

**Committee on Sustainable Energy****Bureau Meeting****Geneva, 11 December 2017, 11.00-17.00****Bureau Report No. 2017/4****Present, Bureau:**

Mr. Jürgen Keinhorst, Chair, Mr. Hubert Schwarz, Mr. Jarad Daniels, Vice-Chairs  
Mrs. Kamalya Huseynli, Azerbaijan for Mr. Nazir Ramazanov, Ms. Miriam Gutzke, Germany, Mr. Aibek Bekzhanov, Kazakhstan

**Webex:**

Mr. Ron Adam, Mr. Francisco de la Flor, Mr. Aleksandar Dukovski, Vice-Chairs

**Audio dial-in:**

Mr. Ramazan Zhampiissov, Mr. Sergio Garribba, Mr. Ray Pilcher, Mr. Aleksandar Dukovski, Vice-Chairs

Mrs. Dina Koldassova, KazEnergy, Mr. Gianluca Sambucini, SED secretariat

**Apologies:**

Mr. Talyat Aliev, Mr. Nazir Ramazanov, Mr. Jean-Christophe Füeg, Vice-Chairs

**Present, secretariat, Sustainable Energy Division (SED):**

Mr. Scott Foster, Mrs. Stefanie Held, Mr. Branko Milicevic, Mr. Hari Tulsidas, Mrs. Charlotte Griffiths

**Action points****SED secretariat:**

- Invite for next Bureau discussion/call, likely 29 January 2018 15.00-16.30 - *done*
- Inform of dates for regular Bureau meetings/calls in 2018, IT based and face to face, about once every two months
- Further develop the document on strategic priorities for next Bureau discussion; possibly integrate into draft concept for 27<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee on 26-28 September 2018
- Inquire about costs/conditions to hold a Committee session outside of Geneva
- Inquire about dates/conditions to hold 4 Committee sessions in the biennium
- Inform of workshop possibilities/dates for “Pathways to Sustainable Energy” for KPI discussion(s), organise donor call for Pathways to Sustainable Energy project in January 2018 in preparation for the Bureau call – *in progress*
- Inform of dates for HLPF and related pre-meetings as soon as available (review of SDG7) – *done*
- Distribute policy briefs for SDG7 review to Bureau for input (tight deadline) – *done*
- Develop strawman for potential UNECE energy ministerial in 2020 for Bureau consideration (outstanding from Bureau meeting 3/2017)

**Bureau:**

- Note next in-person Bureau call end January 2018 and inform secretariat of attendance
- Provide reactions/input into the strategic directions of the Committee (any time)
- Modernisation of energy infrastructure: Provide ideas for alternative funding sources and approaches to the secretariat or to the Chair of the Group of Experts on Coal Mine Methane
- Provide input into the policy briefs for SDG7 review if desired (tight deadline)
- Inform the secretariat if you want to join the Advisory Board of the project Pathways to Sustainable Energy (repeated request from earlier meetings)

**Group of Experts on Clean Electricity:**

- Distribute investment guidelines to Bureau for further discussion at next meeting.

## Bureau Meeting Report - BMR No. 2017/4

### Main discussion points

#### Welcome and adoption of the agenda

- The Chair welcomed the participants, including the Vice-Chairs who had joined through WebEx and audio.
- The agenda was adopted as presented and treated in the order as proposed.

