

FINISHED FILE

ITU WORLD TELECOMMUNICATION DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE 2017
BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA

13 OCTOBER, 2017

14:30

WG-PL

Services Provided By:

Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-482-9835
www.captionfirst.com

This text is being provided in a rough draft format.
Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in
order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a
totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

>> CHAIR: Dear friends, we have limited time so we have to
start our meeting I'm afraid.

So I have had one Drafting Group, one informal
consultation. May I ask my Vice-Chair from Singapore to report
on the result of the Drafting Group or ad hoc group or whatever
you want to call it.

Please, Singapore, you have the floor.

>> SINGAPORE: Thank you, Chairman.

The Drafting Group met during lunch between 12:30 to 2:15.
I'm happy to report that the Drafting Group, our objective, to
outcome, we have put up the square brackets. If I could ask the
Secretariat to project the text on screen that would be very
helpful.

>> CHAIR: The text is there so you can illustrate.

2.3. Am I correct?

The agreed text now reads strengthen capacity of Member
States to use telecom education/ICT for disaster risk
management -- reduction and management and availability of the
emergency telecommunication and support cooperation in this
area. This was agreed during the Drafting Group.

Can I ask the meeting if we can -- sorry to interrupt you,
since you -- there's something, approve these 2.3.

No requests for the floor.

Singapore, please proceed.

>> SINGAPORE: An outcome 2.1, we have had discussions that we have not managed to put up square brackets or reach a resolution, it is the first para that you see enhanced capacity of membership to available resilient telecommunication/ICT infrastructure and services, including wireless broadband, rural, remote areas, globally, the Digital Stabilization Act and conformance and effective and efficient management and proper use of international telecommunication resources within the mandate, including the transition to digital broadcasting. That's the first option.

The second option is reading enhanced capacity of ITU membership to telecommunication/ICT infrastructure and services.

>> CHAIR: You have still not solved -- you need some time to decide which of the two options will be the best one is the question to you?

>> Yes. We require more time to work through the two texts on the table.

>> CHAIR: The remaining third item?

Can I finish the presentation and after welcome back with the intervention, please, Vice-Chairman?

>> SINGAPORE: Yes.

We did not have the discussion on the third item, cybersecurity. We require more time to work on that.

>> CHAIR: It is clear to me that you need the next meeting and after with the Secretariat we'll see how that is feasible and it will be announced accordingly. Very likely it will be Saturday, am I correct? Or before? I don't know. It is up to you.

You prefer to finish if possible today or is it okay for you to meet on Saturday? A question to my friend, Vice-Chairman.

>> SINGAPORE: Chairman, if possible I prefer to meet tomorrow. I think we all have a long day today.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: We'll act accordingly. Thank you.

I do not see for the time being -- we were having informal consultation -- you changed sides! That's the reason why I don't see you! Sorry.

Can you refer -- before you refer, I want to thank the Vice-Chair for the work.

She has all my support to reach conclusion. Thank you very much.

Yes. Sorry.

>> Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.
Good afternoon to all colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, we have -- I had some informal consultation with a number of colleagues who joined me after the closing of the last session of the Working Group of plenary. After examining the text and some consultation with colleagues from CPD I would propose the following text, the following text was discussed and agreed, therefore it would read as follows: Strengthened capacity of ITU membership to develop strategies, policies and practices for digital inclusion for Persons with Disabilities and persons with specific needs, especially for the empowerment of Women and Girls.

The remaining text goes out.

Yes. So there was an issue, Mr. Chairman, that Women and Girls are part of persons with specific needs so for that reason and since the CPD has a proposal and they want to emphasize the importance of Women and Girls we have drafted this way this order to include that. With regard to Resolution 175 of the plenipotentiary conference, the title clearly differentiates between the two. The title is telecommunication/information and communication technology, accessibility for persons with be disabilities and persons with specific needs. This is the text that we have reached out and this is agreed text.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Can we agree on the proposal? I see no requests for the floor.

ATDI.

>> ATDI: Thank you, Chairman.

Very good work was done during the break.

Regarding the second proposal of Singapore, 2.1, the propose is two ways, one very simply and we propose to adopt it so we don't need to go with respect to management and respect to monitoring digital analog to digital, it was a very good text. I think we can -- exactly here.

The Option 2, it is excellent: Enhanced capacity of membership to make available to telecommunications. Why you need all of the rest that's going there and it is confusing. I heard you say in the morning that the transition digital to -- the analog to digital, there was a question.

The second option I think that we can adopt it easily.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: I can make a try. I don't want to reopen and don't give the opportunity to the Vice-Chairman to have the satisfaction to come with a common solution.

You have asked for the floor?

>> Thank you very much, Chair. I'm not intervening on D1.1 but the rewording that the U.A.E. proposed.

>> CHAIR: Yes. You are agreeing on the rewording or you

have a proposal?

>> The new wording we believe, pardon the expression, is worse than the previous one. We're trying to have -- to build consensus, but to say this as it is on the screen is as if Women and Girls are necessarily having specific needs. I don't think that this is the spirit of the previous wording that we had so we would like to, of course, strengthen to the role of Women and Girls, empower them, but that doesn't necessarily mean that they have specific needs. So TOGO would like to go back to the original wording and we believe that's more appropriate.

>> CHAIR: I will ask for a proposed proposition on agreed text.

Korea.

>> KOREA: Thank you, Chair.

