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>> CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon everyone. And I am opening this afternoon's meeting of Com 5. This is our eleventh meeting in Committee 5.

This morning we adopted the agenda, which is in document ADM/65. And we are going to continue with this document 65.

This morning you will recall no doubt that we did not look at item 4, report on informal discussion on Resolution 21 by Egypt. So I'm going to give the floor to our colleague from Egypt so as to address this item 4.

Delegate of Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We met on Saturday, last Saturday, for the Ad Hoc Group for review of Resolution 21. And we reached an agreement in the beginning. We reached an agreement about splitting the Brazilian contribution from Resolution 21 in another new Resolution about numbering issuing. And we ask our Distinguished Delegate of Brazil to draft it and he thankfully has done it and it's posted on the website DL 48.

And regarding Resolution 21, I'm happy to announce that we have -- we are done with it, and we reached consensus in each and every point in it. And I'm taking this opportunity to thank all the delegates who were participating for their understanding and cooperation in finalizing this important and hard task to come up with the consensus needed to finish this important Resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIRMAN: I thank the delegate of Egypt for that good news.

So we are going to have a DT which will be published soon on the results of your Working Group.

We also have a separate Resolution which is currently being worked on by our colleagues from Brazil. So we will have the opportunity to address this tomorrow in tomorrow's meeting. We hope that all of that will go smoothly and we will be able to adopt the document as it was agreed on in your Working Group.

Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, we were going to discuss this Brazilian contribution today at, as far as I know, it is going to be at like 5:30, after this meeting. And we are going to have our meeting in room G. So that is to review the contribution, and I think we can come back with a report tomorrow about the meeting.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Very well, then, thank you. We have taken note. Room G at half past 5:00 for those who are interested in this debate. So we will address this item once again tomorrow.

So now I would suggest that we go back to our agenda to the point that we stopped on. Draft new Resolution on theft of mobile devices. For this, we have a DT document, number 53. I'm going to ask the coordinator, Franklin Merchan, to introduce this document 53. I invite Brazil to present this document. You have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'll present this document in the name of my colleague from Colombia who had to return to his country.

We held formal discussions on the proposed Resolution on theft of mobile devices with several Delegations, and I believe we managed to find a consensus text as it is proposed in document DT/53. From the basic text presented by CITEL, the relevant changes were on the title, so we simplified the title a bit.

And on the "Instructs" instead of having the Secretary-General to conduct the best practices on mobile theft and available solutions and provide assistance to Member States when requested, the preference was to have the Director from the BDT to carry on those tasks, in collaboration with the other directors. The Secretary-General will only be requested to report to Council on the progress of this work, so Council can decide on the way forward as it wishes.

That being said, I put document DT/53 to your consideration Chairman.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Brazil, for presenting DT/53.

South Africa, you have the floor.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, Chairperson.

I just wanted to point out that we felt that it was important to include the Standardization Sector because this issue is not limited to mobile networks, but can also apply to WiFi. So the value of mobile devices, it needs to be recognized beyond just being a cellular communication device, but also a device that can be used by other networks. So the inclusion of the Standardization Sector is important so we can have transparent and interoperable standards in accordance with ITU principles.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

I have a long list, a list of requests for the floor. United Arab Emirates and then the Russian Federation. The UAE, please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman. And good afternoon, everyone.

Chairman, when the representative of Brazil presented this document, he mentioned the instruction to the Secretary-General, who is instructed to undertake actions. Whereas in the Arabic Sector it only refers to the Secretary-General and the Director of the Radio Bureau, we do not think this is enough. And we believe that in the Arabic text it should say at least that the Director of the Telecommunication Sector in cooperation with the Radio Sector and the other sectors and with the Director of the Telecommunication Standardization Bureau as well. We wish this to be added into the Arabic text.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The Russian Federation to be followed by Saudi Arabia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman.

I would like to thank the representative of Brazil, representative of Colombia, and all of those who worked on this draft new Resolution. Of course, we support the topic itself, the topic of this Resolution, but we do have some comments to make. Unfortunately, we could not participate until the last meeting. We support your interest in this subject, but we simply did not see the timetable.

We would like to say that when discussing this at the last Committee 5 meeting, many States spoke and underlined that this issue is very closely linked with programmes that we already have in the ITU on testing of conformity and interoperability and also counteracting counterfeiting. And these should be reflected. So it suggests that references made to Resolution 177 on the new Resolution on counterfeit devices, we also need to note that it does not -- it is not simply a matter of mobile telephones. We should mention mobile devices here, which do not necessarily connect to 3G networks or support 3GPP networks.

