

FINISHED FILE

ITU WORLD TELECOMMUNICATION DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE 2017
BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA

17 OCTOBER, 2017
18:30 LOCAL TIME

COM 3

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: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Let us
resume our work.

The Agenda for this meeting was adopted in an earlier
session. I would like to go to the DL/81 to look at discussions
that are ready to be discussed.

I would like to start with question 5/2. This morning when
we were discussing Question 5/2 it referred to DT/43, that
should have referred to -- -- this revision. So I'm -- I'm on
this question 5/2 just for clarification the decision was on
DT/43Rev.1 I want it on record so everybody would be online with
this decision. Any comments on this?

None? Thank you very much. We move forward.

We go to question 1/2. The document is DT/44 and I'm sorry
that we -- that we do not have Mr. Babu with us anymore. He
left already. What I need to do is go to the focal points for
each question and ask them to please brief us on the extent of
revisions that was carried out in their respective questions. I
start with question 1.2 and I request the focal point from
United States to please inform the meeting of DT/44.

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

Question 1/2 is completed. I think there is some question
about do we have the correct version so we have to go back to

the Secretariat. Otherwise the group discussed it, and agreed.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Since we're going to make a decision on this question, can I ask the Secretariat to show DT/44 to see whether this is the version that's the final one?

Could you go back to the -- right there. It is Revision 1 to DT/44.

Scroll down, please. I request United States to please check if this the final version.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Here's where I think we may actually have lost a version when you get into the actual questions, this is correct, this is the last version of the number 1. I think when we get in the questions the room edited live, and we very well may have lost the live edits. This is the last version we posted on the site at the time thinking it was final.

>> CHAIR: Is there any way we can retrieve the live additions?

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: We need to talk to the Secretariat who was operating the computer to see if he has another version.

>> CHAIR: Okay.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Otherwise, this is the last version we posted on the share point.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Can you scroll down to the end of the document so colleagues can have a quick glance?

Thank you.

Assuming that this is the last, final version, or there would be minor modifications as a result of the live editorial work that was carried out in the focal group, I now invite comments.

Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Thank you very much, Chair.

I thank all the groups to work as they have in the last few days and the chairperson certainly always knows the latest version. However, at least on my stream, Revision 1 of 81, the new Agenda, it is not available electronically. The document we're looking at now, Revision 1 of DT/44 was just posted in the last 5, 7 minutes because before it was not Revision 1 as far as I know. Prior to your meeting I tried to download all new DTs. It becomes very difficult to discuss based on the published document, indeed if we want to progress here, we need to discuss based on the documents which the Secretariat represents the latest versions of each of the questions, for example.

Thank you very much.

>> Chair: Thank you, Germany.

Yes, you're correct, nevertheless we need to work.

Some colleagues were working very hard, some colleagues were here last night to 1:30, 2:30 in the morning. That shows the extent of efforts everybody is putting in. Sometimes while we should make every effort to have the final, final, final version on the screen, nevertheless as you yourself are aware, there are complexities with processing the document and, for that reason, we may have to give time to our colleagues, the time difference between here and Geneva aggravates the situation even further. I'm asking for your understanding that I trust -- we will benefit from your understanding, and request that we move forward to the extent possible.

Now, having listened to the intervention by the distinguished colleague from Germany I would like to ask United States, we would come back to this before the end of our meeting tonight, and if in the meantime you can check with the Secretariat and with other members of the focal group that if this Revision 1 is actually the final version that we can pass on to Committee 4. The reason I'm asking you to please accommodate some of the possible shortcomings is that we need to move forward and provide Committee 4 with input from our Committee.

As you said, we all trust our colleagues in different Working Groups and different ad hoc groups and others and we can benefit from this trust.

On this document, DT/44, we'll come back to it. I trust the United States to do their best so that when we come back to this document before the end of tonight's meeting, we could move it on to Committee 4.

Thank you very much.

We now go to Question 1/1, the document is DT/25.

I invite the focal point to please brief us on this.

>> Thank you very much, Chair.

The document DT/25 contains a draft review of question 1/1 and we managed to bring together all aspects pertaining broadband and in this question we included also some areas of the issue of Question 2 from SG1 and removed as we said earlier all aspects that are annexed -- or applications, rather. Mobile apps, OTT.

In this text, we have also covered some Amendments to -- from all stakeholders, everyone who submitted contributions to this, both to this question and to other questions on broadband, and access to broadband. We were also very active in the Working Group and we carefully considered all issues under this question. I hope that all comments were reflected here and, therefore, I would ask the Committee to approve the content of this document.

Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

We now have this document on the screen. I would like to ask you to carefully check whether it is actually the outcome of his focal group. My understanding, as a note, that this Question 1/1 has been extensively revised. Actually this is a replacement to the previous question 1/1, and it came out of extensive discussions. In this version, if you could scroll down -- we do not see any revisions, any mark-ups because of the fact that it has been extensively revised and it is easier to read it in this way.

So as mentioned, this has been extensively discussed, there's been agreement on this document, and all points have been taken into account.

The floor is open for any comments you may have. Any questions?

>> Thank you, Chair.

You're correct, the document was revised extensively and here this is a clean version and indeed there is a version with tracked changes which is based on the document adopted in the previous WTC. This is a document that's twice as long, around 13 pages I think, and with that in mind there are a lot of Amendments made so it was difficult to read. This document is what we have proposed with all the Amendments made.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Oman.

>> OMAN: Thank you very much, Chair.

I would like to convey my gratitude for the efforts taken in order to draw up this document which we'll support.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Oman.

Any other comments?

Can I take it that you agree with the adoption of this document so that we could forward it to Committee 4 for their information and appropriate action?

Any opposition?

None? You all agree? Thank you very much. We approve of this document and forward it to Committee 4 for their consideration.

Next I would like to go to document DT/57 on Question 4/1. I invite the focal point for this question from Mexico to please present this document.

>> MEXICO: Thank you.

This document, we worked on questions under study which are still pending as well beginning work on Agenda -- on the item 3. We still haven't done the revision of the title of this question.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mexico.

Could we display this document?

Looks like that this document is not available, and considering the fact that there is still one square bracket I would like to request that Mexico, if you could continue your efforts and try to reach consensus with a consolidated text without any square brackets, that I would very much appreciate.

>> MEXICO: Yes, of course, Chair. We'll do that.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

We do not have any other document, study questions available at this very moment. Nevertheless, I hope that we would be able to get further documents from the system as and when they're available and we will get back to this Agenda item and seek your approval.

Now I would like to continue with our discussion. I was told that there is a request to consider Resolution 62 first. This is document DT/49. I request first this document to be displayed on the screen and at the same time ask the Chair of the ad hoc group on Resolution 62, document 47.

The Chair, of the ad hoc on Resolution 62.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Actually we have had three sessions. This Resolution 62 on the electromagnetic field radiations and we have the document posted and we had consensus on all of the subjects. It is right faux available after agreement from all the focal points from different regions.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Any comments on this? The text is now being displayed.

Any requests for the floor?

None.

Can I take it that you agree with the approval of the work that's already been done on revising Resolution 62 as contained in document DT/47?

Any objection? None?

Thank you very much. So we approve the revisions as contained in this document. So decided.

Next we go to Resolution 15, Document 38. Can we see the document on the screen? DT/38.

The Chair of the ad hoc for Resolution 15, please. The focal point for -- the Chairman of the ad hoc for Resolution 15. Russia. Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you very much, Chair.

We would ask to transfer the resolution, consideration of Resolution 15 until tomorrow if possible.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you.

Next is Resolution 43 contained in document 30, DT/30 and I invite the Chair of the ad hoc group on Resolution 43 to please present this document.

Revision to Resolution 43, Chair of the ad hoc group.

Russian Federation, can you please present this document?

>> RUSSIA: Thank you very much, Chair.

Unfortunately, the Chair of the group is currently in a different meeting. We would ask you to postpone this until tomorrow to discuss this particular resolution.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Resolution 47. Next is Resolution 47, the document is DT/41 and I invite the Chair of the ad hoc group on revision to Resolution 47, Brazil. Please.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair.

We had discussions on two afternoons. We analyzed all the contributions from other regions regarding this resolution on enhancement of knowledge and effective application of ITU recommendations in Developing Countries. The result of our discussions is in 41 for the discussion with colleagues.