Two points: One is for the one shown on the screen. We found that during the discussions difference in entitled and WTDC and also U.N. wording. My need to discuss for future PP meeting anyhow as you're aware, we respect to the highest level the resolution of PP and that's not the recent one. That's why.

Another point is that the option on 2. We had discussion under Option 1 and we found the components of the including part may be better to promote 2 in output part or action plan part rather than here. That's why we take the proposal here and put it under Option 1 so it could be respected in the main part of the output part.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. It is clear to me.

United States.

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

Good afternoon.

Are we going to go back to 4-3? We had some concerns with the way that the text is formulated on the screen.

>> CHAIR: Yes. I'm afraid we'll ask Marcel to have a formal meeting to come to solution.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair.

So we have some -- especially for the empowerment of Women and Girls, the text the way it is formulated now, it means that we are -- actually I don't understand it. If we could have some offline discussions from U.A.E. I believe is who coordinated this text. If we're going to -- we had a problem with empowerment of Women and Girls, it should go after digital inclusion, empowerment of Women and Girls, for Persons with Disabilities and Specific Needs. It should not be formulated the way it is on the screen.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Are you willing to -- I know you prefer to continue in

informal discussion during the break, it is up to you or form a meeting, I leave to you really. What is your preference?

>> Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

After the last session I invited all interested colleagues to join me but still seems to be others that did not join the meeting and the discussion, they still have some views. I believe it is more appropriate to have a formal group where everyone can join, maybe the Secretariat can check if a room is available, but please if possible to be have it maybe tomorrow early morning or today late, not to be -- I mean in parallel with other sessions. Personally, Mr. Chairman, I'm involved in many, many discussions and I would appreciate if it is possible not to have it overlapping with other sessions.

The discussion that we had, Mr. Chairman, when we come -- I mean, we had the Secretariat with us, a representative from BDT and it was collaborated in the last action plan persons with Specific Needs included Women and Girls. For that reason, this text was reformulated to say especially for empowerment of Women and Girls given those two categories are within that category and persons with Specific Needs. However, I do agree that since there are still comments we will have a formal discussion and hopefully we can come to the next session of the Working Group and plenary with agreed text.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your understanding. That was my preferred solution because since there are still -- it will be announced, a formal meeting, we'll try to avoid overlap but there are so many activities going on Saturday that I'm afraid it will be rather difficult.

You're wanting the floor, South Africa Republic?

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Honorable chairperson, I think during our discussions we were focusing more on the issue of persons with disability vis-a-vis also persons with Specific Needs and I do believe that the U.S. is right in saying that we do not really engage in terms of, you know, Women and Girls. I don't think it would be controversial to actually remove the -- you know, rearrange the text so that it reflects what you're talking about because I think the concern was mainly that let's have a distinction between, you know, the two when it comes to Persons with Disabilities and Persons with Specific Needs which will include that.

>> CHAIR: United States, you have the solution for the meeting?

Please, United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: And for persons, not -- thank you Chairman.

Yes, we would be interested in participating in the small

group. It's -- as South Africa has indicated, we don't have a problem with the words, just where it is located.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So I'm afraid you'll have to reconvene your group on Saturday.

Good luck.

Now we have finished with the strategy plan. What's feasible for the benefit of the time being.

I want to move to the Declaration which we have not touched for the time being. As you're aware, for declaration we have had a similar process as for the strategy plan. The director has already launched this three years ago in '15 and established the correspondence group that I have had the honor to Chair and it was a review at the last architects meeting, the last meeting, the documents to meet through the various RPM as agreed at the last TDAG meeting, the document, but the members are preparing proposals to the WTDC17. Therefore, we use TDAG document 9 as a basis for discussion. There have been several contributions to this document and I ask shortly the various members to present the main point I want to outline on these declaration.

I start with the document presented by the African Union, WTDC1719, so maybe you can present the main point very shortly.

Zimbabwe, Côte d'Ivoire? One of the two? No problem. Who? Zimbabwe.

>> ZIMBABWE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I present the proposal from the African Group and the proposal is to include the protection of children in the declaration and the need for children. That's the proposal from Africa. It had been left out in the draft declaration that we had when we noticed that it had been in the previous declaration, the Dubai Declaration but had been left out, and it is something that the African Group believes should be part of the declaration from Argentina.

I thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the clear presentation, and what you want to obtain.

After we ask the CITELE to present the 17/20 Addendum 2 with the same short importance of Africa did.

Please, CITELE.

Someone from CITELE? Please.

>> CITELE: Good afternoon. Thank you very much, Chair.

Uruguay on behalf of CITELE is going to briefly introduce its proposal for the Buenos Aires Declaration. We understand it is crucial that there needs to be an enabling factor to provide an impetus to the timely application of the action lines of the world summit of Information Society to contribute to efforts to

achieve the Sustainable Development Goals and targets.

We believe it is crucial for the ITU-D to tap and look at the existing links between the WSIS action lines and the Sustainable Development Goals and targets through the regional initiatives and action plan by contributing to the strategic plan in or the to support global evolution. Moreover, we recognize it is important that it is a reflection, the Buenos Aires Declaration.

Just one moment. I had left out one clarification.

It is reflected in the Buenos Aires Declaration that in order to reduce the digital divide it's possible to continue to strengthen public private models and public private partnerships in order to find a financing mechanism in order to sustain the sustainable and inclusive development.

>> CHAIR: Don't forget, the Director says it should be an eye-level declaration, the feeling of the conference, the development goals, and we should not repeat declaration in general what is in the strategic national plan, should be high-level vision.