Also, as regards the "Instructs" to the three sectors, we believe that there should be an instruction to the three directors of the three bureaus. And we are not certain that at the task level we should instruct the Secretary-General to report to Council. Perhaps it should be one of the directors, for example, from the Standardization Sector. Because work in SG 11 is already underway. And this SG has already -- the Study Group has already drawn up a report on this subject.

Moreover, we believe that the references in the text to specific organizations, such as GSMA and the 3GPP in the "instructs the directors" section, well that indirectly involves the implementation of this. And we would suggest that these references be removed.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: I have Saudi Arabia to be followed by Canada.

>> SAUDIA ARABIA: Firstly, I would like to thank Mr. Franklin Merchan from Colombia for the work which has been accomplished in coordination with other colleagues. I would also like to thank the representative from Brazil who presented this document.

Indeed, we would like to join the previous speakers who were -- who favored the Director of the Standardization Bureau in here. We could include here "Instructs the Director of the Development Bureau in coordination with the Director of the Standardization Bureau to undertake studies" and so on and so forth.

There is another point I wish to make. Under number 2 of "Instructs" it says to consult those concerned. We should include those included here, particularly Study Group 5. When we mention the third generation of telecommunications, we should note that cooperation should be undertaken also with representatives of this third generation.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Canada, to be followed by Mexico, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman, and good afternoon to you.

Mr. Chairman, we would like to thank the administration of Colombia who acted as the coordinator of this informal meeting, and Brazil that submitted the contribution on his behalf.

Mr. Chairman, we have a couple of comments. The first one is of an editorial nature in the "Instructs" number 2. We believe that it would be very useful for further clarity in the text that at the reference in "Instructs" 2 to GSMA and 3GPP, to identify possible technological measures that exist or that may need to be developed, both software and hardware, to mitigate the use of stolen mobile devices.

This just points to the fact that there are already technological measures that have been identified or developed.

And the second comment, Mr. Chairman, is in regards to the reference and comments made by our distinguished colleague from the United Arab Emirates. For Canada, there is a clear distinction between counterfeit and theft. So we would strongly suggest that the reference to "counterfeit" not be included in this particular document.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mexico, to be followed by South Africa.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chairman.

We support the comments expressed by the Distinguished Delegate of Canada and we also recognize and acknowledge some of the comments made by other delegates.

However, sir, given the time in this conference and also taking into account the excellent coordination of this informal group, and the fact that the coordinator has in fact left the Conference, taking all of this into account, we would request that we consider the comments made by the Russian Federation references to 177 and so on. This would not be enough. There was, in fact, an Ad Hoc Group on this Resolution that addressed these topics, and therefore we believe this as a CITEL position. And we looked at two topics there, at a topic on theft and a topic on counterfeiting. And we believe that the UK and the Netherlands and Saudi Arabia were all involved in the discussions, and we believe that we do turn to the Standardization Sector at a point which we thought was appropriate. And, therefore, given the time that we have left in this conference, we support this text.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

I still have a list of those to take the floor. I do not wish to prolong our debate. We actually only have two days left of meetings, tomorrow and the day after. So we will have other things to do. So what I would suggest is that we do move on.

The -- I have the Republic of South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the Russian Federation to be followed by the Netherlands. Of course after the Netherlands I will give the floor to Brazil.

South Africa, please.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, Chair.

Recognizing the good work that has been done already, we do however still have a few concerns with the text as it stands. I'm not sure if it's just a matter of construction, but I think there is more to it than that.

So I would favor, if possible, the chance for a little bit more further discussion, if possible. Maybe if Colombia and Brazil would still be able to facilitate, that would be good.

I think definitely in the "Instructs" part we should be including the Standardization Bureau Director.

And in the second paragraph under "Instructs" it would also be good to include "relevant ITU-R and ITU-T study groups."

And I'm also not sure about the reference to the industry bodies in particular, because I think we have already mentioned there that we would refer to industry organizations, but we also need to work within the ITU to make sure that we have inclusive and interoperable standards.

So I think, Chair, I think it still does need a bit of work, if possible.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The United Kingdom, you have the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

Well, I agree this text is imperfect. I've heard the interventions from a number of Member States. I think they are arguable; I don't think they change things terribly. I worked with Colombia. Colombia felt very strongly on this. They took out a number of things which they would have liked to have been there, in order to get a text which achieved what they wanted.

So I support Mexico in saying that yes, it's not perfect. We might wish to include a number of things, we might phrase things slightly differently, but I think we have a good text here. We deal with counterfeit in another Resolution we have passed. We have dealt with amendments to Resolution 177, which deals with other aspects. This was for the specific problem of mobile theft, and I would support Mexico in maintaining the text as it is.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. And I'd just like to thank all the speakers who preceded me.

Of course, a great deal has been clarified in the current text. But we are looking through the text and, in fact, this Resolution is talking about combating mobile device theft. But the ITU cannot prevent and combat this, because this is a rather different issue.