### Bureau matters

- The Chair invited views on Bureau interactions. The Bureau discussed frequency and types of meetings for the biennium and decided to hold more frequent, but shorter, more concentrated discussions and IT facilitated conversations. Ideally, these should be held once every two months and strengthen the interaction with the groups of experts. Policy relevant conversations should be carried out in face-to-face meetings, possibly three per year. Dates should be set in advance for better planning.
- The Chair further reacted to the low participation of capitals/countries during the 2-3 day sessions of the Committee. He proposed to hold shorter, more focused Committee sessions of 1-1.5 days two times a year, i.e. 4 Committee sessions per biennium, instead of the current two meetings per biennium. The agenda should be focused on a few targeted topics so that issues of political relevance would be concentrated on one day and would attract more high-level participation on that day. The 25<sup>th</sup> session was cited as a good example, i.e. it was split into two parts, and the second part benefited from quite a high participation, offering a limited and focused agenda (NB by the secretariat: it was the meeting held to endorse the outcome document of the Energy Ministerial in Astana). A further proposal was to hold future Committee meetings as part of the International Forum process, i.e. outside of Geneva. This would avoid duplication of invitations for some stakeholders and bring the Committee issues into the region. During the afternoon session, the Bureau came back to this point about the Committee session preparation and asked the secretariat to make a proposal / propose a concept note for the 27<sup>th</sup> session (see also remarks on page 8).
- The secretariat informed that Ukraine had been asked to host not only the 9<sup>th</sup> International Forum on Energy for Sustainable Development but also meetings of Groups of Experts (Energy Efficiency, Renewable Energy, and Cleaner Electricity Production). At the time of preparing the minutes, Ukraine has not yet responded to the date proposal (see also below under the relevant agenda item).
- As meeting dates for the 27<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee have been set for 2018 (26-28 September 2018), the Bureau wished to hold the second part of the 27<sup>th</sup> session in spring 2019 and so forth. The secretariat was requested to enquire about conditions including holding Committee meetings outside Geneva and report back. Quoted were meetings in Canada and Poland by the ECE Committee on Forests and the Forest Industry. Holding meetings outside Geneva is seen as a way to increase the participation of capitals and expert opinions.
- The secretariat pointed out that dates of meetings are organised 2 years in advance and that a mandate by the Committee in session is needed to make changes to the way meetings are held.
  - NB by the secretariat for information on this topic (not discussed during the meeting):  
The programme of work for 2018-2019 requests the Committee to hold two meetings per biennium with 12 sessions (= 6 days), and for these sessions document services, translation and interpretation are provided by the United Nations. There is some flexibility in how the 12 sessions are distributed over the biennium, provided rooms and interpretation services are available. This is not up to the Committee nor the secretariat of the sustainable energy subprogramme. The allocations are made centrally and concern all programmes and services. In the past, the secretariat has proposed a

## Bureau Meeting Report - BMR No. 2017/4

- number of variations for the length of Committee sessions to hold the 12 sessions (6+6, 5+5+2 etc.).
- The current mandate allows for two agendas and two Committee meeting reports per biennium, and are an obligation for the subprogramme. Any deviation or change has to be mandated in session and by other relevant services in the United Nations. This means, even when a mandate exists, a meeting can only be held when a number of conditions align, and mostly they do not depend on the subprogramme or the secretariat.
  - The agenda for an intergovernmental body is considered an important parliamentary document in the United Nations process. The agenda has to be approved by the Bureau, followed by the UNECE Programme Management Unit (PMU) before it is submitted officially. Once the agenda for a session has been submitted into the United Nations system (deadline 12 weeks before the session), it can only be changed in session. This means that the deadline for the 27<sup>th</sup> September session is in mid-July, and it needs to be approved by PMU earlier than that. This implies that the agenda for both meetings of the same session must be the same, and that the report for both sessions with the same symbol can only be submitted once approved at the end of the second session.
  - Therefore, mandates provided in the first part of the session are not effective until the report has been approved. This is an important hurdle for the work of the subprogramme. The UNECE Executive Committee has to be informed because it is not common practice to split up sessions. The trend is to fewer and longer meetings as they are cheaper and require less secretariat support overall.
  - For inter-governmental meetings outside of Geneva the full United Nations protocol applies, i.e. a host-country agreement needs to be established, with the host-country bearing the full cost for all UNECE staff, selected experts as well as United Nations security and United Nations interpretation for the duration of the meeting.

### Cooperation between Bureau and secretariat

- Two points were discussed under this agenda item: the role of the Bureau in the Committee and the budget of the sustainable energy subprogramme.
- The secretariat invited the Bureau to comment on the question how to set up the relationship between the secretariat and the Bureau so that the platform the Bureau offers could be used in the most optimal way.
- The secretariat proposed to the Bureau to take intellectual leadership of selected topics, including agenda times and themes it oversees, i.e. become focal points on a variety of issues for the Committee and drive these issues toward implementation. Pathways to Sustainable Energy, Methane Management and Energy Security Dialogues are the topics that the Committee currently oversees.
- The Bureau stressed the importance to drive any points of political relevance in close interaction with the secretariat: once such items are identified, the expert groups could receive a mandate from the Bureau or the Committee for further action, e.g. policy papers, dialogues. Political and policy related discussions could happen at the Bureau and Committee level, but key questions of technical nature should be outsourced to the relevant groups of experts or task forces.
- The Bureau could define priorities to enhance interaction with governments. The Bureau was convinced that funding was more likely using this approach. Further, the Bureau wished more continuous engagement in the activities of the sustainable energy subprogramme, not just once or twice a year, as it had already stressed under the previous agenda item.
- On the Budget, the secretariat informed that currently the Sustainable Energy Division of UNECE employed 14 staff members: 10 professional staff (including a JPO funded by Germany until October 2018) and 4 support staff. In 2017, fees and funds for travel amounted to USD16,300,