We updated the calling in recognizing and considering parts referring to some resolutions of PP and some resolutions of the Dubai and some other resolutions that were added in regards to contributions. Also throughout the resolution we emphasized the complimentary activities that ITU-T and ITU-D have regarding conference interoperability and we also had updates on the resolves and instructs of the BDT with close collaboration with the TSB and recognizing also the work from other relevant activities that are taking place in ITU-T and we have acknowledged the benefits of the CNR programs to Developing Countries and we can forward to the consideration of all.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for the work that you did on Resolution 47, Brazil. Thank you very much.

You have seen the Document DT/41. Are there any comments?

There are no square brackets in this?

>> BRAZIL: No, Chair. We agreed with the text from the proposals of the regions, and we had some discussions and agreed with the current version that's on the screen.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil.

Any comments, views? Can I take it that you agree to approve the modifications and changes to Resolution 47? Any requests for the floor? None? Any objection?

I take it you agree to approve this document as contained in Document DT/41.

Thank you very much. So decided.

We consider Resolution 62 already.

Next I would like to go to Resolution 16, Document DT/37. I invite the Chair of that Ad Hoc Group Kyrgyzstan to please present this document.

>> KYRGYZSTAN: Thank you very much, Chair.

I would like to introduce to you a Consolidated Document. This was a contribution from the RCC, and then we received information from comments from the U.K., from Paraguay, the work on this was successful, and we worked very swiftly, we worked today and yesterday with correspondence and also met and discussed in person. There were no issues of obstacles and I'm submitting the outcome Consolidated Document for you.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kazakhstan for all your efforts.

There are no square brackets in this document. I invite comments.

Any views? None? Any objection to approve of this document? The revision to Resolution 16 as contained in DT/37. None? Can I take it that you approve?

Thank you very much. So decided.

Next I would like to go to Resolution 11, DT/45. I invite United Arab Emirates to please take the floor.

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

We will present our documentation after hearing what will be presented by the group that prepared this document.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Can I ask the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 11 to please present your work?

Azerbaijan.

>> AZERBAIJAN: Thank you very much.

On this document, yesterday we met with Mexico and with some others so we could agree to this and we transferred this to the Secretariat. Now today, and today after lunch, after this afternoon, the U.A.E. approached us and I think that this a bit later we'll all be able to see our agreed version this afternoon. This the agreed draft which is on the screen at the moment.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Azerbaijan, for all your efforts. I do appreciate.

Now I give the floor to U.A.E. You have the floor, sir.

>> UNITED ARAB EMERITES: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

On behalf of the Arab Group at the outset we would like to thank the representative of Azerbaijan administration for

coordinating the efforts and for amending the text of this resolution. We would like to inform you that we were unable to participate in the works of the informal discussions because these were not included in the Agenda and they occurred simultaneously during some works of other groups. Therefore, as an Arab Group we have a certain number of observations with regards to this resolution and we would like from you to provide us with instructions. Is it possible to look into the matter here? This will require some time for discussion, or if you believe it is better we could postpone discussion to another time and come up with a Committee accepted text for all participants?

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Arab Emirates.

We have the possibility to discuss your points, and I'm in your hands as to whether you would like to discuss it now or you would like to have discussions outside with the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group to come up with a unified text.

U.A.E., please.

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

Our observations can be summarized with looking into -- recognizing -- we would like to support the principles, in English, to continue to support the principles and, therefore, we do not know who will be implementing such a support so this has to be clarified who would be implementing that support.

Also we have queries with 4, the question is who is examining as seen in this paragraph, and we have a proposal to delete this paragraph because it is already included in paragraph number 1.

We also have other proposals with regards to resolve 5 and some Amendments specifically with regards to the participation of the small operators, the small non-for profit operators and community operators.

If we move on to the next paragraph, which is with the director of the Telecommunication Development Bureau in collaboration with others, we have reservations with regard to Paragraph 4 because we have some Amendments we would like to bring about and we also have an opinion. That's that this paragraph has been included in both Paragraphs 2 and 3. As for the last paragraph it is not quite clear to us how this will be implemented as it states in English through multistakeholder technical cooperation activities amongst others.

In Paragraph 5 we have quarries with regards to the use of the term "detect." These are our observations, Mr. Chairperson. We would like you to instruct us whether we could revise these observations one after the other or to move to a work Drafting

Group to look into the content of this resolution.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: United Arab Emirates, let's see what other colleagues have to say on this.

Mexico.

>> MEXICO: Thank you very much, Chair.

We would like to thank the previous speaker for the comments. We think that some points raised are to do with in completing the resolution of Resolution 19, which was approved at the previous WTDC. We understand that this is a recommendation which has already been approved by -- this happened four years and we have been using this for the last four years. Perhaps we may be able to change some drafting areas as part of the Drafting Group we think that maybe we will be able to look at the text and discuss it furthermore with regards to the comments if not to come back to this plenary, to seek your approval on the drafting.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mexico.

Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Good evening, everyone.

We thank our colleagues for the work they have done in the context of this resolution. Our attention has been drawn to a certain number of items that we find in resolve in one of the paragraphs of resolve and we would like to obtain clarifications from those colleagues that came up with this proposal.

In Paragraph 5 there is the expression or the term under Resolve 5 the participation of small operators, not-for-profit operators. We would like to ask what is understood from not-for-profit operators, maybe those who presented this proposal would be able to clarify the matter.

We are sorry we're participating in quite a number of ad hoc groups and we were unable to participate in the group that was looking into this resolution.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair.

A question for clarification: You have a busy Agenda and several documents to deal with, would it be amenable that those interested in modifying the current version that we have on the screen, Resolution 11, under the leadership of the Chair of the ad hoc Resolution 11 to meet somewhere else while we advance our other business and then we can come back with a consensus text that may include all the issues they are currently raising.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada.

Mexico, please brief.

>> MEXICO: Thank you very much, Chair.

Just to clarify: If recommendation 19 which was discussed at the last WTDC, one of the changes which was made was looking at small, medium operators and not-for-profit operators. These are operators very specific in some standards these are -- this assures the important function which they undertake for the smaller operators in terms of sustainability.

You can't reach small or remote areas without this. There's a number of examples throughout the world, in Mexico, in India, and also in Argentina and other countries across Latin America.

In Kenya and in Africa, these, it is a very essential part to the support given to those stints in order to bridge the digital divide, including in both Study Group 1 and this recommendation has addressed these topics. Moreover, based on this, we have updated this resolution.

I would like to bring your attention to the fact that this is not just a topic which is included in this WTDC but it is within a recommendation which is already in use and in use in Study Groups, and of course we're very happy to discuss this in Ad Hoc Group. I would just like to emphasize this point to the room.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mexico.

Could I suggest that the agreed approach was as suggested by Canada and request the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 11 to please reconvenes? You can with the participation of those who have already spoken, including UAE and Saudi Arabia to try to mitigate the differences and produce a consolidated text, that would be satisfactory to all.

Saudi Arabia, are you still asking for the floor?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you to the distinguished colleague from Mexico for bringing the Recommendation 19. In fact, we're aware of Recommendation 19 and the text reads that non-profit community operators, it is not non-profit operators. I think the operators -- there's no sense that sometimes to say non-profit operators, because usually operators are working for a profit. However, for what's included in the recommendation 19 is non-profit community operators, and we'll work with our colleagues and the other group to refine that text further in alignment with the recommendations that's mentioned and other WTDC resolution.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

I want to emphasize there is a need to reconvene under my

distinguished colleague of Azerbaijan and the idea is to come up with a consolidated text that would be satisfactory to those that have certain rules on this resolution.

Azerbaijan, I would appreciate if you could continue to work and provide us with a revised text as soon as possible.

Thank you.

Now if you could go back to Resolution 15 it was DT/38. Could I ask Russia if they're now ready to present this document.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you very much, Chair.

Unfortunately the head of our group is still at an ad hoc meeting. I would ask you to perhaps postpone discussion of this resolution until tomorrow.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: That you, Russia.

We have two more remaining documents that we can have some discussion on. There is this Resolution 69, the document is DT/48 and after that we have Resolution 45, the document is DT/49.