Anyway, Arab States presenting document, thank you for your contribution.

70-21, Addendum 30.

Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

With regards to the special declaration of the WTDC in Buenos Aires, at the outset we would like to refer to the recognizing which refers to the implementation of the region of WSIS after the year 2015 and we would like to refer to the resolution of the United Nations National Assembly, 8/70/1.

We would like to refer in the third paragraph and 5th and 7th, the necessity to add the term services in addition to applications because there is distinction between the two meanings and then we come to base on all of this, first of all, the development sector in the ITU was strengthened relationships between the WSIS and the objectives of the Sustainable Developments and that they should combine between the two societies.

We would also like to refer that it is important to increase the participation to Developing Countries in the activities of the ITU with regards to closing the standardization and digital gaps, that these countries can benefit from the economic benefits due to technological advancements. We would like to emphasize that we should have an efficient management of spectrum which is important for regulating authorities and broadcasting bodies and other concerned parties.

We would also refer that building confidence and safety and

security in the use of communications has to be for peaceful purposes and in order to achieve development and we emphasize that we have to protect personal data and we emphasize with regards to coordination that there be coordination cooperation both at the regional and international levels.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the presentation, Egypt.

Now we have APT with document 70/22, Addendum 30. Someone from APT?

Japan, please.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good afternoon, everyone.

On behalf of APT members, I would like to make a presentation of our proposal for the draft of the declaration.

We have our discussion on the APT meeting with respect of the TDAG document and taken into account the hierarchy of this document.

First, our proposal is to mention accessibility particularly to other interesting issues and next is the mention of the development in society and this economy and also we emphasize the importance of the international connectivity. Then -- so for the example of emerging technology, they reinsert the word of Artificial Intelligence with the Internet of Things.

Then also the considering importance of the disaster management so we established the one individual item to emphasize the importance of the disaster arrangement. And it has the crucial role of ICT in disaster management.

The rest, also the -- we mention on the importance of the resource modernization of our activities, and these are the proposals.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan, for the presentation.

Now we will ask the representative of RCC to present document 70/23, Addendum 1, Revision 1.

Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman.

Good afternoon, colleagues.

In the contribution from the RCC countries we're proposing to make a number of clarifications and Amendments pertaining to references to resolution by the General Assembly of the United Nations to clarify some wording and to reflect trends with regard to the development and the growing role of ICTs and telecommunications in the economic and social

development of communities over recent years to reflect the opinions of various other regional organizations and the results of the discussions at the meeting of the TDAG in 2017.

We believe that the declaration should reflect the main strategic objectives of the ITU reflecting firstly the interests of Developing Countries.

At the same time, the text should reflect the specific task, objectives of the ITU-D in respect with the basic documents of the Union. We should avoid any overlap between various sections in comparison to the text that was prepared by TDAG we propose with an inclusion in the declaration of some paragraphs, in particular on the effective management of the use of the radio spectrum including not allowing the creation of interference, harmful interference.

Overcoming standardization gaps and digital transformation in particular the creation and implementation of a Digital Economy. These proposals are also reflected in the contributions from a number of other regional organizations.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the introduction. Sorry to call you by name, but since I know you, I use it to get this way.

We will later on have the eventual general discussion but I want to end the presentation. The CPT, document 70/44, Addendum 1.

Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, so we don't know each other well enough obviously!

Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief because there will be detailed discussions of the different Amendments later on in the Drafting Group. Our document is based, of course, on the version developed by TDAG and it already took on board some of the proposals from the SSC, the proposals that were known after the regional preparatory meeting of the SSC region.

We believe that this proposal does not affect the substance of the version developed by TDAG but improve in the sense of clarifying very appropriate the language of the draft declaration. In addition, we introduced Agenda element into it, we believe that this is appropriate taken into account the high recognition of the ITU received for its gender-related activities at the recent G20 summit meetings in Germany.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

I'll let the whole meeting know that we are old friends. This is true.

Now the last document is document 45.

ODS, please, introduce the document.

>> ODS: Thank you very much, Chair, for the opportunity to comment on the document, including some additions that we considered could be relevant and important to reflect on the declaration to allow all technologies to be recognized and part of this discussion. We will go into the detail of them and I'm happy to talk later.

Now I formally open the floor if there are from the floor requests for specific questions or points that you need to be discussed at the plenary level and not to go in detail. The only message I can tell was the message from the director since the beginning, the first TDAG meeting where the group was created, please make a line-level declaration that can reach people not familiar with our technological world, but that they can have worldwide. This was the message given by Director at the beginning and has been repeated by the way during this conference.

I open the floor for any requests for clarification questions. If none, we have a completion of all the proposals submitted and this is -- it is not posted? -- sorry. The conclusion would be posted for the Ad Hoc Group that I intend to create.

Since I come to the other, I'm taking all of my Vice-Chairman, I will ask my Vice-Chair from South Africa if she's willing to Chair the Ad Hoc Group during the weekend.

South Africa?

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Chairperson, I'm always at your service. We want to complete this work in a successful way.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Very kind of you. I thank you as I thank the Vice-Chair of Singapore. The other Vice-Chairs, I have to thank also them and don't be afraid with me, you will always have something to do.

The document compilation is DL5.

Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman.

We wanted to ask you and the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group if the meeting of this Ad Hoc Group could be held not in parallel with the Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 1

and Resolution 31. Otherwise it would be quite difficult for us to participate if these are held in parallel.