## Bureau Meeting Report - BMR No. 2017/4

for consultants USD12,300, totalling USD28,600 for travel and consultants. The 2018 budget was not yet released but will definitely not be increased. Staff cost is the lion share of the budget and is not managed directly by the sustainable energy subprogramme. XB funding needs increased attention in the coming biennium.

- The Director reported that despite his request for an increase of staff in 2016, the Sustainable Energy Division was about to lose one support staff (G post in January 2018), and a further regular budget cut of 40% (forty per cent) had just been announced as an instruction from the United Nations Fifth Committee. No details are yet available, other than that decreasing donor contributions to the United Nations were to blame. The question remained why UNECE was hit with such a high number when the average budget cuts across the United Nations amounted to more or less 10%. As decisions about the budget are ongoing in New York, announcements to this effect can be expected early January 2018 and might affect the Sustainable Energy Division further. The Bureau will be kept informed of implications of the restructuring.
- Attention should be given to attracting XB funding. “Pathways for Sustainable Energy” was quoted as a source for additional funding, as well as the United Nations Framework Classification (UNFC) and the work on methane management (EPA funding received), the international centres of excellence in Poland and China, and the United Nations Development Account (UNDA). Interesting would be to pursue new approaches offered by for example the projects “Energy Efficiency in Buildings” or “Modernization of Energy Infrastructure”, which allows countries to work together with international financial institutions and across the United Nations to explore innovative funding mechanisms.

### **Strategic priorities of the Committee**

- This agenda item continued the discussions by the Bureau in its previous meeting on topics of political relevance and their implementation. A background paper listing themes for discussion had been prepared for the attention of the Bureau, listing nine potential areas.
- The Bureau contemplated political areas and issues, which could be highlighted or made a priority for future work of the Committee and the expert groups. The Bureau decided to follow Italy’s suggestion about the “transition to sustainable energy systems” as the Leitmotiv for the biennium.
- The Chair summarized that the themes of political relevance should be discussed at Committee level and seek to connect politicians and technical issues based on strong proposals from the Bureau. Some of the themes are repeated here: support the transition process in the region; deal with appropriate incentive mechanisms; eliminate subsidies in the region; address problems of financing of structural changes; investigate the role of coal in region; further deepen the understanding of CCS and other technology options to shape transition; cover all energies with a view not to waste money but rather help countries to manage huge influxes of money, often from donors and international communities.
- The Chair then led the discussion about the themes and tasks, which technical issues were of interest, how the relevant expert groups could be mandated and involved. The following discussion concentrated on defining approach and next level down. Key words from the Bureau discussion are summarised here:

#### Transition to sustainable energy systems

Objective: Support countries in their transition; no regret decisions

Key themes:

- The role of fossil fuel in sustainable energy systems; the role of gas
- Stranded assets and costs in the transition
- Grid stability, renewable energy integration, big data and cyber security
- Infrastructure development, modernisation and financing
- Game-changing technologies, digitalization in the transition
- Removing harmful subsidies; energy pricing, end-use tariffs

## Bureau Meeting Report - BMR No. 2017/4

Selected individual contributions highlighted:

- Work should support the centres of excellence and help spread information and peer learning, e.g. how can geothermal programmes be expanded; education be provided at the right level. The Centres of Excellence are a tool that can connect stakeholders, gather specialists, etc., how can geothermal play a role to meet climate targets; how can UNFC be applied to other countries and areas?
- Work should build on existing capacities, expertise of the groups of experts, and not duplicate; specific partnerships should be sought with other Committees like the Committee on Environmental Policy, Housing and Land Management (there is already a joint initiative), Forestry, OECD, others.
- This might be the wrong direction for the Committee, it should focus on political visions that are great and that stress the importance of energy efficiency and renewable energy and not be based on the needs of the fossil community. One way is to partner with leaders and strong organisations that share such visionary beliefs to develop a win-win in the long run, even if it means not receiving voluntary contributions at the beginning and doing own research. Instead of promoting solutions that extend the life of fossil-based plants, the Committee could enhance the promotion of decarbonising the economy by investing in the “right” approaches and sustainable sources.
- The written contribution from Azerbaijan is joint in Annex I. The letter from Italy was circulated in preparation to this meeting.