Now I would like to start with Resolution 69 because you see that the differences are -- there is more agreement on Resolution 69. I ask my distinguished colleague from Ghana to ask with DT/48, Resolution 69. Please.

>> GHANA: Thank you very much, Chair.

Good afternoon to distinguished delegates.

So for Resolution 69 we are almost there. We agree to a C so we can go to the C and this a new text. The consensus here were the words coordinated, and then action. Those were the two uncomfortable words which puts this whole phrase into square brackets. As much as the opportunity was given for an agreement to this text since Saturday, we could not achieve that.

Mr. Chair, under your charismatic self, this should be removed even in these minutes.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Ghana.

I understand that all other paragraphs and points have already been agreed to between different Delegations, the only remaining part is C in this revised Resolution 69 and I invite comments.

I see Sudan is asking for the floor.

>> SUDAN: Thank you.

On behalf of the Arab Group, I appreciate the work of the ad hoc Chair of Ghana of the period that he had in this drafting and consolidated document.

Chair, in regards to the point mentioned in C the progress comes in line with Resolution 113 and we use the same sentence. So still we would like to keep the word without the -- I don't

know why -- I'm also seeking more clarification from our colleague, those requesting to delete the word and document to come in line with the resolution.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sudan.
Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I would like to commend what's been stated by the Honorable Delegate from Sudan that this text has been taken from Resolution 113 that was adopted by the plenipotentiary conference in 2014.

Paragraph F of the part considering also uses the same terms that we see present in this text, and therefore Mr. Chairperson, this is not a new text. However, it is a text that was accepted by the PP conference and we, therefore, propose to keep that text while removing the square brackets around them.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

As you can see, the argument is that this noting C is taken from another document approved by the plenipotentiary conference, and since that was already approved by the plenipotentiary conference the argument is that there is no -- there should not be any difficulty by including that into this resolution as well, and the proposal is that taking into account if we can remove the square brackets in noting C in this document and keep the language and wording as it is.

I see United Kingdom is asking for the floor.

You have the floor, sir.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good afternoon, everybody.

We have been pleased to be a part of the discussions on this resolution, and we thank the Chairman of the ad hoc for his very excellence work on this.

Coming to noting C, this issue, our belief is that the essential action between certs, and especially national certs is one of cooperation, that's the nature of national certs and other certs indeed and some may say it is the life blood of them. It is natural that these certs, they cooperate with one another. We word coordinated adds more to the cert community which will have a role on the work of the certs. We're very strongly supportive of international cert cooperation. We feel that's the appropriate word to put in a resolution. We are concerned that coordinated has some extra functionality to the word that goes beyond cooperation. We feel this is the wrong direction to move in, it does not fit with the work of the international cert community. We note the wording in the plenipotentiary resolution, we feel that's in a slightly

different context, but we have been listening very patiently and with great interest to the discussion on that point. However, our feeling is that cooperation is a much more natural term to describe the interaction between certs and coordination. We prefer to stick with the word cooperation thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom.

Any other views?

United States.

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

Good evening to everyone.

I would like to add our thanks to the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group for his excellent work and endurance in working on these two resolutions.

I would also like to echo the thoughts, comments of our colleague from the United Kingdom regarding the context and need for the language here as proposed in noting C. The language from the plenipotentiary text is -- the United Kingdom has pointed out in a slightly different context, and in fact, the Paragraph is -- this paragraph noting C does not capture the full paragraph that's in the considering F in the plenipotentiary Resolution 130, which regards more specifically the activities of certs, including private sector and citizens and users, and including international and regional cooperation as well as coordination. We feel that there is the same contextual issue with the text that's proposed in noting.

I would say that there are several references of course to Resolution 130 in these documents and it may be that this particular text is not necessary since there's already a reference.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

Next is Senegal.

>> SENEGAL: Thank you very much, Chair.

I would like to thank the Ad Hoc Group for their work with regards to noting C, and the appropriate word. I think coordinated and cooperation could be used, perhaps replace the word with required, replace required but with develop.

I think that could be a way forward.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Senegal.

Czech Republic, next.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you very much, Chair.

Thanks to the group for the work done. However, I want to support here the opinion stated by the U.K. We're of the opinion that certs cooperate quite well worldwide, even without our interventions here so that's why we support the comments as noted by the U.K.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Czech Republic.

Other views? Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you very much, Chair.

Good evening.

We would like to emphasize the broadest respect of the Committee's motives by said community that's also a call by such organizations. This was really pointed to the U.K. and the U.S. and other countries upon the objectives and support of such ideas to do -- to maybe avoid using coordinated -- coordination in this text.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan.

Any other view?

Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: We have concern of the words coordinated and the word of certs and we would prefer a softer work than cooperation is recognized.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia.

Another other requests for the floor?

Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. We would align Canada with the observations made by the United Kingdom and Australia.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada.

Any other views?

If there are no other views then I have a request -- I have a question from Saudi Arabia. You refer to the specific paragraph in the decision and resolutions of the plenipotentiary. Can you please identify the exact paragraph?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Mr. Chairman, considering in the plenipotentiary Resolution 30, considering the section A reads as follows: That in order to protect this infrastructures and addresses and address these challenges and through its coordinated national, regional and international action is required for prevention, preparation, response and recovery from computer security incidents on the part of the government authorities at the national, including the creation of national computer incident responses and sub national, the private sector and citizens of users. In addition to the international and regional coordination and coordination and that ITU has made the role clearly in its mandate and consequences in this field.

So it is clear, Mr. Chairman, that considering if it has the role coordinated, we're not bringing any new text here, we're just taking the exact wording from Resolution 130. I agree that there may be some slight changes at the beginning of

the paragraph, however, the word coordinated which is the discussed word is existing Resolution 130. That's the whole point. at the beginning of the paragraph, we may align it to the beginning of considering if Resolution 130, however, the word coordinated is exists. It is the terminology and it is -- we had agreed on number 6, we have agreed on using that term at the plenipotentiary conference 2014. I hope this clarifies the matter, Mr. Chairman, and I'm at your disposal for more clarifications.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

Guinea.

>> GUINEA: Thank you very much, Chair.

Good evening.

I'm not sure we should choose one word over another. There's a translation problem, the word in French is concerted action, perhaps in the translation we need to make sure that we have used the word coordination or cooperation. They have different meanings than the word used in French which is concerted.

Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

Any other requests for the floor?

My understanding is that there are two different positions on this noting C.

Is South Africa asking for the floor? No? South Africa, please.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

We have been listening carefully to the discussions and I think the problem is even though we're quoting part of the plenipotentiary resolution we are not quoting it as a whole. I'm wondering since both are coordinated approach and also the cooperation is part of the plenipotentiary, which is the highest-decision making body of this Union couldn't we take the language that's proposed in Resolution 130 because at the end of the day what you are saying is that we are deviating from about what we adopted at the at the plenipotentiary. We heard that some Member States were talking about setting nuances that are different, but from what's contained in Resolution 113 it would perhaps be good to understand what the nuances are. For us, when we read this, it is actually capturing both concerns from different parties.

Our suggestion would be that, yes, take the text that is contained in the Resolution 130 of the plenipotentiary conference. Maybe that may be a possible format.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, South Africa.

Next is had Argentina.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you very much, Chair.

We align ourselves with what South Africa has just said. We're using text that already exists in Resolution 130 in this we feel we should go along these lines. Also mentioned by the Delegate of Australia we may be able to change the words cooperation, change the word coordination for cooperation.

Excuse me. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Argentina.

Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

We have stated several times in this conference, but plenipotentiary resolution is for the entire ITU. In this regard, we believe that recycling plenipotentiary resolutions in resolutions of WTDC is an unnecessary exercise; but if you recycle, you do have to recycle the entire text and not only part of the text.

Mr. Chairman, we are not in a position to accept in this context here where we're proposed noting C.

Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany.

Like my colleagues in South Africa, we're following this discussion very closely. I would like to note the following, that is that reading the paragraph from the first noting, that is the reason proved but no level of computer emergency preparedness in the Developing Countries, now in we're reading that with in line with what we know, in order to protection the global infrastructure structure from the threats and challenges of the evolving cybersecurity landscape coordinated national and regional and international action is required for prevention as it reads.