>> CHAIR: The group resolution is running all day on Saturday. There are some problems, but at the Secretariat level they will try to find a possible solution.

In our case, the only thing we can do to not have parallel group so for example not working with the one group and the declaration, maybe after I can ask Marcel and two Vice-Chairman to come here and to decide the timing they prefer so that we can adjust accordingly. If we repost, don't worry, nothing is secret, it is public.

Any further requests for clarification?

If not, I think we have completed today and the interpreters will be grateful.

I remind that I give back some time.

Really we have prepared a possible way forward for the declaration also, including all proposal. That's if you allow, we can post today and we, the Secretariat, you can criticize, whatever you want to criticize but this is a summary of the compilation. If you allow me, we can post these documents.

ATDI.

>> ATDI: Thank you, Chair.

If you have it in your computer, maybe we can start the draft group of South Africa instead of Saturday, now we have one hour. So for sure, some of the issues can be discussed for this hour.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: That's a good suggestion, maybe. I don't know if we can post these -- the suggestion is to try to avoid the plan and to try to find the solution. We post the compilation of the declaration for tomorrow meeting.

Vice-Chairmen, are you willing to continue and we can reopen the discussion? We can project the three points, the two remaining points and see if we can come to a solution? Please. Singapore, can you -- Vice-Chairman, Singapore, please.

>> SINGAPORE: Yes. I think we can continue discussions on the strategic plan.

>> CHAIR: Can we project the remaining two items so we can try to agree on that?

It was 2D1 and 2D2 if my memory is correct. Yes.

DTI was proposing to Option 2, simplify the matter and put the end of the matter in the output or in the

operational plan. Can the meeting agree on Option 2?

I see no requests from the floor.

Option two is adopted. Good suggestion. We are progressing.

Now we can go to 2.2.

I give the floor to Singapore to see if it is possible to find a way out, the Vice-Chairman, please.

>> SINGAPORE: Thank you, Chair. During the Drafting Group we did not manage to discuss this item.

If I may, I would just like to repeat and read out the sentence that's on the screen right now, Member States capacity to effectively share information, find solution and respond to threats to cybersecurity and develop an international cybersecurity strategies and capabilities including capacity building, national, regional and international mechanisms and cooperation to enhance engagement among Member States and relevant players.

>> CHAIR: Can we agree on this proposed text?

ATDI.

>> ATDI: Thank you.

So the brackets here so we can agree with the brackets. Again, take off the brackets and stop including capacity building. The issue is the brackets for sure are representing the only one thing that the sector members who speaks. For sure when you write Member States, please write membership.

To conclude, you may take off -- I don't think the last bracket, only the first bracket I see, but in any case bracket shouldn't be there and if you leave the text, please instead of among Member States and relevant players please write membership and relevant player. We already discussed it on Monday this week.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: United States.

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

Regarding the bracketed language we would propose to delete the language to transition between bracketed language to deletion.

The reason for this, it is difficult to understand the nature and outcome product from the development of sector of the ITU on the international mechanisms of cooperation and it just seems out of place in this context. Alternatively, if we can have a discussion regarding what is intended and what kind of an outcome is desired under mechanisms of cooperation we are quite open to such a discussion and this is the -- the words

are particularly highlighted when they are preceded by international. Are we talking about treaties of some sort, and in which case which?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Czech Republic.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First we would like to support the intervention about international part and the second one, is that we would like to support the wording that's on the screen involving Member States because the national strategies are meant only -- let's say approved by Member States, not by the industry. We understand that the industry also has its own -- teaches about more or less the business strategies are not national law strategies so we would like to support this wording. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay.

South Africa, please.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you very much, Honorable chairperson.

For us it's important to have international mechanism of cooperation when it comes especially to issues of cybersecurity because it cuts across borders. For us I think -- Amendments made in terms of that proposal, we would like to retain that because it is a very important aspect of actually trying to take care of this problem which is going across boarders for all Member States.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

I agree with the opinion made by South Africa because we're dealing with what is international in this international conference. Hence, we have to have a plan of action that looks into the national, the regional and the international, three levels and this is important with regards to cybersecurity and therefore we would like to see the expression international or the term international in that text.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: I listen to all, and after we will see a way forward. There are two different opinions.

Brazil, please.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is just to support South Africa and Saudi Arabia. We believe we should have distance retained and as an outcome we could just be highlighted as an example the impact, even though it is not existing anymore, it is no longer usual, it is a successful example of international

mechanism of cooperation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil.

Estonia.

>> ESTONIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We support the position taken by South Africa and would prefer to have the text relating to international mechanisms because without some kind of systematic cooperation method it would be difficult to deal with cyberthreats for a single country.

I thank you.

>> CHAIR: Was that -- China.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Given the cross-border nature of cybersecurity we think that the international cooperation and relevant mechanism of cybersecurity is quite necessary. So China supports the previous Delegations. We should maintain the expression of international cooperation.

I thank you.

>> CHAIR: United States.

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

The United States at this time can't support the text on the screen. For us, it is unclear what kind of mechanisms of cooperation are envisioned here. Generally, but also in the context of the D sector. The outcome seems to be focused on capacity building for cybersecurity which we support. The notion of mechanisms for cooperation is not clear here.

We -- it seems to be calling for support for new mechanisms. Rather -- we would propose the following text as a way forward and I'll read it in dictation speed: Strengthen Member States capacity to affectively share information and respond to threats to cybersecurity and to develop and implement national cybersecurity strategies and capabilities including through capacity building.