If we wish to counteract the theft of mobile devices, perhaps one could come up with some control of -- to counteract the circulation of stolen phones. Well, if we are talking about this, then the identification of devices, which has been come up with to counteract counterfeiting, then that covers this issue. And we continue to believe that we cannot continue to look at these two issues separately, particularly if we exclude the Standardization Sector. We are certain that we should look at this issue in the framework of Study Group 5 of the Radio Sector and in Study Group 11 of the Standardization Sector.

And since work in our Union needs to be carried out based on the development of standards for the International Telecommunication Union, then in any case a primary point should be the documents prepared by the Union where the sectors and participants of the Union will assist us in this work as Member States and Sector Members. And, of course, we are grateful to them. But our task is to develop our own standard.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The United States and then the Netherlands.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In the interest of time, I will be brief. We want to support Canada, Mexico, and the U.K. And of course Brazil and Colombia in supporting the text that we have before us. The CITEL region identified the issue of theft of mobile devices as an issue of top priority for them. And we support that as a priority issue for us as a union.

It is agreed that this text is not perfect. No text ever is. But this text is a good start for us to focus on this very important issue, and to alert administrations to all of the resources that they have to combat this issue, including the GSMA and 3GPP databases noted in this Resolution.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, the U.S.

And now the Netherlands, please.

>> NETHERLANDS: Yes, thank you, Chairman.

We also feel that it might not be perfect present text, but it's a good start. We would like to have GMSA and 3GPP mentioned. We agree with Canada that there is already existing technology, so that should also be taken into account. And maybe add to what Russia has said, I don't think the intent of this Resolution is to counteract theft, but to mitigate the use of stolen devices. And I think it's a good basis for that.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, the Netherlands.

I will give the floor again to Brazil. They have taken the banner again as coordinator of this Working Group on this draft Resolution. Brazil is recognized.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair. Well, Brazil is not the convenor of this particular document, but we were asked to help our Colombian colleagues to do this.

I would just like to state that as many have said before, it is not a perfect text, of course. But I do believe we managed to get to a pretty good document. It does give good guidelines for the work on what is supposed to be done at least. And with respect specifically to the TSB, we have a specific reference for the Director of the TSB in "Instructs" 3. So it is contemplated in the text, this specific idea. So we do have the three directors and the three sectors working on the issue in their specific roles.

Basically, I'm not to take charge time of the room, Chairman. Of course we can always improve the text. But given the time we have, this being our last week and our lack of the official convenor, I do believe we can go with the text has has been improved now and of course it can always be improved in our coming conferences.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, the Distinguished Delegate from Brazil, for your summary. I believe that you underscored certain points in connection with the points that were raised.

We then have a text. You've all said that this is not a perfect text, it is subject to improvement in the future, but that it could be used as a basis for this issue. I would like us to adopt this text, particularly the fact that our Colombian colleague is not here as the convenor of the group. And if we devote more time on this document, then we won't have time to deal with the rest. I must remind you that we have to complete our work on Wednesday.

Iran, do you insist on taking the floor? Iran, please.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We never insist on anything. Please kindly consider that.

Just a clarification -- a confirmation. I don't think that we should talk about mobile but not talk about GSMA. This is a main player. So I don't think anything is wrong with GSMA here.

The only thing, the title of the document talks about Government and Member States, and in the "invites" you don't talk about the States. So simply add to "invites" "States and Sector Members." That's all.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I don't want to reopen our discussion, and thus I'd like to continue so that we can bring this discussion to an end. And I would truly want to adopt the text as it stands, even if it's not perfect.

It seems to me that this already allows us to move forward, as was said previously, assisting us in dealing with this point of theft in assisting countries in dealing with this very sensitive issue. So this text is before us and is there a country that can truly not live with this text?

South Africa, do you insist once again? You cannot live with this text? I would ask you to make an additional effort, South Africa.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: It would be an effort, Chairperson. Just to note the context as it reads, you have the third paragraph under "Instructs" referring to the Director of the Telecommunication Standardization Bureau. But the "Instructs" actually refers to the Development Bureau and the Radiocommunication Director -- sorry the Directors of the Development and Radiocommunication Bureaus. That's a first point. So it seems a little bit illogical already.

And the second part is I think, as Russia rightly pointed out, you talk about Study Group 5 in the R Sector, but not about Study Group 11 in the T Sector, which is also relevant.

So I think if we could make those minor amendments, it would be very easy for us to move forward.

>> CHAIRMAN: I'm not that happy with introducing these minor amendments, at least not in plenary -- in Committee 5. We're not going to do that.

If I see that you insist and where you cannot adopt this text now, then I will submit it for an additional discussion; and I don't think that we're going to be very efficient if we proceed this way.

