITU (hereafter called the Chairman) shall be responsible for the overall CEPT co-ordination if not decided otherwise.
2. The Chairman shall be assisted by an agreed co-ordination team, which would include the Vice Chairman, the Project Team chairmen and the CEPT co-ordinators, during the negotiations and lobbying activities.
3. The observers from CEPT at ITU-Conferences shall also assist the Chairman.
4. Each CEPT delegation shall notify the Chairman of their main contact person, and one for each ECP.
5. The Chairman shall call CEPT co-ordination meetings as appropriate, or when requested by a Member, to inform CEPT delegates of progress, agree on a modified position as necessary to take account of progress, and agree the degree of flexibility on negotiations.
6. Such meetings shall be called by sending a notice to each contact person using the available messaging system.
7. CEPT coordination meetings during the conference to agree on a modified position or on the degree of flexibility on negotiations shall be led by a member of the coordination team (normally the Chairman) from an administration which has co-signed the relevant ECP.
8. In exceptional circumstances, participation in coordination meetings during the Conference may be limited to administrations that have not objected to the relevant ECP.
9. In emergency situations, the co-ordination team shall have the responsibility of notifying all the CEPT delegations of developments.
10. The co-ordination team will negotiate on the ECPs with other countries within the agreed limits of flexibility.
11. Other CEPT delegates should avoid entering into individual negotiations with non-CEPT countries which could undermine the CEPT position. Discussions with non-CEPT delegates should be limited to lobbying of the current CEPT published position, and intelligence gathering. Information gained should be made available to the coordination team as soon as possible, and to all delegates at the next co-

---

<sup>1</sup> Plenipotentiary Conference (PP), World Telecommunication Development Conference (WTDC), World Standardisation Assembly (WTSA) and World Conference for International Telecommunication (WCIT).

ordination meeting. These principles should also apply in the period leading up to the conference in relation to provisionally agreed positions.

12. Unless it has formally notified to the Chairman its opposition to an ECP before the deadline for signature, and preferably before its adoption, an administration which has not co-signed an ECP should avoid opposing the proposal in formal meetings but should seek to maintain European co-operation and unity, remain constructive and search for acceptable compromises, in particular within the coordination team.

13. Delegates from CEPT Administrations, at all times, should maintain the original agreed CEPT positions, or the latest stance agreed at a co-ordination meeting, and not make known the agreed negotiating limits.

14. In cases where CEPT is unable to agree on an ECP or a common position, or in cases where a CEPT Member is unable to agree with a common position, CEPT Members should, before bringing forward explicitly their own positions as national or multi-national proposals, endeavour to determine through CEPT co-ordination before or during the Conference, a common position on these proposals which could be supported by a majority of the Conference.

15. Each of the ECPs shall be presented by a co-ordinator from an administration that has co-signed the proposal. The co-ordinator shall be responsible for tracking the proposal until the Conference has disposed of the issue which the ECP addresses. A coordinator shall also be designated for agenda items where no ECP has been submitted.

16. Each co-ordinator shall establish contacts with the appointed representatives from the CEPT delegations (2 to 4 above) in order to have efficient co-operation among the delegates concerned before and during working sessions of the conference.

17. Within the authority delegated by the CEPT co-ordination team, the CEPT coordinator on a given subject shall call CEPT co-ordination meetings as appropriate, or when requested by a Member, to inform CEPT delegates of progress, agree a modified position on this subject as necessary to take account of progress, and agree the degree of flexibility on negotiations. Within the scope of their subjects, and within the authority delegated by the CEPT co-ordination team, the CEPT co-ordinators will, as necessary and in co-operation with interested CEPT members, lead the negotiations with non-CEPT delegations or organisations, keeping the co-ordination team informed.

18. Each ECP shall be actively supported by all CEPT delegations whose administrations have co-signed the ECP. This shall include speaking in support of the ECP following its presentation.

**PART 2**  
**WORKING PROCEDURES FOR CEPT CO-ORDINATION**  
**in the preparation of contributions to meetings of ITU**  
**groups<sup>2</sup>**

Project teams may submit documents to ITU Working Parties or Task Groups. This can only be done based on unanimity among the CEPT members represented at the meeting. In case there is no unanimity the issues will, if necessary, be brought to the parental group for decision.

In case a contribution, agreed accordingly to the above, is submitted to the ITU, it should include the sentence:

“This document has been developed and agreed within the framework of CEPT [*group responsible*]”

It should be emphasised that all CEPT Administrations should support such documents after their introduction in ITU.

---

<sup>2</sup> ITU groups include, but is not limited to, Study Groups, Working Parties, Task Groups and Experts groups.

### **PART 3**

## **Definition of an European Common Proposal (ECP)**

An ECP is a multi-country proposal to which the Working Procedures for CEPT Coordination apply.

Co-signature of an ECP must be evidenced by endorsement from the responsible person within an Administration. It is recognised that in some cases this may take some time after approval of the ECP in the responsible Com-ITU entity. For the purposes of defining an ECP, an indication of intention to co-sign an ECP shall be considered as support.

The purpose of this definition is to serve two main purposes:

- to ensure that there would not be major open opposition from CEPT members;
- to require a reasonably active support, inter alia, through the co-signature of the proposal.

If this cannot be achieved, the proposal should not be submitted in the form of an ECP, as to do so would undermine the credibility of ECPs.

In making this decision, not only the quantity of opposition/support but also the quality must be taken into account. Those opposing might, reluctantly, accept a lost vote or, alternatively, they might feel obliged to reserve their right to present a contradicting national (or multinational) proposal. In a similar way, support could be anything between strong national interest (leading to very active support in the Conference) to luke warm acceptance in the spirit of European cooperation.

Although these factors cannot be built into a simple count of votes, as a general guideline an ECP would not be approved by the responsible Com-ITU entity unless there were at least 10 CEPT members indicating their intention to co-sign it, and not more than 6 opposing the proposal going forward as an ECP.

Even so, it would still be for the responsible Com-ITU entity to decide if a proposal should go forward as an ECP or not, based on both the quantitative and qualitative factors as described above.

Any CEPT Member which is obliged to voice objections or submit alternative proposals to an ECP should inform the responsible Com-ITU entity of its intentions and should, nevertheless, cooperate with the other CEPT Members during ITU meetings to develop a common consensus.

At the request of the responsible Com-ITU entity, the Office may circulate ECPs to ITU member administrations via diplomatic channels in Copenhagen, seeking their support