>> CHAIR: I'm afraid it was not completely at dictation speed, but I will know if you capture the text? Shall we repeat? Is that the text you were reading?

Russia has requested the floor.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman.

We believe that the issue of security is an international one. On a national level it is very difficult to resolve this issue alone. We fully support the position expressed by South Africa and Saudi Arabia and by other colleagues.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Germany.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Chairman.

Well, speaking as Germany and not as Europe, we have difficulties similar to the United States with mentioning of international mechanisms of cooperation in this regard. We cannot accept such a text.

And in addition, we don't know how this should be dealt with within the BDT, if at all I guess this is more of an ITU issue maybe to be discussed at the plenipotentiary conference.

We would support the proposal of the United States with regard to the text as it was. We have no problem, for example, that capacity building is done at national, regional, even international level, but we oppose against the mechanisms of cooperation. I would remind you that there is roles and I guess a relatively successful program of the BDT establishing a national and regional cyberincident response teams, but this we do not challenge at all but the international mechanisms of cooperation, we are unfortunately not in the position to accept.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

I have Côte d'Ivoire, Brazil, Czech Republic and after we have to stop because we are repeating different arguments.

Japan.

Côte d'Ivoire, please, you have the floor.

>> CÔTE D'IVOIRE: Thank you, Chair.

Like the other Delegations that spoke, I would like to clarify that the world is working more and more online and there is machine to machine communication, Internet of Things, a cyberattack now would be more catastrophic than 5, 10 years ago. It would be better in order to address these challenges and ensure we can have secure ICTs, it would be better to have an international mechanism for cooperation so that we can address these challenges. Therefore, we support all of the proposals that were made seeking to have an international mechanism of cooperation.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Botswana.

>> BOTSWANA: Thank you, Chair.

We support the position that Côte d'Ivoire has just said.

I think the issue of regional and international

mechanism and cooperation, you know, whatever else we speak right now, you know, ITU is assisting many countries and they do cooperate and those are international mechanisms that are about sharing the information, without the government, without other organizations which we accept, we are an organization assisting Member States with regard to the information. Really I don't see why it is a problem for the ITU in terms of assisting other countries, details have been indicated. Cybersecurity is an international issue. You can't have issues with these communities, you cut across borders. On rare occasion you will see that with other countries. Most of the terms, they come from outside of the country. It is very, very important to have the mechanism and share the information of the cyberthreats.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: I have Czech Republic, Japan, United Kingdom, Uruguay and United States. We stop the list there.

Czech Republic, please.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Well, discussing about this issue, we would like first to support the proposal that the U.S. made, the text that was proposed and also the German comment.

Further, we would like to express that it is true that the text across the board never goes as they are always two-part issue. Taken part, the part that's receiving. It is a national matter. We would like to stress this, and to be very cautious about the international cooperation.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Chair. Japan also has the same concern with the U.S., Germany and Czech Republic. We, Japan, also think that ITU-D focus area is capacity building or best practice sharing or those kinds of things. I'm just thinking -- this is Japanese proposal, how about to delete that starting with national, regional and international mechanism and input somewhat after share information at national, regional, international review.

So with respect to the international cooperation, they're working together, what if you focus on the knowledge sharing or the capacity building.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan, for this proposal.

That's -- I don't know if you have captured? You have captured. Yes.

United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chairman.

The United Kingdom agrees with the proposals and comments made by Japan, Germany and U.S. We're not clear what's meant bit the reference to mechanisms and that there is no relation to existing working within the D sector.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Uruguay.

>> URUGUAY: Thank you, Chairman.

Some of us have worked on cybersecurity and we are aware that there is no such thing as particularly on a local basis from attacks. You can be attacked, but the attacker could be abroad, they could be at home, it could be somewhere between the two. We know the only way of effectively counteracting a cyberattack when it is a large scale one involves one way or another a kind of collaboration which goes beyond local borders. Therefore, for the sake of seeing whether we come up with a consensus tasker we would like to suggest keeping the text of D2.2 as it was before the proposals, simply what we were proposed would be adding the mechanism straight from Member States capacities to effectively share information and find solutions and respond to threats to cybersecurity and to develop and implement national strategies.

>> CHAIR: Establishes including capacity and national and international cooperation engagement among Member States and players.

Thank you, Uruguay, for this constructive proposal which is very similar to that which was made by Japan.

I give the floor to Canada.

Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman.

Just very briefly to associate ourselves with the intervention of Japan, we believe that they have provided alternative language that in our view addresses the concerns of the meeting.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Can we agree on this proposal that's really covering all things without entering into much detail? If you agree on this proposal you don't have to request the floor, if you see a problem, request the floor.

United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Would you mind reading

the Japan proposal again, please?

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Put it on the screen? Strengthen Member States -- sorry.

Member States capacity to effectively share information and find solution and respond to threats to cybersecurity and to develop and implement national strategy and capability including capacity building, national, regional cooperation and management and specific engagement among Member States and relevant players toward enhanced engagement.

Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you.

I would like to speak on behalf of -- I wouldn't want to speak on behalf of Japan, our understanding is that the Japanese proposal would end at including capacity building, full stop with the deletion of the remaining part of that paragraph.

Again, it is up to, of course, our Japanese colleagues and friends to confirm whether my understanding is correct or not.

>> CHAIR: I was taking notes of the Uruguay proposal and merged the two.