Now, if the comments at least from delegates from the United Kingdom and the U.S. and Australia, et cetera, they are actually saying that the current measures of cooperations are sufficient, where noting C, what it tries to say is that whatever is happening currently may not be sufficient, and now that I come back to the comments which we got from colleagues from South Africa, can we know what the nuances that are introduced by introducing the new word coordinated? In that respect we would be in a position to understand the whole context of the argument.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Brazil.

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

First I would like to reiterate the plenary that we are under noting, this is not on resources in any other parts of the

text but in the noting. It serves to give us a status of the situation.

We think it is desirable to have cooperation, everyone can agree that cooperation among certs is extremely important so we could have more secure environment. We also think that it is recommendable that a certain level of would coordination exists among certs, that's why, Mr. Chairman, we think that the words as provided as it is in the text reflects what we understand as well on both cooperation and coordination among certs. It also means that under notice it is not obliged no certs to act in this way. We're not obliging them. It is up to certs to coordinate, which is desirable and to make cooperations when they wish to.

In any case, Mr. Chairman, we would be willing to work with any kind of possible new wordings for the paragraph that may come up and we thank you. We would be willing to look forward to work on this new paragraph if necessary. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil.

Next, Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to add very much to what's been said by other delegates in this regard.

For the fact that we have been negotiating and discussing this even though it is part of another Article for I think now we are -- we have two different questions on this regard. The objective of -- of all the text that's in the square bracket although the issue was on the issue, on the national, international. We all as developing countries, we believe that there is a need for more contribution in this regard.

I suggest that to save time, to keep it as is in the square bracket and we take it to the plenary for further discussion and elaboration.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan.

Next is Algeria.

>> ALGERIA: Thank you very much, Chair.

I didn't request to speak on this issue, but I think there's a precedent that a sector can question and discuss a part of resolution from the plenipotentiary conference. The plenipotentiary conference and these resolutions and decisions taken are binding for the administrations, and this very valuable. So the D sector cannot address these. The WTDC should not reexamine something that's been addressed in the plenipotentiary. We just have the right to quote it. Therefore, I suggest to consult the legal counsel who may be able to clarify this point for us, Chair.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Algeria.

Any other requests for the floor?

Colleagues, as I said, we have -- we begin this document and we had two different views: One was to use similar wording as to considering Resolution 130 of the plenipotentiary conference and the other was to use a less demanding wording by replacing coordination and coordinating with the cooperation or cooperating.

My distinguished friend from South Africa had a way forward that was to my understanding trying to address some of the points that was mentioned by the distinguished colleagues from the United Kingdom, United States and others.

That way forward with as to copy the exact wording from considering in Resolution 130 of the plenipotentiary conference.

I would like to see whether the room is agreeable with this middle ground that we would not be introducing any changes in the language of the plenipotentiary conference but copy the exact wording and move it to this noting C in this resolution.

Are there any strong objections to this?

None?

I see that there are requests from Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom and United States.

Saudi Arabia, you have the floor, sir.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you very much, Chair.

The Arab Group presented this proposal, which we have in front of us, with some Amendments to take account of the comments which we have received within the framework of the Ad Hoc Group. Nevertheless, Chair, and in able to reach a solution on this, and to take into account the time remaining we, therefore, support your proposal, therefore, to copy Paragraph F from Resolution 130 and to insert it instead of Paragraph C in noting.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

Next is United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We're, of course, willing to look at ways to move this forward and come to a satisfactory Resolution of this issue.

We would suggest that rather than replace text from plenipotentiary Resolution 130 we rely on the fact that 130 is already referenced in this resolution and we would suggest deleting this entire paragraph and we go to Resolution 130 text will still be there in Resolution 130 and it is referenced here and that would allow us to move forward and to reach a satisfactory conclusion.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom.

Next is United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Chair.
Sorry for the delay.

I was going to make the same comment as my colleague from the United Kingdom, following up on my earlier comment regarding the existence of the reference to Resolution 130 already in Resolution 69 and also follow along the comments made by our colleague from Germany regarding the references to resolutions from the plenipotentiary. I support the suggestion to delete the paragraph here altogether and retain the full reference as it exists and therefore we would be able to conclude an agreed document on Resolution 69.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.
Please.

>> JORDAN: Thank you very much, Chair.

The reference to Resolution 130 from the plenipotentiary conference is a cited reference as Resolution 69 and as the Saudi Delegate has said, the Arab document contains this Paragraph as it appeared in Resolution 130 from deliberations that have been undertaken and the Amendments which we put forward. Therefore, we would like to support your proposal to include the Paragraph as it appears in Resolution 130.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan.

Next is Czech Republic.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you very much, Chair.

Just very brief remark here, we fully agree with what's been said by the U.K. and the U.S. and I think there's no need to repeat the text once we recall the plenipotentiary Resolution 130. It is recalling, let's keep it there.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Czech Republic.

Argentina.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you very much, Chair.

Thank you for giving me the floor, once again.

In order to reach a solution and compromise we would like to propose that you delete the Paragraph N or insert it from Resolution 130 because this resolution already exists within the plenipotentiary conference scope and it wouldn't be -- we don't need to insert it.

Perhaps a small change to this paragraph which would then read we need to have cooperation, have national, regional, international cooperation instead of having words coordinated and action is required, which I think these are the words leading to some conflict and disagreement.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Argentina.

I think that proposal has already been discussed and some colleagues are not prepared to accept it.

Next, South Africa.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

We think that we're trying to help the meeting in moving forward, we have looked for instance at the Resolution 101 and 102 and combined in recalling they're actually stressing one aspect, which is collaboration and not really meeting the halfway point that we're trying to actually get to which is that of including and accommodating both views so we would ask members to consider going back to language that we agreed in terms of the plenipot. I think this would really make everyone equally unhappy or equally happy.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, South Africa, for your wise suggestions.

Let's move forward to the next speaker, Algeria, please.

>> ALGERIA: Thank you very much, Chair.

I don't know why and I can't understand why so many organizations are reluctant to include the text of the plenipotentiary conference while during the Ad Hoc Group we added reference to a report of Study Group. I really am surprised and don't know how ITU-D is working.

I think putting the text as it is in the resolution of plenipotentiary conference is a wise way to proceed and not to delete it. It was a lot of preferences, if we delete all the references, we have no text at all. So having this text, it is very important. It is already -- it exists. That's why I advise if we could have also the idea, the vision of legally owning it, with the text, I think it is very important. I fully support to maintain the text of the resolution -- the plenipotentiary resolution.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Algeria.

I request that maybe the legal adviser will say a few words on this as requested by the distinguished colleague from Algeria.

Could we have the microphone for the ITU legal adviser?

>> Legal adviser: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you very much for allowing the service to provide its feedback and its input to the Delegations here although I fear I'm not going to be of much assistance. We have to stress here that we're talking about a plenipotentiary resolution, that it is indeed the resolution of the supreme organ of the union and no resolution of conferences can take additions that's contrary

to this resolutions they can specify and they can still focus or further advance the thought of a specific plenipotentiary resolution in this case.

I note here we're talking about a plenipotentiary resolution, a sector resolution without the exact same scope and subject matter. That being said there is a similar context. At the end I think it relies -- it lies on the Member States to decide whether a deviation from the exact wording of the resolution of the plenipotentiary conference, it is justified in the light of the slightly different context of the specific sector and resolution.

Again, with this, I would also note that there is the same legal affect as to whether the sectoral conference decides to make a reference to a resolution as the plenipotentiary, to specifically cite a quote from a plenipotentiary resolution or to simply recall a plenipotentiary resolution.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, legal adviser from the ITU.

Next we'll go to Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Just to add to the discussion here, it's a practice that we're recalling sometimes some resolutions and in the same resolutions we highlight part of that resolutions. I would just now work you through one of the examples, I have plenty of them, but I'll just give you one example.

In Resolution 101 we have recalled opinion 1 of the WTDS in the recording part and in the considering part of the same resolution we have stressed about opinion 1 # by saying that opinion 1 of the WTDC deals with the establishment of this as a priority. It is a practice in ITU that we sometimes recall some resolutions and the same resolution, we highlight part of the resolution that are relevant to the discussions here. This just to add to the discussions and highlight to colleagues the instance of the contribution of the Arab States.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

Next is Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman.