So I beg you to consider this text as is. I urge you all to make an additional effort so that we can accept it as it is.

Russia, do you insist? You cannot go along with this text? Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman.

Of course we do not insist on this text. We did not participate in this group, and we -- because we did not want this. We did not know that it was being held, unfortunately, and now I'm speaking on behalf of the RCC countries. We simply wished to receive a response on why we cannot instruct the Director of the TSB as well to study this issue, in the framework of Study Group 11. If we cannot make this amendment, then the RCC countries do not have any serious problems with the text, but... thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: I do not wish to insist, Distinguished Delegate of Russia, but in "instructs" 3 we mention "to collaborate with the Director of the Telecommunication Standardization Bureau." So standardization is mentioned.

So please, let us keep the text as it stands. It seems to me that those who have worked on the text have not neglected this, and so I beg you to adopt it.

Are we ready to adopt this text?

China, do you wish to take the floor?

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We, too, would like to have it adopted as soon as possible, but we still think that is an urgent issue. But currently the text as it is, there are some issues, although not big issues, but we would like to have time to improve it. And so although it is -- TSB is mentioned here, but it's pretty vague. It is not appropriately said what it is going to do, the TSB.

In addition, we think to mention two mobile standardization and mobile organizations, we wonder if it's appropriate, because there are other organizations who are doing work in combating the theft of mobile devices. So mentioning only two here, well, it's of concern to us. So we would like to have some time to improve this text.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: I am also concerned because I see that we are not making significant progress. We're not moving along.

And so I would ask Brazil to go back to the discussion with those who wish to introduce amendments, maybe you can meet tomorrow to see whether you can improve the text.

So I would urge our colleague from Brazil, could you convene this group to attempt to improve the text? Because it seems that it is not acceptable for certain delegations.

Brazil, please.

>> BRAZIL: Yes, Chair, we will be happy to help you on this. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

You also have the support of the Secretariat to do that.

Very well, I propose that we leave this document 53 in abeyance until tomorrow. The group maybe can meet this evening in order to conclude consideration of this document, and I hope that the other remaining documents will not pose difficulties. I don't know how we're going to finish by Wednesday if we continue like this.

I propose that we move on to the next item, which is DT/54, Resolution 146, and I believe that it is our colleague from Cameroon that is going to introduce this report.

Cameroon has the floor.

>> CAMEROON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Good morning one and all.

Since your meeting on Friday, when I presented my oral report, we had another meeting from 2:30 to 5:00 on that same Friday. Because of the many parallel meetings, certain delegates pointed out in advance that they would not be able to participate during the entire time of our meeting. In spite of that, we took into account their concerns to the extent possible.

The result of the work is reflected in DT/54. It is a very sensitive balance that we attempted to strike, and this is an attempt to settle the different points of view. I start off by expressing my gratitude to all delegates who contributed, to express my gratitude to Mr. Santiago from Canada, who Chaired the informal group on this matter. And then I would like to thank Mrs. Yang from the Secretariat for the work achieved.

And so DT/54 is now before you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you for introducing this document. Are we ready to adopt the document as it stands?

South Africa and Iran are requesting the floor. South Africa followed by Iran.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Chairperson, I must apologize for raising issues after a lot of good work has been done. But I think you will recognize that a lot of countries struggle to keep pace with the large number of ad hoc meetings that we have been having over the last couple of days.

I think in looking at the particular text for the revision of Resolution 146, we end up with something very similar to what we had in 1998. And it took another 14 years after that before we actually got around to holding a World Conference on International Telecommunications, leading to a situation where it was 24 years to review the International Telecommunication Regulations. And I think as a delegation certainly we felt that we shouldn't allow ourselves to walk down exactly the same path when we know where that path can go.

We have a responsibility to the Sector. We get involved in expensive International conferences, because we are supposed to solve problems that face the sector and face the users of the services that we provide, ICTs that we're supposed to regulate. So for that reason, we felt that this text does need to be strengthened. It does need to look at -- I think it wouldn't necessarily be a major strengthening, because I think -- I mean major changes, because there have already been some informal dialog about the text. I think an agreement can be reached. But I don't think we can allow it to be left as it is at the moment, Chairperson.

I can give more specific details, if requested, about the areas that we want to look at. But I'll just open that up for now.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, South Africa.

Now, Iran, followed by Brazil, please.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We also were not able to follow all of these groups. We are limited in number, Chairman.

This ITR review is a very -- some troublesome or difficult for many administrations if we do not carefully consider the matter, how much effort.

Chairman, we have one simple addition to add, to make, and that is I don't know why in the "Resolves" one "should" was converted to "shall." It was "should" and should remain "should." If you want to change it to "shall" put "2) between 8 to 12 years." And I allow you to express our views, it's difficult for us to agree.