Uruguay, can I have better clarification when you're speaking also in English before, is the text on the screen what the proposal is or is it different?

>> URUGUAY: Thank you, Chairman.

The text which is on the screen is what Uruguay is proposing. You're quite right.

>> CHAIR: That was my understanding. I found this text as a possible compromise. That's the reason why I was grateful to Uruguay. Please, there is still time to think.

Okay. Kindly thanks Uruguay for the proposal.

Czech Republic, we cannot -- I was open to thank you.

Czech Republic.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for -- sorry to spoil the moment.

Well, reading the text we still have this national Agenda and international cooperation. It doesn't -- what we understood Japan proposed was to have capacity building on national, regional and international levels so this is a bit different text and we're -- we tend not to support this because this is cooperation that's in the cybersecurity which is really quite -- quite a problem for us. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Is the text on the screen a series of

compromise, it is not perfect, but I think it is a way of maintaining the international and the example quoted, it is really an in between. I was hoping that the meeting can accept, but I see that you have some problems.

Senegal, you may solve the problem. Senegal.

>> SENEGAL: Thank you very much, Chair. I think as was said before, cybersecurity is international by dimension and cooperation is key to address this. The wording proposed, that we could propose on top of this is that after implement that we have encourage national and international cooperation. After capacity building encourage national, regional and international cooperation so that could help countries that are having problems so far.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the proposal, Senegal. South Africa.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you very much, Honorable chairperson.

We're trying to move forward. I think the issue while listening was about mechanisms, they're objecting to international cooperation, we're asking what kind of mechanisms and that's been taken out of the text which means we're merely talking international cooperation.

Chairperson, can we have an understanding what is the objection? Member States don't want international cooperation on an issue which is across borders? I think really we have the same problem here as Member States where we have cyberattacks from across our borders, which is international so we want an understanding of what is the issue with the text as currently proposed.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: With the addition of Senegal, this is also -- can the Czech Republic accept -- and the others -- accept these texts we have shown on the screen? I see no requests for the floor. I thank Senegal, with the last proposal, the text is adopted.

Thank you.

Is there a -- yes.

Since we still have some time, it instead of meeting tomorrow, can you try to come to a conclusion to your point and we project your subject so that tomorrow would be free to attend the declaration and other matters?

Please go ahead.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Thanks also to the dear colleague from BDT for the clarifications.

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, if you look at the final acts of the plenipotentiary conference, in one resolution it mentioned that there are two categories, persons of disability and Persons with Specific Needs. Where Resolution 71 there is a definition of persons with specific needs which includes as well Persons with Disabilities. So there is inconsistency within the text of the Union. It makes this difficulty for many of us. Therefore, in order to find the solution, I do have a proposal, Mr. Chairman, if we can type it on the screen.

Strengthen capacity of ITU membership to develop strategies, policies and practices for digital inclusion especially for the empowerment of Women and Girls -- sorry, for the empowerment of women, girls, youth, Indigenous Peoples and Persons with Disabilities. We don't mention the term people with Specific Needs and this needs to be clarified in the plenipotentiary conference. Either we keep it and we have a clear definition or we take out this term from all documents of the ITU. Even I try to look at the U.N. definition, it is still very confusing, Mr. Chairman. With that, I would propose to take out the Persons with Specific Needs, take out -- add from the text and I propose the following wording as shown on the screen if this is acceptable to everyone.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

It is rather late, I need some time to -- okay dear friend.

TOGO, please.

>> TOGO: TOGO is satisfied with this wording, it is more suitable. The key point is that we need to be sure that what we want to cover under people with specific needs is Women, Girls, Youth, Indigenous Peoples. These are the people in order to take into account under the expression Persons with Specific Needs is covered. So that poses no problem. So TOGO is satisfied with this new wording option.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Very good news!

Senegal.

>> SENEGAL: Thank you, Chair.

I think that persons with specific needs is a widely used term in the ITU. I recognize the consent of countries who do not want to consider Women and Girls to

be people with Specific Needs, I understand this full well. It is a question of wording. Indeed we needed to, as was proposed by the U.E., especially for the empowerment of women, girls, et cetera, but what I believe is that we need to add after Persons with Disabilities we should also add Persons with Specific Needs because then that would cover some people entities covered under the ITU, I agree with the wording but would like to add at the end of the sentence people with Specific Needs.

Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: My understanding from the introduction of the Chairman, of the convener, to say, it was practically, that he was trying to enumerate the person with person with Specific Needs, that's a way out to solve the problem.

Is that correct? United Arab Emirates?

You are not on the list, but you're the one I'm giving the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMERITES: Thank you. I requested the floor, but it seems that maybe there is a small technical problem.

Mr. Chairman, if we look at Resolution 71 of the plenipotentiary conference, Persons with Specific Needs is defined as follows: -- sorry, it is not even persons. We use people where Resolution 175 uses the term persons. There is inconsistency even in the terminology, if I may say.

People with Specific Needs are Indigenous people, People with Disabilities, including age-related disabilities, Youth, Women and Girls. Then if we go to Resolution 175 it says -- the technologies as used -- being used indicating that there are two different categories so maybe the way out is as I propose, Mr. Chairman, but in order to not limit the categories maybe we can reduce some text to say including digital inclusion especially instead of especially, maybe we can say -- to have a term that we say that this list is not exclusive and in this case maybe we can go forward. Bringing back the term persons with specific needs would bring back the same confusion again.