Thank you to the legal adviser.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the United Kingdom and Czech Republic have already made the point in recalling, first recalling of this resolution already refers to Resolution 130.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, in having heard intervention of our colleague from Argentina, we should also take a look at that suggested text or changes because it offers a way forward. Lastly, Mr. Chairman, if we're going to start inserting text from plenipotentiary resolution, in this particular case, the

one that's been referenced by Saudi Arabia, we would also be opening the door to inserting all the paragraphs of resolves of the said resolution. We can give you an example. We can insert results 3 of the plenipotentiary conference 130. So Mr. Chairman, we're, of course, in your hands. Bear in mind that the recalling already refers to the Resolution 130, that should suffice.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada.

Next is Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

On behalf of Sweden, I would like to support the U.K.'s previous statement, however, may I suggest changing the word coordinated to collaborative?

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sweden.

Germany.

>> GERMANY: Thank you very much, Chair.

I apologize for taking the floor again.

We have listened carefully to the Distinguished Delegate of Saudi Arabia who speaks rightly about tradition in the ITU and with the proofs, there are many others we know. We have also listened very carefully to the legal adviser. It is clear that having -- that recalling a plenipotentiary resolution is in legal terms sufficient.

So there's no need to repeat text from that resolution that's already recalled.

Now with regard to probably solve the issue, if we understood the proposal from Argentina, I think this a way forward if we could use this text as far as we understood. We can understand both positions, the one of Saudi Arabia with the traditional approach and, of course, the legal approach. We would go with the legal approach simply because the text and the overall text will then be shorter.

Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany.

Senegal.

>> SENEGAL: Thank you very much, Chair.

I think the reference to Resolution 130 does not prevent us to urge in the text of this resolution to part of it, particularly if there is a question or puts the resolution back into question like Brazil I would like to recall that here we have the text in time as very specific but it is not less binding than the PP resolution. I propose that we review this paragraph.

In terms of coordination and cooperation, I propose that have the encouragement, not an obligation. I think rather it

being a requirement -- rather than required we could say encouraged in English. Could that be a way forward?

Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Senegal.

Next is Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Thank you very much, Chair.

Apologies for taking the floor again.

I would like to highlight that Saudi Arabia and Jordan are speaking on behalf of the Arab Group. This proposal, as we have already clarified, comes from Resolution 130 and comes from the discussions that -- we came up with this paragraph following discussions. As the legal counselor has said, if we want to encourage -- if we want to quote resolutions from the PP we can do so, however, we should not use wording that does not correspond to what's been adopted by the plenipotentiary.

I think the Argentine I can't proposal is not suitable. That's why we support your proposal, that's to say we quote the paragraph from resolution -- from plenipotentiary resolution as a solution to move forward rather than discussing other alternative wording.

Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan.

Next is Sudan.

>> SUDAN: Thank you very much, Chair.

In turn, we also support the statement made by Jordan and Saudi Arabia, and so if we could move forward we support the inclusion of text from the plenipotentiary without deleting text.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sudan.

Slovenia.

>> SLOVENIA: Thank you.

I would commend the passions on the discussion of this matter. I would like to look at the first part of the Resolution 69 referenced on the recalling side. It is clear that resolutions which have been recorded here, they're looking at stressing the need for cooperation. The coordination aspect is missing and I think this is where noting C is trying to raise.

I would like to support the proposal from South Africa to make everybody equally unhappy, let's just repeat the text as it reads from Resolution 130.

Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Slovenia.

Ghana.

>> GHANA: Thank you. I speak as the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group and I have listened and I have seen countries coming again

and repeating themselves. At this point in time, I want to intervene.

What was said was reflected in our coordinated meeting. The practices, the writing style, the recalling, the highlighting other areas of resolutions were also reflected in our meeting. Because of this, what we realized is that the C, the noting C tended to paraphrase what was relevant from the PP Resolution 130 which is on building confidence and security in the use of ICTs which was touching on this subject matter related to this subject.

What it was, was for Member States to have an agreed text and that was stressed, that we have an agreed text. I see the conversation heading towards that we go and turn to bring the considering F and to put it here as our C. Mr. Chairman, we're almost there. We go to a time that the Distinguished Delegate from Sudan was -- the feedback I was getting from him, it was that there was nobody that he could get to talk to. I have seen many people or many Member States who are commenting on this matter that we never realized in our meetings. It is becoming difficult if you don't agree on the PP text and then we could give Sudan one more opportunity, at least now, and those that have interest in this noting C that we could again come up with an agreed text and we would take note that we're developing a resolution, a resolution has to be agreed and we avoid a situation where we're taking square brackets to the plenary.

Mr. Chair, this will be my suggestion to you.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group for your wise council and way forward.

Before we can come to the end of our consideration of the arguments let's see if we do have some flexibility from parties concerned. I see on the list Guinea is asking for the floor, then United Kingdom, and finally United Arab Emirates.

I would like to close the list at this time and move forward.

Guinea.

>> GUINEA: Thank you, Chair.

Thank you to the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group for his understanding.

I would like to confirm what's been said that the legal adviser clarified that we can quote decisions from the plenipotentiary and what's happening here is that in the first noting, the calling rather that we refer to as 130 and then the legal adviser said that this can be more specified, and that is what C does and the noting it specifies more carefully. Why we're doing such gymnastics, if we have confirming what was just quoted in the introduction and this is to be more specific,

states agree. So as the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group said, I think we can support -- continue to support the text as it is because it is providing more specific information rather than interpreting what's mentioned in the introduction.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Guinea.

Next is United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm speaking on behalf of CPT.

We're anxious to move this forward. It is unfortunate it is proving to be such a difficult discussion. We're actually very interested in the helpful suggestions made by both Argentina and Sweden and think that maybe significant value in exploring those very positive ideas that came from the two nations had.

We also note the wise words of the Chairman of the Ad Hoc on some further coordination and we would be very willing to work with Sudan to have another attempt following this. It is very interesting. A challenging discussion we have had here and we're anxious to help you move this forward and get to a satisfactory state on this resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom.

United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chair.

Having listened to previous speakers and the discussion on this Paragraph C, noting. We would support what was said by the representative of the Arab Group, Saudi Arabia that is, and Jordan, on this paragraph.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, U.A.E.

We have heard different views and alternative ways forward. It is my feeling that we may need to again request the Ad Hoc Group to engage in further consultations. We did have a number of different proposals that were to arrive at the middle ground and I'm asking my distinguished colleague, the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group from Ghana to please continue your consultations, and I invite all those who would like to have a movement on this please engage in further consultations Chaired by the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group on this Resolution 69.

Do I have your agreement?

I don't see any opposition to my proposal.

One thing I want to emphasize, is that we are very much pressed for time. There is very little time left until the end of the conference. There are many, many issues, some of which are extremely complex, and we have to properly address them.

In the interest of moving forward, I ask each and every one

of you to be as flexible as you can be and be sure that we can move forward on this.

I thank you very much.

Now we can move to another topic on our Agenda. We have one more resolution to cover, which we have DT/49. I would like to go back with your permission to consideration of study questions. This is very much urgent because Committee 4 is meeting tomorrow and we have to provide them with as much material as we can on the study questions.

I would like to go back to question 1/2 and request United States as the focal person for question 1/2 to see whether the document Rev1 in fact captures all the discussions and we have a common position in this document.

United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I apologize personally. Our focal point for this question is not in the room right now. We can try to contact her quickly and provide an update when she's back.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. I would appreciate if we can move on this and locate your colleague so that we can proceed on this, work on this as well.

While we're waiting for the Chair, the focal point of Question 1/2 I would like to provide you with some additional information.

Question 6/2 and 8/2, we did not receive any specific contributions to modify the text of these two questions. We only received contributions on the merger of the two questions. The questions and the restructuring of Study Groups is not our mandate. I have already talked to my colleagues in Committee 4 and informed them that we would be waiting for the decision on these three questions 6/2 and 8/2. For your information if the decision of Committee 4 is to keep them as separate questions, since we did not have any contribution to modify these two questions all we have to do is keep the current text and then since there was a proposal to amend the title of the two questions we only consider the titles. If the decision of Committee 4 is to merge and combine the two questions, then what we have to do is to look at the existing text for the questions since we have not received any contribution to modify the text and to pick and choose different parts of these two questions and merge the combined questions.