Either "shall be every 8 to 12 years" or "should normally be every eight years." These are the suggestions that we suggest. We don't -- we have other suggestions but we don't want to do that at this stage because of the time and the sake of brevity. So we limit ourselves to one thing. But it's very essential, to be careful. We do not, before doing any study, we say that "shall" we -- it's too much. It's too strong. Because we ask a group to establish. We don't know what is the result of the group. So therefore we cannot prejudge the outcome for that. Maybe the group comes for a different period. So let us put "Should."

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We have taken due note of your request. "Should" instead of "Shall."

Brazil followed by Philippines.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chairman.

I don't have a problem changing "should" for "shall," but I'd like to point out that this document, it's -- it was actually constructed after long, long discussions, and I do believe it's a very big, I wouldn't say "big," but a hard consensus to have built this document. And I do believe it is a very good document that we arrived at. And I actually, we don't think it's a good idea that we should start to open discussions on this document again. We have been doing this since last week. We had several different proposals from several regions.

And speaking as CITEL, for instance, Brazil was the spokesman for this, we had agreed. We had very different approaches for the review of the ITRs in this Resolution, from the different regions, and we managed to come up with one simple and some very concise text that at least in our groups it seemed to be reasonable enough to be approved, and I'm very -- it gets me very worried that we try to open discussions on the document again.

So I would suggest that we try to keep it, maybe with a very small amendment suggested by Iran.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Brazil.

Philippines, followed by Denmark.

>> PHILIPPINES: Mr. Chairman, again we are returning to the very issue of this discussion. The "Resolves" portion. The matter of using "Shall" or "Should" was precisely discussed very substantively, very exhaustively during the meeting of the Ad Hoc Group, prior to the submission of this paper to this Committee.

I wish we should no longer go back again to this debate. If, however, we will open up again to a debate, the Philippines reserves its right to discuss substantively the "Resolve" portion, because we are not here discussing the Russian addenda of the "organizing" portion, but we are talking about the "Resolve" portion. It is our belief legally and very substantively that because we are talking of this position of not a rationale of this Resolution, the word "Shall" and not "Should" should prevail. Note however that the word "Shall" is in fact introduced by the word "periodic." And by "Periodic" that means that which occurs at regular intervals. Having said that, therefore, the interval, the period must be a mandate or a categorical imperative as pointed out precisely by the speaker from South Africa.

We have had this misfortune of having to revise the ITR only after a period of about 20 years. And here we are again not sure as to whether we shall even call a meeting every eight years.

Mr. Chairman, as pointed out in fact by the delegate of Russia in their other document on the definition of terms like "Recommendation," like "Decision," like "Resolution," a Resolution -- and this is a Resolution -- is or consists of two parts. The rationale or the rational addenda, leading to the dispositive portion. But in every dispositive portion, it must no longer be an expression of preference. There is a portion that must express a mandate or a categorical imperative, which must be done or it must be followed without further recourse or debate.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Denmark is recognized.

>> DENMARK: Thank you, Chairman. And good afternoon to all colleagues.

Chairman, I have asked for the floor on behalf of the CEPT to echo the words of our Chairman from Cameroon and from the Ad Hoc Group and from our colleagues from Brazil who very precisely described that this DT document that is before the Committee is a sensitive compromise text. It is the result of a very constructive engagement from all ITU regions, and therefore it is the CEPT preference that we adopt the document, the compromise, that is as it stands in the DT before us.

I think -- I share the concerns that if we now start to open up this text and make amendments and additions, I'm afraid that we will risk not having an agreement on this very, very important issue. And I think the interventions shown so far on this issue have shown that there is a risk that views that regions have positively expressed before, but have engaged in a very sensible dialog to come to this compromise, will come back. And in the view of the precious time that is left on this conference and this Committee, I'm afraid that we risk not having an agreement.

So from the CEPT side, we would strongly urge this Committee to adopt the compromise in the DT text.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Canada followed by Argentina.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. Very briefly.

I want to strongly associate Canada with the observations and comments made by Brazil and by Denmark on behalf of the CEPT.

Mr. Chairman, CITEL made a substantial effort in the spirit of compromise to accommodate all other interested parties in the resulting text that we have in front of us. We had an informal meeting. Then we had an ad hoc meeting. This is the result of substantive dialog and compromise.