### **Projects for the attention of the Bureau**

#### Pathways to Sustainable Energy

- The secretariat presented extracts of slides prepared by one of the modelling teams. The Bureau also received a background note. Both documents were sent to the Bureau for information after the meeting. The modellers are regularly discussing their joint approaches; the imminent issue to resolve is related to the Key Performance Indicators.
- During the course of the project, it was discovered that no universal definitions exist for the terms used in the project. The teams, the secretariat and the advisory board proposed the following definition to the Bureau: “Key Performance Indicators are a specific set of metrics. All KPI’s are metrics but not vice versa. As the term implies they are chosen to track and assess strategically important aspects in a chosen environment. KPI’s are independent of any paths/scenarios. To yield meaningful indications of performance KPI’s can be presented in relation to predefined goals or historic values. This allows them to be unitless expressions such as percentages or factors (i.e. between 0 and 1, or greater than 1). KPI’s are set for two points in time, 2030 (SDG timeline) and 2050 (mid-century strategy).”
- The Bureau was consulted on slide 12 (proposed indicators) and slide 16 for discussion, as an agreement on the proposed KPI’s is necessary to complete the tasks. Questions for discussion: How far can we go when predefining KPI’s? Can and should they be quantified? The modelling teams and the advisory board argued that quantifying them in advance is likely to cause resistance from stakeholders, would it therefore be better to monitor output to quantify KPI’s after the modelling? When quantifying in advance, should stakeholder approval be sought and should there be a differentiation between the three main sub-regions: North America, Europe, and the Former Soviet Union?
- The Bureau discussed these topics at length, including with a written contribution by the Russian Federation (attached in Annex II) and requested the secretariat to organise the following:
- A Bureau call at the end of January involving the modelling organisations to decide which KPIs, which ones are important for the imminent modelling process, which ones can be easily adjusted, which ones should be done in advance and are difficult to change. Possibly discuss ranges.

## Bureau Meeting Report - BMR No. 2017/4

- Investigate with the modelling organisations the possibility to hold three regional workshops in Q1 and Q2 2018 in order to agree KPIs and first results of the modelling on a subregional basis.
- A Bureau in-person meeting should be held after the regional workshops to discuss the results of the three regional conferences about KPIs, and to propose KPIs to be endorsed by the Committee during its 27<sup>th</sup> session (deadline by mid July 2018).
  - NB by the secretariat for information on this topic (not discussed during the meeting):  
On Friday, 15 December, the secretariat held a call with the modelling teams to brief them on the outcomes of the Bureau recommendations and to consult on a way forward. While the modelling teams welcomed the interest and comments made, three KPI meetings are not feasible for them given the original project plan and funding received. To stay in the agreed project plan KPIs need to be agreed no later than April 2018. Modelling teams propose one joint meeting at the beginning of March 2018.
  - On the point of quantification, modellers will propose a set of indicators that are essential for the beginning of the modelling and is available to discuss with the Bureau at the end of January.
- There was equally a request to link the project to the outcomes of major political processes, e.g. G20 analysis and comparisons, so that recommendations from such processes can be taken on board right away.

### Review of SDG7

- The Bureau received an update about the ongoing process of the review of SDG7. A pre-meeting for the High Level Political Forum (HLPF) will be held on 21-23 February 2018 in Bangkok, for a final review in summer 2018, managed by UN DESA. More information about the global conference and registration details can be found here: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/EnergyConference>
- The Bureau then contemplated how to influence the conversation of various ongoing political processes, including the HLPF, but also the UNECE Regional Forum (March 2018 in Geneva), the 9<sup>th</sup> International Forum on Energy for Sustainable Development (November 2018 in Kiev), others.
- Stressing the huge outreach opportunity that such processes provide, the Bureau wished to be involved in input materials to these conferences and processes. The secretariat was tasked with circulating policy briefs and information material as soon as available (done at the time of writing the minutes).