Someone can help, maybe we can say matters of digital inclusion in particular instead of especially. In particular.

For the empowerment of Women and Girls and when we say in particular, it is mean we have other categories,

we're not limiting it to those categories. This could be helpful. As I said, Mr. Chairman, by bringing back the Persons with Specific Needs will bring back the same issue.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Now the list has been reshuffled. Germany was the next speaker so I give the floor to Germany.

Germany first. We -- we shuffled --

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Chairman.

I believe what we should do with the help of the Secretariat, really deserves to approve his proposed text.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the constructive proposal. I think it really -- I think he's done his best, he's made the research and the text but still I have a long list.

The issue with the text, if you agree, it is not necessary to state. I would be very pleased. Belize.

>> BELIZE: Thank you, Chair.

If we look at document 22E of the APT on the declarations there is something that's very similar there in the last paragraph which reads, and I quote, as well as to pay attention to the needs of special groups such as women, elderly, youth and people with disabilities. Why can't we adopt that and we can put in special needs, whatever it is that you need in between.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

>> Thank you, Chair.

Indeed, I believe that we need to focus on the needs of persons with disabilities and Persons with Specific Needs because when we think about those with Specific Needs it is quite broad and we discussed this when -- while this was -- this covers people who have difficulty reading, for example, and so I think we should keep persons with disabilities and people with Specific Needs because that goes broader. If we just use the one, then we'll be more restrictive and that's not the end goal here.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: I think that the convener has clearly explained that this is a result of research conducted with the Secretariat and practically encompassing the Specific Needs requirement.

I have South Africa, United States, Tunisia, Brazil, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia has spoken but I can give you the

floor again.

South Africa, please.

I have to ask is the interpreters to -- we need 10 minutes more.

>> That's fine. 10 minutes more is fine.

>> CHAIR: South Africa.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you very much, Honorable Chairperson.

We just want to address the issue the of Specific Needs. This is not unique to have People with Disabilities and also people with Specific Needs. If you go to the final acts of the last conference you will find there is objective D4-6 where this Specific Needs is mentioned and then there is a footnote 51 which is actually explained in that when we're talking about this, we're talking about people with Specific Needs and Indigenous people, Persons with Disabilities, including age-related disabilities, Youth, Women and Girls so this is not a new concept in terms of the Union. It is in part of our final acts.

With regard to the issue of women empowerment: As we indicated before, we would like to have that mentioned when we are talking about digital inclusion, talking about digital inclusion, including the empowerment of Women and Girls and then we go on with the rest of the text.

Thank you, chairperson.

>> CHAIR: I think Nasser would make a compromise, using the whole proposal.

United States.

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

Well, we all know Andrea Saks, and she's been a fixture in our Delegation for a very long time. She's been our spokesperson on Resolution 175 from the plenipotentiary and it would be difficult to go home without Persons with Disabilities and Person with Specific Needs and if it is not included in this text I'm not sure how I would know how to explain that to her. If we could please include Persons with Disabilities and Persons with Specific Needs as articulated in Resolution 175, that would be great.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Leaving the rest of the text and the Person with Specific Needs, that's covered by the previous text, but repeat if you're saying something new.

Are you comfortable with that proposal?

>> UNITED ARAB EMERITES: Thank you very much, Mr.

Chairman.

Well, if this text is agreeable to the meeting, that's fine. Otherwise, we could say person with disabilities or Specific Needs or other Specific Needs. So Persons with Disabilities or others with Specific Needs.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Can we agree on this text?

If you agree, please take out the request for the floor.

I still have Gambia, Tunisia, Côte d'Ivoire. Gambia -- I want to avoid Nasser to have another informal group after this meeting. I try!

Côte d'Ivoire, please.

>> CÔTE D'IVOIRE: Thank you, Chairman.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to take the floor on this issue.

During the work of the Study Group we had a lot of discussion about the terms, and I think during our work we kept some terms and mainly People with Disabilities and People with Specific Needs. I'll give you a practical example of why.

This morning we changed the place in which these words were put. See this morning, some -- some Delegations couldn't take their places because they had forgotten that there were People with Disabilities in the Delegations. I think the same thing happens with words, you need to put them in, otherwise people forget them. There's a need for us to include Persons with Disabilities here because this is going to allow us to highlight the problems the People with Disabilities face and solutions to them. We support the term Persons with Disabilities and People with Specific Needs. It is more specific, it is clearer, it is more exhaustive.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: You're supporting the latest proposal from the convener.

Brazil.

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

I'm sorry to come back to this issue. As far as we have understood, the expression Persons with Specific Needs includes People with Disabilities, people who cannot read or write, people with learning difficulties, children, Indigenous people, older people and those with age-related disabilities and any person with any disability.

For us, the best wording in this case could be in

particular for the empowerment of Women and Girls, Persons with Disabilities or the Specific Needs because the issue of youth and Indigenous people is an issue which we covered by the concept of people with other Specific Needs.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil.

You remember when I introduced the proposal, it was -- that's including everything really with specific needs but I see it may be -- to repeat, sometimes it is useful. That's the way out. If necessary, if we agree to delete the text as you are proposed, I have no problem.

Please.

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

Yes, I think Brazil proposal is fine for us.

We can delete and keep empowerment of Women and Girls and delete the rest, but maintain Persons with Disabilities or other Specific Needs.

Thank you.