We urge all interested parties to acknowledge that fact and, Mr. Chairman, to adopt the current text as it stands.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Argentina followed by the United Arab Emirates. Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wanted to add my voice to the comments made by colleagues from Canada and Brazil. It seems to us that this was hard work that was done in the group that was chaired by our distinguished colleague from Cameroon. We believe that it is extremely important to understand that in an attempt to seek a consensus, we must all give in some matters and issues with which we came to this conference. And it's very important that this text be supported because it's a balance and the consensus that we all wish to attain at this conference where we worked very hard and even long hours during this weekend in order to come to a consensus.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The Emirates followed by Mexico.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to say that this document has been extensively discussed for long hours in order to reach the document we have between our hands. And, therefore, Mr. Chairman, if we open the discussion over this document, then we would have to take into consideration all comments of all administrations on this issue. Otherwise, we have to adopt the document as is.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mexico followed by Nigeria. Mexico, please.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon everyone.

We wanted to add our voice to the comments made by other colleagues such as Brazil, Argentina, Denmark, and the United Arab Emirates just now. Although this is a text, it is true, that does not have us all equally happy, we also have some other concerns. And in spite of that, we are willing to come to a consensus. And with that in mind we thought that the consensus had already been reached in the different groups headed in a very diligent and very able way in the last few days, where we spent countless hours trying to come up with a text that would be well balanced and well compromised.

We ask all delegates to support the text as it is in this document 54 and to move on with other issues that we understand are also important within this Committee and for this conference.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Nigeria followed by New Zealand.

>> NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, we are just on the second document, and it's more than 30 minutes now we have been discussing the second document and we are not moving forward.

Mr. Chairman, ad hoc groups, Working Groups were set up to look at various contributions. If compromises were reached at these various groups, I see no reason why when we come to the plenary we reopen discussion. If we are reopening discussion on a document, that implies that there was no compromise. And if there was no compromise, why then did we bring this document to plenary for adoption?

And so, Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with your situation, with the position delegates are putting you. But, however, I want to plead with delegates that if we have agreed that a particular document has been considered at the Ad Hoc Group and compromises have been reached, we should in this spirit of compromise adopt the document at plenary here.

And the fact is, when you said there has been compromise, certainly some Delegations will be agreed and some -- in fact, all delegates will be agreed, and some -- and not all will be happy. Compromise means give and take. You give this way and you take from the other side.

So I want to plead that we push ahead and see that this meeting moves forward. Because we do not have time and this is the last week we have. And if we continue like this, I believe we are not going to make any headway.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN: I thank the delegate of Nigeria who stole the words from my mouth, if I could say it that way.

We have very little time. And like you, I'm also surprised text which was discussed for a very long time, where we had compromise, are in fact being opened up again. I do not think that we're working in a very efficient way, unfortunately.

I do have some requests for the floor, New Zealand to be followed by Mali.

>> NEW ZEALAND: Thank you, Chairman. Good afternoon.

It would be fair to say that New Zealand does not support all of the aspects of the text in front of us. However, more importantly, we have reached an agreement in terms of how this text should be presented to the meeting. And that is more important to New Zealand than anything in the text that we don't like.

Mr. Chairman, in the spirit of compromise, we are happy for this text to go through and support the other interventions along the similar lines made by other administrations.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIRMAN: I thank the delegate of New Zealand for your readiness to make progress on this document.

I have Mali to be followed by Iran.

>> MALI: Thank you, Chairman.

As is traditional, Mali is a country of dialog and compromise and consensus, and we are following along those lines and general interests of the work of the Committee and of this conference, as a whole.

When we look at this work, we try to leave some aspects to one side so that we can make progress. So the way in which I understand the discussions is that Mali is going along the same lines as the only issue left is the "Should" or the "Shall." And I think perhaps the Chair can go to some of those countries who had an issue with this and try to find a compromise so that we can quickly adopt this draft Resolution.

So I have confidence in you to be able to bring together these two or three countries so that we can find a general understanding.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: I thank the delegate of Mali.

I would like to give the floor to Iran now. And Senegal. And then I would like to conclude.

Iran. Please.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In view of the general support given to that, we wish to associate ourselves and that you put your gavel and approve the document immediately without any more discussion, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: I didn't want to prevent Senegal from taking the floor if they also wish to follow this path.

>> SENEGAL: Yes, we wish to go in the same direction. Even though we did not participate in the Ad Hoc Group, it's difficult. We might have had some questions about certain parts of the document, and it's true that we had a document before from which we could have perhaps worked. But all of this was discussed in the informal meetings and the Ad Hoc Groups. This is a compromise document, as the Chair said. It is very -- it's a delegate compromise, but I would like to invite all States to understand this. Not everyone can be happy with the document. We all make concessions. And I would like to urge everyone to leave the document as it stands so that it may be adopted.

>> CHAIRMAN: I thank the delegate of Senegal. I believe that we should follow your wise advice.

So I would suggest that we adopt this document as it stands, even if we are not perfectly happy with it.

(Applause)

It is so decided. Thank you.

Thank you, everyone.

I would simply like to add one thing. I wished not to say it before. We spoke about the issue of "should" or "shall." But normally -- but the text, in fact, says "shall be normally."