### Group of Experts on Clean Electricity

- United States introduced investment guidelines/principles on clean fossil fuel infrastructure to the Bureau. This ongoing piece of work by the Group of Experts on Clean Electricity seeks to work with international financial institutions and NGOs to develop ways and means to secure investments into an aging infrastructure, which in the medium-term will remain fossil based. The Bureau was consulted on the best way to have this conversation, which fit well with the ongoing discussions about topics of political relevance. In particular, the tension between achieving developmental aspirations and 2 degrees was mentioned. This work links in part to the project on the modernisation of infrastructure, which seeks to refinance the rehabilitation of mining areas (see below).
- The Bureau invited the Group of Experts to stay engaged and to seek Bureau input when required, for example at the next meeting in Q1 2018. The topic was chosen as an input area during the UNECE Regional Forum in March 2018, an important opportunity to gain a better understanding of public perception and awareness. The Bureau advised to involve the IFIs at an opportune moment and involve other Groups of Experts as needed.

## **Bureau Meeting Report - BMR No. 2017/4**

- The Bureau was informed of a meeting held in the European Parliament the same day about the future of coal mining regions in Europe. A platform was launched to enable like regions to discuss the social, economic and technical issues related to the phase out of coal. More information can be found here [https://ec.europa.eu/energy/sites/ener/files/documents/agenda\\_coal\\_regions\\_in\\_transition\\_6\\_dec\\_2.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/energy/sites/ener/files/documents/agenda_coal_regions_in_transition_6_dec_2.pdf)
- The Bureau requested the Group of Experts to distribute its guidelines and discuss them with the Bureau, e.g. in Q1 2018.

### **Modernisation of Energy Infrastructure**

- The Chair of the Group of Experts on Coal Mine Methane presented further ideas on the project “Modernisation of the Energy Sector” (presentation sent to the Bureau earlier). The underlying idea remains to develop a tool to help member States plan the transition to a lower-carbon energy sector and green economy, and that the modernization of the energy sector can be accomplished efficiently and cost-effectively. The overall objective of the project is to produce a robust and flexible business model that can be replicated in other countries/like industrial complexes (countries mentioned Poland and Italy). Project outcomes will drive towards an innovation-led socially and environmentally responsible national energy strategy. The example presented was the opportunity in the Timertau region in Kazakhstan.
- He informed of a note verbale received by the Mission of Kazakhstan to offer Kazakhstan as a pilot country for this project. Groundwork could now start by developing case-specific recommendations as listed in the slide presentation and based on the wishes by the host country.
- The Group of Experts on Coal Mine Methane could lead the work with the help of the secretariat and the Bureau to determine and best way forward, to maximise the likelihood of replications and likelihood of change. There could be a role as well for the recently founded Technology Centre in Kazakhstan, which could host this work and offer to be the platform for lessons learnt.
- The Group of Experts requested help from the Bureau and the Committee on Sustainable Energy to determine next steps and to gain advice on the funding of the various stages of such a complex undertaking. Reference was made to an earlier phone call facilitated by the secretariat with the EBRD, which confirmed the difficulty of finding pre-project type funding. A solid pre-feasibility study would cost about EUR 3-5 mio and require a clear commitment from a potential investor.
- The Bureau recommended to seek the political support from all involved ministries as early as possible and to bring in the related sectors early, e.g. Arcelor Mittal or other large industrial players. The Bureau stressed that without private sector funding and engagement such a project would not be successful, however, engaging other international organisations would strengthen the case, e.g. the OECD has an ongoing review process on the transition to greener economies.
- The Bureau further recommended developing a clear business case connecting parts of the system that are not currently connected. A compelling story would need to be created about the multiple benefits of this kind of modernisation approach, with the following parts: i) Analyse situation ii) Develop value added from various perspectives iii) Develop business case iv) Create platform for exchange v) Develop a framework for replication.

### **EXCOM Meeting**

- The Executive Committee (EXCOM) welcomed the presentation and paper by the Chair. After supportive remarks from the European Union, the Russian Federation and Belarus EXCOM approved the requests by the Committee (programme of work for 2018-2019, mandates and work plans of subsidiary bodies).