This is what we need to do in any case, the amount of work is not extensive and we would be able to try to realize it very quickly and provide appropriate input to Committee 4.

This morning when Mr. Babu was here, there was a reference

to new questions. We haven't been able to clarify the situation. There were questions where proposed by the United States and one question was proposed by United States, and I did talk to my distinguished colleague in the United States Delegation and my understanding is that since their point has already been covered in one of the questions, mainly question 1/1 there is no need to consider the proposal further.

Then there was another proposal from another question, another new question. I'm looking into my notes to see who actually proposed it, but again my understanding is that new question is also covered in the outcome of the Ad Hoc Group chaired by Mr. Babu. We don't have any new questions, per se.

We could proceed with the work that's already been done in the Ad Hoc Group on Study Group questions. So far you can see on the screen that the results are almost with us. The means that we have, the document that is ready to go to Committee 4, the yellow means that we're still waiting for the system to process these documents. The actual work has already been carried out and we're waiting for the system to provide us with a definitive text that we can show you on the screen and then make a decision to forward it to Committee 4. Assuming that because of the extensive amount of work that's already been carried out in this Ad Hoc Group and the feedback that I had received from the focal points and from the work of Mr. Babu, my understanding is that there has been consensus more or less to the substance of these questions and I have provided at least some of the questions to my colleagues in Committee 4 so that they could be able to move forward at least on the titles of the questions and do their work in due time.

I have provided you with the explanations so that we believe you would be informed of the work that's already been carried out. Again, emphasize that thanks to your active participation and cooperation, we're almost there and we can count on this to be finalized.

What needs to be done, first, we have a number of other resolutions that we still have to consider. The result of the work, the Ad Hoc Groups are working on. In addition, we also have to finish our work on action plan and the strategic plan. These are the remaining Parts of our mandate.

At this point I don't think we have any document except two more documents, which I would get to momentarily.

I see that my distinguished colleague, the focal point from question 2/1 is in the room and if you can advise us as to the status of Document DT/44 Rev1.

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

We have done a very thorough computer search of all of the computers on the floor and we cannot find the document.

The best we can offer, we have confirmed amongst those of us who we have been able to be in contact with in the room, that we did make changes and they're not reflected in the temporary document. The best we can do is we can convene a quick meeting tomorrow morning, which I'm happy to lead, and the Secretariat is happy to join us and staff and see if we can recreate the changes. We know basically what the changes are, but we would like to invite those people who had some very good ideas because the question -- the document really did improve.

So we really apologize, but we're anxious and ready and willing to do the work again.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

Oman is asking for the floor.

Oman.

>> OMAN: Thank you, Chair.

I would confirm what was said from my colleague from the United States. This document was amended yesterday and we amended the title this morning. However, the document was not included or uploaded. I would like to highlight that there is an Arab proposal to merge question 6/2 and 8/2 and a proposal just to merge the two resolutions from the U.S. as well. The Ad Hoc Group did not agree on that issue. That's why I want to confirm what was said.

We have a proposal of merging the two questions, 6/2 and 8/2.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Oman.

As I explained Question 6/2 and 8/2 the decision either to merge or to keep them as separate questions is part of the mandate of Committee 4. We would be waiting for the decision to move either way, whether to merge or to combine. If the decision is to merge and combine, then we could get involved for writing and the substance of a merged question.

If the decision is not to merge, then we have the text ready as explained in the contribution to the current text. We would be waiting on Question 6/2 and 8/2 for Committee 4 to provide us with their decision in due time.

Coming back to Question 1/2, yes, I would like to request if United States could take the lead and convene another meeting hopefully quickly and shortly tomorrow morning. Could I announce the time? Maybe 8:00 in the morning? If that's convening?

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: It is fine with me if fine with the secretariat and the parties who were involved.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

I can see that my colleagues in the Secretariat are

prepared to meet with you at 8:00 tomorrow and they'll provide you with the logistics and the room that you could use for your meeting.

Thank you very much.

Mexico, on this points, please?

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chair.

I'm sorry, but I'm seeking clarification on the Agenda that we have, the colors on the screen, the documents in pink are documents which are ready but nevertheless we understand that Question 4/1 still has text in square brackets, therefore in this case this document should appear as yellow on the screen. In the same vein we understand that the Distinguished Delegate from India presented this to us this morning and said that the text as it stands was already ready in order to be sent.

I'm seeking clarification on these two points.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mexico, for your point on Question 4/1 and Document 57.

My understanding is that Document 57 is almost ready. We cannot change the coloring on the screen because this is a DT document and we cannot change it on the fly. Nevertheless, it was initially perceived that we could have a presentation on this, but my understanding is that there are some square brackets on this document.

Of course, Mexico is in charge and the focal point on Question 4/1 and if Mexico is prepared to provide us with another shot of removing the square brackets, by all means.

Mexico, please.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chair.

Therefore this document should be in yellow, given that there are still some text under discussion.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mexico.

So it is in this light that I suggest that the focal point from Mexico on question 4/1 also reconvenes either after our meeting tonight or early morning tomorrow to try to patch the differences and provide us with the consolidated text.

I trust that Mexico would be happy to do that? Can I have your confirmation?

>> MEXICO: Yes. Of course, Chair, I'd be delighted to consider these discussions further. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: While we're in the room for the interest of those that would be interested to participate in your work, could you advise what time is convenient either after the meeting tonight or early tomorrow morning?

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chair.

We would look for a room early tomorrow morning.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

The Secretariat will make an effort to provide you with logistics and the meeting will be early tomorrow morning.

I would emphasize we have to move as quickly as possible on the remaining study questions. Committee 4 has been patiently waiting for our Committee to finish the work and providing the substance of the questions. Your effort is very much appreciated and I'm grateful to all of you.

Rwanda, please.

>> RWANDA: Thank you, Chair.

It is, again, about Resolution 35 and Resolution 75 which were approved yesterday night. I still see them on the list of documents to be discussed and approved. When will they be on the list of approved and for the next steps because they are already approved.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, but on DM81 Revision 1 I don't see the resolutions. When we take a decision on any matter, we would remove them from further consideration. So since we have already decided on those two, there's no need to go back to them and the DL/81, it does not have reference to these two resolutions. I hope this clarifies the situation.

Thank you.

The only remaining document that we can consider at this time is the work done again by my distinguished colleague from Ghana on Resolution 45. He was Chairing the Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 45 in addition to the work that he did on Resolution 69.

Resolution 45, the outcome of the work in this Ad Hoc Group is in DT/49 and I ask DT/49 to be displayed on the screen. I invite my colleague from Ghana to please present DT/49.

Ghana, please.

>> GHANA: Thank you, Chair.

We were given a 28-page compiled document with very divergent contributions where the proposal and good support for no change to the entire Resolution 45. There were also proposals to the title of the resolution among many others in the recalling, considering, the recognizing, the further recognizing, results, the directive, under advice and the directors, request to the invitation to the membership and invitation to the Member States.

Mr. Chair, as the DO, the DT/49 is now 9 pages. With this, 9 out of 28, I want to thank the Distinguished Delegates for their collaborative discussions that brought us this near, yet far with as many as 18 issues in square brackets.

Chair, I want to summarize the concerns and the discussions

we had with Resolution 69 was helpful because similar sentiments were also reflected in discussions here. Really it has to do with the right-hand style, as to whether when you recall a certain outcome, for example you have to again take parts of it and state it in a note and recognize it. Some of these parts were in and are in square brackets. There is an issue of ITRs, which the concerns were that currently the 2012 ITRs are not applicable for Member States and that it has to be deleted. That's the first issue, the ITRs.

There is also the concern of whether we should refer to the C or let me say the previous resolution which is being revised, because we're in the Buenos Aires now and the one in Dubai, should we refer to the same Resolution 45 from Dubai in our recalling. This is in square brackets.

Substantially, there were the concerns of the extension of the scope of the resolution to cover issues of misuse of numbering resources for which the argument was that there is a resolution which is on misuse on numbering resources developed elsewhere or being revised elsewhere in this conference. That could be standard to another Resolution on consumer protection. There was also the concern of the extension of some to privacy.