I believe this leaves a certain flexibility and room for maneuver, and I think that could perhaps reassure some parties. The wording of this text should show them it's not an absolutely rigid stipulation or date.

I would also again like to thank all of you for your understanding, for your readiness to find a solution. I would also like to thank the Chair, who did not have an easy job to do, our colleague from Cameroon. I think it is a good decision that we have been able to make today. Thank you everyone.

I would suggest that we move on to the next document. I hope it will not be as difficult. That is agenda item 11. Draft revised Resolution 177 on conformance and interoperability. It is quite difficult to say in French. So this is document 57. Mr. Pasquali from Brazil is going to introduce this document and explain it to us. Thank you.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to present Resolution 177 and a new Resolution on counterfeit devices as they were both part of the same Ad Hoc Group.

The Ad Hoc Group held four sessions last week to deal with these two documents. After considerable discussions, I believe that the group arrived at a very good text and a very good result. The document DT/57 is a draft proposal for Resolution 177. And document DT/58 is a draft new Resolution combating counterfeit devices.

I'll not go into details of these documents, as they are a little long and we are running out of time. But I'll just like to acknowledge all the participants of that ad hoc for their constructive inputs and the spirit of compromise, and I'd like to especially thank the Secretariat, Mr. Reinhard and Ms. Xiaoya, who helped me a lot to complete this work. So not to take too much time, I put documents DT/57 and 58 to your consideration.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you for introducing these documents on conformance and interoperability. That is document 57. And document 58, also.

Document 57 to begin with. Are there any comments on this document or can we accept it as it stands?

I have requests from the floor. I hope not everything is going to be opened up again. I don't want to put pressure on delegates, but let us please try to find solutions together so that we can effectively come up with results.

Iran, you have the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Having experience of the previous document after half an hour discussion we come back to take it up as it was, so if there are no major problems, you take the document as it is and go ahead, immediately.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Arasteh, I see that you want us to gallop through the text, and I'm ready to do that if everyone else is, too.

The Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes, thank you, Chairman.

We also participated in the work of these groups. And we would like to express a gratitude to everyone, to the Secretariat and the Chair.

Nevertheless, we do have a small comment to make. The first comment is of an editorial nature. Because during our discussions we talked about removing the references to IMEI, International Mobile Equipment Identity in the text. But this is probably a technical issue. And we all agreed to remove it during the discussion from the entire text.

The second comment I wish to make is that we talked a great deal about the inclusion in this Resolution of recommendation x.1255, which covers all of the issues covering all mobile devices. And the question was how we could do this.

We analyzed the issue and it showed that at the Plenipotentiaries, when required, and we believe this is the case, that we can include recommendations of a basic nature in four Resolutions of the Plenipotentiary, we have such references, 101, 125 and so on.

And these recommendations were also approved through a traditional TEP -- TAP procedure, and we would like to consider this same approach.

>> CHAIRMAN: I thank the delegate of Russia. We are talking about document 57. Are you also speaking about document 57? Russia, please, go ahead.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes, we were talking about counterfeit. The counterfeit Resolution. We have no remarks to make on Resolution 177.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I was still on Resolution 177. I had not quite reached the Resolution on counterfeit devices.

I see there are no further requests for the floor on Resolution 177, conformance and interoperability. So we can adopt this document. Document 57. It is so adopted. So decided.

(Applause)

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So we're moving on now to document 58 on which the delegate from Russia had a few remarks. Shall I give you the floor again? Had you completely finished with your comments?

The delegate of Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes. Chair. Thank you.

Yes. We had these remarks which we made before and they were, in fact, with regard to the Resolution on counterfeit devices.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The Dominican Republic, you have the floor.

>> DOMINICAN REPUBLIC: Thank you, Chair.

I believe from the discussions that there was an agreement on removing IMEI references in the -- in the "resolves" and in the "instructions." But I believe that the compromise was that it did no harm to just mention it as an example of device identifiers in the "Recognizes," so I think it's appropriate that we would still leave that in there.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I see no further requests from the floor.

The delegate of Russia, do you insist upon your amendments? Is it truly crucial or can we move on? Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Our question was simply that during the discussions we agreed to remove this reference throughout the text. This was not only the opinion of the Russia Federation. We simply ask this question. This does not mean that it is of crucial importance simply for the Russian Federation.

If during the discussions at the ad hoc meetings we took that decision, then we understand that it is simply a technical issue and we can remove it. If colleagues say that we can leave it and it has no influence on anything, then in any case I think that we could in fact leave it out.

>> CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. I'm working on a French text. I was wondering whether you could tell me exactly where it is. Thank you.

Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes, Chairman.

I simply wish to say that it's under "Recognizing" under "Subparagraph E." Subparagraph E.