## **Bureau Meeting Report - BMR No. 2017/4**

### **26<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee on Sustainable Energy**

- The Committee on Sustainable Energy has tasked the Bureau to make proposals how regional advisory services could be further enhanced. The Bureau summarized its discussion about the strategic priorities from the morning and enlarged its considerations to include regional advisory services and regional perspectives.
- The secretariat stressed the constraints of the funds available to the regional advisor. Further, it stressed the opportunity of the role to help with fund raising and to bring policies and technology knowledge into the region to accelerate transition.
- The Bureau requested more involvement and information about the activities of the regional advisor.

### **27<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee on Sustainable Energy**

- The Bureau revisited its discussion from the morning about the Committee session preparation. It renewed its request to split future Committee meetings into two parts and to hold shorter meetings with more focused agendas of about 1.5 days each. The secretariat was tasked to make a proposal and propose a concept note (see also page 2).

### **9<sup>th</sup> International Forum on Energy for Sustainable Development**

- The 9<sup>th</sup> Forum will be hosted by Ukraine in Kiev. The proposed date of 6-9 November 2018 has not yet been confirmed by Ukraine. The Bureau will be informed as soon as possible after the confirmation of the event.
- The Bureau welcomed the choice of country and sees the 9<sup>th</sup> Forum as an important opportunity to discuss energy infrastructure, all energy technologies and sources and touch new ground on such issues as nuclear (with partners).
- The Bureau requested the possibility to input into the development of the materials for the 9<sup>th</sup> Forum, and the secretariat will keep the Bureau informed – as usual and every year.

### **AOB**

- Next meeting: : Likely 29 January 2018 15.00-16.30

\*\*\*\*



**Annex I**

**Meeting of the Bureau of the UNECE Committee on Sustainable Energy**

**Statement delivered by Kamala Huseynli-Abishova on the behalf of Bureau member Nazir Ramazanov from the Republic of Azerbaijan**

**December 11, 2017**

**Geneva**

Currently around 80 % of global energy demand is covered by fossil fuel resources.

Azerbaijan as one of the major players in global energy market rich in oil and gas resources has in the long term been able to ensure its energy security, while a number of countries continue to experience various challenges in accessing energy.

Abundance of fossil fuel resources has not prevented our country from developing renewable energy. Our interest and well-targeted approach to the to the renewable energy sector development are also driven by the fact that our country enjoys vast potential for renewable energy.

It is our belief that the development of alternative and renewable sources of energy may not only serve to achieve diversity in energy supply markets, but also, as an integral part of future energy system, ensure sustainable and more environmentally friendly development.

In 2016 we adopted Strategic Roadmap 2020, which envisages further increase in the share of renewable energy in our energy mix.

Natural gas as the most eco-friendly fossil fuel can be considered as an important enabler for the deployment of renewable energy. Its combination with renewable sources of energy could significantly increase the share of renewable energy in the total energy mix.

In conclusion, we appreciate UNECE efforts to organize dialog and exchange of the best practices among Member States, as well as, various other activities such as GFT, status report by REN21 and Hard Talks organized in Member States. One of the last such Hard Talks has been held in Baku this year. We believe that the Hard Talk has been fruitful and we will continue to build up on its outcome.

**Annex II**

**Pathways to Sustainable Energy**

Dear Stefanie,

At the current moment (in addition to presented before more general “donor’s notices”) it seems potentially reasonable:

- To get working definition of “scenario” and “pathway” for using inside our project (cf. recommendation not to use word “scenario” at all inside somewhat similar REEEM project);
- To agree that KPI (may be, better to still use “success criteria”) are important, but could be incrementally adjusted in course of the necessary “scenarios-strategic policies” dialogue;
- To structure “success criteria”, identifying, for example, 3 kinds of results: prospective, characterizing the achieved future 2100 vision (e.g. climate change); pointwise 2030 and 2050 estimates (e.g. energy poverty); cumulative 2030 and 2050 estimates (e.g. pollution and emissions);
- (most important) To keep the genuine project’s direction towards getting not just another scenario space, but a “model” of successful sustainable energy development through this space.

Best regards

Talyat Aliev

Yury Baron

\*\*\*\*