There was also the concerns with listing types of spam.

More entrenched was the introduction of global chatter in the instructive part, especially when it was requested, the secretary had not had a reflection of that global chatter. Again, there were the national approaches and now the introduction of redoing it at international level so the word international as we may see in the advice of members and Member States also tends to be in square brackets.

Chairman, thanks to you, we have 9 pages and 18 square brackets.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, distinguished colleague from Ghana. I do appreciate the effort that you have put into this resolution and reducing the number of pages and getting colleagues to look at the number of issues, although on such a sensitive topic it is given that we need to continue our discussions.

Now, in order to open the floor considering the fact that we have only 45 minutes to go I would like to suggest that if some colleagues have any proposals that we reduce the number of square brackets.

Let's start from this angle. If countries have specific proposals that they think would be satisfactory to other colleagues, let's hear from them first.

I see Saudi Arabia is asking for the floor.

You have the floor, sir.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

At the outset, we would like to thank Ghana for the efforts that's been undertaken in managing this small group.

The works of that group were characterized by diverse opinions, but thanks to his wisdom, the wisdom of him and his leadership we were able to come up with the text which is presented before us. We think it is a good text, and through which we could come up with a final consensual text that's agreeable to all.

Mr. Chairperson, we, the Arab Group, we have met in an attempt to facilitate your work within this Committee. We tried to identify those aspects of the work that should not be listed and where we could remove the square brackets around them while preserving at the same time content of the resolution and the original text that has to be mentioned and stated in this resolution.

We have a certain number of proposals, Mr. Chairperson, to reduce the number of square brackets to a number that I could call a good number. We are at your disposal, Mr. Chairperson, to find out how we could move forward in discussing this topic.

Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

Before I give the floor to Germany, can I ask Saudi Arabia if you have any specific proposal that would deal with one of the square brackets that we can reduce them?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Absolutely. As I have already stated, the Arab Group have met as I indicated, to discuss reducing the number of square brackets around the text that were presented by the Arab Group. We effectively have proposals to delete certain square brackets.

It is possible for us to continue to discuss this topic or should we leave the opportunity to listen to comments and then we present our own proposals?

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

Of course, we have different ways to proceed on this. One is to listen to different delegates on this topic with a view of arriving at common positions in this meeting. The other is to listen and then again go back to the Ad Hoc Group and ask them to see about what further efforts could be made to reduce the number of square brackets. We'll see what other colleagues have to say.

I now would like to give the floor to Jordan that was asking for the floor earlier.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chair.

I want to second what was said by the Distinguished Delegate from Saudi Arabia that after the conclusion of the

meeting we had an internal discussion on the way forward. Mr. Chairman, we're in your hands on the way forward. We can draw on examples if you wish from the list that we have discussed and you can test the floor to see if there is, you know, a positive response to the amendment, subsequently we can continue. Otherwise, we can as you have illustrated, go back to the Ad Hoc Group and discuss this.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan.

Ghana was asking for the floor. The Chair of the Ad Hoc Group.

>> GHANA: Thank you very much.

You have some time, some 30 minutes. I have heard Saudi Arabia and Jordan say they have -- perhaps if we could use the time, there is no other Agenda item, we could start from the recalling aspect and proposals that could be made and we could then see the way forward. Among them, also from the previous discussion on Resolution 69, lessons learned, I could also raise proposals on some of the square brackets.

Mr. Chair, if your time is available and we could be granted, that could be granted if we could make some progress from the recalling.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Ghana. Thank you for the way forward.

Yes, as you said, we have about 30 minutes to have some discussion on this topic. In the interest of providing Committee 4 with other additional material, I am just being informed that on Question 3/1 in 6/1 we now do have a document, a DT document available. If you allow us, we can quickly consider those and then come back to this topic of Resolution 45.

Can we go back to study questions? I feel we have to provide Committee 4 with some input.

Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair.

We really want to help you, but it is just a question of clarification, the proposed exercise would not be limited to the removable of brackets but also would include as appropriate the removable of some paragraphs; am I correct?

>> CHAIR: Yes. We would be dealing with square brackets including the square brackets themselves and the text within the square brackets. When we say removable of square brackets that means that there is a modification to the text so that we would remove the square brackets and the text or the removable of the square brackets themselves and then keep the text in between.

Having clarified that, can we go back to Study Group questions? I would like to go to see whether we can proceed on

Question 3/1? We have DT/22. DT/22, please.

This is the revised text on Question 3/1. I invite the focal point on this question to please brief us on the outcome of your discussions.

United States, please.

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

DT/22 represents an agreed text from the Ad Hoc Committee to modify Question 3/1. We worked with proposals from the United States and Mexico and we also -- this document also reflects an agreement that we had during the meeting that we would move consideration of M services and OTTs from the Question 1/1 on broadband into Question 3/1 on Cloud computing so that these topics would be considered jointly. It would also help address the issue with Question 1/1 which was a very broad question in the last study period. What we did, we moved the text related to OTT and M services into this question. If you take a look at the text, we have prepared an update to Question 3/1 on Cloud, and then we have added in sections on M services and OTTs. There are no square brackets in the text so we came to an agreement on all of the language so we put that for consideration.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, distinguished colleague from the United States, for your hard work.

I was in your Ad Hoc late, I think it was just before midnight that you concluded. Thank you for the effort. My gratitude and thanks to you and to your colleagues.

Can we approve this document, and the revised question 3/1 as contained in Document DT/22? Do I have your agreement?

Do you agree? Any opposition? None? Thank you very much for deciding we approve this document.

Next is Question 6/1. Question 6/1, we have DT/50. I invite the Chair -- the focal point for this question to please present this document.

Mexico, please.

>> MEXICO: Thank you very much, Chair.

This question was discussed in the Drafting Group on Study Groups and received comments on behalf of the United States and it worked together with the proposal from the Asia-Pacific region in order to consolidate a single document. It was presented at this group and approved in order to present to you in Com 3.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mexico.

Any comment on this? I trust that many participated in the discussion so this is a consolidated text, no square brackets and everybody in the Ad Hoc Group agreed to this so we're just

considering their output.

Can I suggest that we approve this document and forward it to Committee 4 for further consideration? Any opposition? Do you agree? I do not see any requests for the floor. I take it that you agreed that we approve this work on Question 6/1 as contained in DT/50. So decided.

Thank you very much.

We also have some work on Resolution 17 and 46. I was told that the DT documents on these two resolutions are available. Can we see the DT on Resolution 17 on the screen?

DT/46, Resolution 46 or Resolution 17. Either one. Document DT/-- the revision of Resolution 17 and suppression of Resolution 32. The document is displayed on the screen. Could I ask the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group on this, Australia, please?

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair.

We didn't have an Ad Hoc Group for this, all five regions met and had some informal discussions and developed proposed common document addressing the proposals received. It is shown on the screen there, DT/53, I understand the translations will be available tomorrow.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia.

No square brackets on this, all five, six regions agreed?

Thank you very much.

I see Australia is nodding.

Can I suggest that we approve this revision of Resolution 17 and separation of Resolution 32 as contained in this Document DT/53? Any comments? Any views? Any objections? I don't see any requests for the floor. I take it that we should thank my distinguished colleague from Australia for his hard work, and also thank all those that participated in this worker by providing us with this DT document 53 and so this document is approved as Document DT/53 and we can proceed with this.

Next, Resolution 46, it is DT/128. DT/128, please. It is modification of Resolution 46 and suppression of Resolution 68. Could I ask the Chair and the Ad Hoc Group Senegal to please present this document?

>> SENEGAL: Thank you, Chair.

Allow me to introduce the modification of 46 which provides assistance to peoples and communities had through ICTs. These -- this is the fruit of our work.

Indeed, be decided to fuse the two and then suppress and we took in all comments from all interested regions. That is to say ACP, the Arab Group, CITELE, the African Group also, all points were taken on board and we achieved a consensus-based text which we submit for you on DT/28. We have changes made to

concluding, considering, taking into account, recognizing further, resolves, invites the WTDC and the director of the BDT.