Simply if we put in one example, that we need to put in several. And if we're not going to put in any example, then it perhaps would be better simply to remove it.

Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that clarification. I believe that everyone was able to find where the reference was.

Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDIA ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman.

Firstly, I would like to thank our dear colleague, the representative of Brazil, for the enormous amount of work undertaken to come up with this document.

I would also like to note what the delegate of Russia said; namely, regarding the need to refer to X.1255 identifiers. So as to put this somewhere under "Recognizing" I would also like us to add in an example with a device identification equipment. IMEI.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I give the floor to Brazil again.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair. I believe our colleague from the Dominican Republic said it well, at least what I recall from our meetings. We have decided to remove the IMEI reference in the "Resolves" because we had, I believe, two references to that after the "Resolves" part. But we went up to the "Considerings" as well, and at least as I recall it we agreed to retain it in the "Recognizing" since we're recognizing just the fact, since something is actually happening.

But again, Chairman, this was a very compromised text. It led to a lot of discussion, and again I'm really worried we start debating specific issues in it right now.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: I thank the delegate of Brazil.

So it would seem that there was a long and difficult discussion regarding these references. And what I would suggest is that we don't open up the debate again and adopt things as they are, so that we do not lose time at plenary on these issues, which are details.

The Russian Federation, are you insisting on taking the floor?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes, Chairman. Thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to clarify our position.

We are a little struck that we are looking at the work of one organization under the "Recognizing" when in fact the work of our organization is not within its sphere. And when we put in IMEI, we should also denote other alternatives here. We should also identify other alternatives, otherwise we risk becoming subjected to one example. And we should consider this problem.

And we would like to ask our colleagues to think about this.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We have understood the meaning of your intervention. At least one example is an example from inter alia from others. We are simply citing one entity out of others in this particular point. Clearly we cannot cite a whole list of them. I did not take part in these discussions, but it would seem that this compromise was also concerning the mention of this example under A.

I'm going to give the floor to Canada and then I hope we will be able to conclude on this document. Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Yes, thank you, Chairman. Very briefly.

There was agreement to remove the reference to the IMEI from the "Resolves" to keep it in the "Recognizing."

Also it references here using qualifying terms like "Such as." I think it's clear, it's consistent with the discussions held. And again, Mr. Chairman, we encourage you to use your gavel as soon as possible.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I'm going to try and follow your advice.

So it seems to me quite clearly that keeping this example is part of the compromise. Since it is a compromise, I would suggest that we don't open the discussions up again. Because if we start discussing examples, we're not going to finish. So what I would propose is that we adopt this text as it stands, as a compromise.

I would like to request that if you cannot accept this compromise, that you please mention it. But to withdraw your request for the floor.

Saudi Arabia, South Africa, and Tunisia, are you insisting on us opening up the discussion again? We have four minutes left this evening.

So Saudi Arabia I'll give you the floor.

>> SAUDIA ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We could, I mean, accept the reference to the IMEI. However, maybe it's -- we would request also just to bring under "Recognizing" the reference to ITU-T recommendation X.1255. And I could provide very simple text under "Recognizing" that "ITU-T recommendation X.1255, which is based on the digital object architecture, provides a framework for discovery of identity management information." So this is a straight recalling from an ITU recommendation, ITU-T recommendation.

So we would, as a way forward, accept the existing text but adding this under "Recognizing."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN: South Africa, please.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, Chairperson. I think it's just really just a very small amendment that we're being asked to make, just to introduce some balance into the text. So we would support this small amendment, Chairperson.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Tunisia, please.

>> TUNISIA: Thank you, Chairman.

I wanted to follow on from the proposal made by Saudi Arabia. We had a consensus -- and I would like to confirm that. Yes. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Could we give the floor to Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes. Thank you very much, Chairman.

We would like to thank Saudi Arabia for this excellent compromise, which we support with pleasure.

Yes, as South Africa said, it would be a good balance and we support this proposal.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Very well, then. Last try. I hope that everyone will be able to agree with this. We would simply add in this reference to recommendation X.1255. Is everyone in agreement with that? It is so decided.

(Applause)

>> CHAIRMAN: I will confess to you, I do not know what x.1255 contains, but I'm certain that the Secretariat will be able to explain it to me later. I must confess I do not know the text. So I'm very glad that we were able to find this solution.

We are going to suspend our work here and we will start again tomorrow. Tomorrow morning. Because we still have some documents to consider. Once again, I'd like to thank all of you for your spirit of cooperation. And I will see you again tomorrow.

I would like to thank all of the chairs of the various groups who had had a great deal of work to do in order to enable us to adopt a number of documents today.

Have a good evening and I'll see you again tomorrow.

(End of meeting, 17:30)
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