Before I give you the floor back, Mr. Chairman, also in order to just highlight and consistency in the text if you look -- we have another situation, other technologies, vulnerable populations, which include all these categories.

So, you see, it is really confusing. For that reason I think that at the plenipotentiary conference we have to look at all of the terminologies and look at also what's been used at the U.N. level and hopefully in the plenipotentiary conference and we'll have the advantage of having Madam Andrea Saks with us in the meeting in order to reach agreement on the different technologies.

>> CHAIR: I do remember not today, but the day before someone has reminded us that they were -- maybe it was the Secretariat, it was to say that the world summit, the U.N., the agreed terminology and asked us to stick to the same terminology. However, this is for -- I agree with you, the plenipotentiary should clear the matter, however this at this time it is a compromised proposal and I have still Belize, South Africa and Côte d'Ivoire.

You have the floor.

>> BELIZE: Thank you, Chairman.

There is a need to look at this issue first and foremost. This is a question which is dealt with under Question 20, the access of People with Disabilities to ICTs. It has developed through the WDTC and the WTDC,

and we have discussed the topic of People with Disabilities and People with Specific Needs a lot in those conferences. This also corresponds back to the resolution, relevant Resolution 75. I think it would be a really good idea to keep Persons with Disabilities and People with Specific Needs because this covers a lot of things. During our work, we even try to have roundtables and we have demonstrated to participants where people who had reading difficulties could have such trouble in schools and could benefit from ICTs so I think we do need to focus here on the issue of Persons with Disabilities and Persons with Specific Needs.

Thank you

>> CHAIR: Can we adopt the text as shown on the screen? If so, we're easing the work of Nasser that I have to thank again. Any objection to the text on the screen?

Please, South Africa, you want to have objection of the text on the screen?

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Yes, Chair.

I may not be an English speaker by nature, when we're talking about Persons with Disabilities and then you say other Specific Needs, you're not using the same language addressing People with Specific Needs. We're saying people with disabilities, that being health, but they may also have other Specific Needs which is not the same as what Côte d'Ivoire and Mali, my colleagues were saying. You need to also put in people with specific needs because then you're talking about another category. We're not just addressing in terms of Persons with Disabilities, we're also saying there are People with Specific Needs.

As I articulated before, we heard that in our final acts of the last plenipot. I think it is very important to us for that distinction, as indicated, we have -- you know, people with certain Specific Needs, we need access in terms of, you know, the ICTs and that's what we would like reflected in that text. I don't think it would be any difficulty to actually reflect that.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Côte d'Ivoire, you're supporting the South Africa proposal? We're short of time, if you have something different, please take the floor. Something different.

Côte d'Ivoire?

>> CÔTE D'IVOIRE: Thank you, Chairman. Well, I'm going to be very brief as was suggested.

I just wanted to say that what the Delegate of South Africa said is very coherent, and there is even a Resolution, 175, and if you allow me, I can read the title of it as an English, information and communication technology accessibility for Persons with Disabilities and Person with Specific Needs.

So, Chairman, in order to be consistent with this resolution, it would be a good idea perhaps to consequently reword this part of D.4-3.

>> CHAIR: It is written on the screen. I would say if you're not opposed to the text on the screen, please do not take the floor.

Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chairman.

In order to achieve consensus and bearing in mind the concern from South Africa I would just like to point out that this concern as to naming has already been covered in the outputs which we already approved as output 4.3. So I think all of the concerns are already reflected in the text that we have.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Korea and after I ask if really we can adopt this text.

Korea.

>> KOREA: Thank you, Chair.

We are repeating similar discussion this morning so I would suggest to the circumstance, as suggested by Nasser, the toolkit, the terminology of the PP resolution first and then we might add explanatory note in this meeting. I would suggest add in particular for people with disabilities and People with Specific Needs. That's the scope and we could be including or whatever or we could full stop after disabilities.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, you're coming back and the Nasser proposal was to have further discussion and I think we -- I don't know really what -- the sentence, what's it read now? Women and Girls, Persons with Disabilities, People with Specific Needs, does the meeting agree with this text?

Korea.

>> KOREA: Thank you, Chair. I'm sorry, there is some difference.

In particular for the empowerment of Persons with Disability and persons with special needs to be consistent with the PP resolution terminology, and we could explain from note the terminology.

Thank you

>> CHAIR: The problem is the question of Women and Girls was specifically added and I think it was a compromise, the proposal. May I give back the floor to Nasser, United Arab Emirates.

Sorry, we have to come to a stop. But it is not good.

Your latest proposal, you will continue to form a group I'm afraid? The meeting is over.

Nasser? United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMERITES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Maybe this would help, shall we read the text to read as follows, in particular -- sorry -- the text below, the empowerment of Women and Girls, Persons with Disabilities and other People with Specific Needs. Would this help? If not, Mr. Chairman, I think I have to have this group to discuss this text tomorrow and we come back to you, Mr. Chairman, with some text agreeable to everyone.

Thank you. Can we agree in terms of compromise to avoid Nasser and you to come tomorrow with this text? Persons with Disability -- we didn't say other people with specific needs, are we saying that, Nasser?

>> UNITED ARAB EMERITES: Yes. Exactly. What's reflected. Instead of people, we say persons to be in line with 175 Resolution, so other Persons with Specific Needs.

>> CHAIR: Can the meeting agree with this proposal? [Applause].

>> CHAIR: Yes.

Thank you, my friend, Nasser.

The meeting is over.

This text is being provided in a rough draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.