We thank all those that participated in the spirit of compromise and I invite you to consider document 28.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Senegal.

I'm grateful to you for all the efforts and for those that participated in the Ad Hoc Group.

As you can see, there are no square brackets in this document. I suggest that we approve this document on modification of Resolution 46 and suppression of Resolution 68. Do you agree with this modification of Resolution 46 and separation of Resolution 68 as contained in Document DT/28? Any views on this?

Any objection? I take it that you agree with approving of this document, DT/28.

Thank you very much. So decided.

We can go back to Resolution 45. As it was suggested by the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 45, from the recalling part, we'll see whether we can remove some of the remaining issues and resolve them. I would like to invite the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 45, can we go back to this document?

>> The recalling part A is referring to Articles 6 and 7 of the 2012 ITU-Rs, considering the applicability cannot be standard to all Member States we may tend to delete this one if it is agreeable by members.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for the proposal to delete recalling A. Any objection to this deletion?

Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair.

The Arab Group believes that to the recalling A was -- is indeed the same as Paragraph H of Resolution 130 where we refer to Article 6 of the ITU-Rs and also Article 7. Article 6 and 7 of the ITRs, these are -- this is text in found in Resolution 130 and therefore the Arab Group believes it is important to maintain this paragraph.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: It is evidence we should leave this recalling A and come back to it at a later stage.

Can we proceed with other less contentious parts of this resolution?

Ghana, please.

>> GHANA: Thank you, Chair.

We move on to recalling I. This talks about Resolution 45 from 2010. We may not need this resolution as we have the new E

which is also talking about Resolution 45 from the Dubai 2014 which tended to revise the 2010 Resolution 45.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Ghana.

The proposal is to delete recalling -- is it I? Recalling I? Any objection to removing this?

Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair.

To achieve consensus, the Arab Group agrees to delete this paragraph.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Saudi Arabia, for your understanding and cooperation.

Any other views on this? Can we move forward with deleting this square bracket? and the text in the square brackets? Yes? Thank you. So decided.

Ghana.

>> GHANA: Thank you, Chair.

So we move on to N. This is a big one. So it is recalling the N and Q output together. It's looking at misappropriation and misuse of international telecommunication numbering resources and the other one, 78, it is also talking about telephone numbers. Here it is not an easy removable or a deletion. It is to agree on the scope of this resolution whether we want to -- want to cover misuse of numbering resources.

Mr. Chair, here I -- I'm sorry, I cannot make your accommodation at this time.

>> CHAIR: I understand. Thank you very much, Ghana.

My suggestion is to come back to these two paragraphs and let's see the other provisions in this resolution that we can easily decide.

Ghana, please.

>> GHANA: Thank you.

That is complete from recalling.

Then we can do for considering. Considering C as well as concerns, the quotations of new topics such as personal data protection privacy and then we see the second part about online security. So those were -- the privacy part, the data protection, privacy part brought the entire C into square brackets.

The issue here is that if privacy is removed or deleted the brackets may tend to -- Mr. Chair, this is a matter as well on scope.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

Any views on this? I see Saudi Arabia is asking for the floor. On this or the previous item?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair.

As I said, the Arab Group has not got good news for you. We met, and we would like to tell you that despite the importance of the text in N and Q earlier, we're ready to delete the brackets. This is Paragraphs N and Q.

Can we go back to N and Q, previous page? We have square brackets in N and we have square brackets in Q. My understanding is that Saudi Arabia is on behalf of the Arab Group prepared to accept the deletion of N and Q altogether. Do I have the correct understanding? I see Saudi Arabia nodding and I thank you very much for your understanding and cooperation.

Are there any other news on this? We are witnessing very admirable cooperation from the Arab Group. I'm extremely thankful to you for your flexibility.

Can we accept the deletion of N and Q? Any exception? Jordan is asking for the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chair.

Just to clarify, as the Chair of the Arab Group -- of the Ad Hoc Group said, the approval of the Arab Group to delete these paragraphs does not mean that we agree to not refer to these issues in the text.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan, for this clarification.

Can we take it that for the time being we can delete N and Q? Any objection? None? Okay. We agree to delete N and Q and then go to the next page. As the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group mentioned there are some words that are causing some difficulties and specifically on the first bullet on Paragraph C the word privacy. I take it if this word is deleted the remaining text is agreeable to everybody.

Can I ask the meeting whether we can delete the word privacy? Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair.

Ducker our consideration of these paragraphs to delete, we also considered this paragraph and I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the term privacy is located in section Resolution 130. This is a word, a term that's used in Resolution 130. It therefore is a term using resolution to the plenipotentiary conference so the Arab Group believes it is important to maintain Paragraph C.

Thank you.

>> Thank you very much, Saudi Arabia.

I have on my list United Kingdom and Brazil.

One question that I would like to pose for the meeting is that taking into account the extreme flexibility that the Arab Group has shown, can I propose that those who have some position

with respect to the word privacy if they would be willing to compromise and agree to keeping the word privacy here.

I start with United Kingdom. You have the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We appreciate all efforts to move forward with this document.

The position with considering C is actually a little more complicated in that the WSIS+10 beyond 15, that is a useful document but it was an input document into the overall WSIS+10 process. Our preference which we stated in the Ad Hoc is to have a reference and recall at the top to the resolution that captured all of the aspects of the WSIS+10 review and we think it is much better and it is much more respectful for the WSIS+10 process leading to that resolution if we do not quote the input documents but we quote the output documents which was agreed in the U.N. General Assembly. That reference is to the top of this resolution and we think it is wrong and it is unfortunate and we think it is inappropriate to quote from an input document when we have the reference document.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom.

United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much

I would also like to make the comment that the concern about this language is broader than the term regarding privacy and refers to as our colleagues from the United Kingdom just said to the fact that the vision for WSIS beyond 2015 was an input document to the resolution.

In addition to that comment, I would also say that the two subparagraphs that are included in this Paragraph C are only a portion of the document that was even agreed as an input document so it has a particular emphasis without representing the balance that was in the document itself and then was, of course, translated into the ultimate resolution. I agree with my colleagues from the United Kingdom that this is a broader concern and -- a broader concern for us.

I would add as I have the microphone, just a reminder, that we do have a no-change position on this document and we have participated in all of the discussions in the Ad Hoc Group as well as some bilateral and collective discussions and look forward to continuing to discuss them as we move along.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

It appears that we have diverting views on this point. It would be best to skip this for the time being and go to other square brackets to see if we can reduce the number of scare brackets to the extent possible.

Ghana.

>> GHANA: Thank you, Chair.

We move on to considering E and considering experienced we're talking about a UNG Resolution 71/25 and that was recalled as C. The argument here was that because it has been recalled as C it is not necessary to emphasize Parts which tends to put in quotation marks and that this is redundant and could be removed.

Mr. Chair, this is for members to decide at this stage what to do with this considering.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Ghana.

So I take it that one option is to delete this Paragraph E. Any views on this?

Saudi Arabia?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair.

In reality this proposal wasn't an Arab proposal, it was the pot significance set out by Brazil, if I'm not mistaken. However, when we considered this text we thought that this was important text and the Arab Group believes it is important to maintain this paragraph particularly given that this Paragraph refers to agreed text from the United Nations General Assembly. Did the Arab Group position is therefore to maintain this text?

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Saudi Arabia.

The proposal is that there would be no harm if we keep this Paragraph E.

Any strong feeling or objection to keep this Paragraph E and remove the square brackets?

United States.

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

We also very much appreciated the attempts by our colleagues to come to some compromised text here. A couple of elements and a comment we would like to make: One, we already do have a reference to the UNGA Resolution above so it makes me wonder why we might have it here again and while the references that are in this particular set of paragraphs have reference to the topic, there are many other paragraphs with relevance to the topic, for example this paragraph quotes Paragraph 10 on building confidence and security and the concern about growing challenges and abuse of technologies, however, it does not refer to Paragraph 9 for example which affirms the same rights that people have offline must also be protected online.

The second part of this quote refers to Paragraph 50, for example, with I is also an important paragraph, but then it doesn't include, for example, Paragraph 51 which affirms the applicability of international law to cyberspace. While these are important paragraphs there are many other important paragraphs. We already have a reference to UNGA

Resolution 70/125, we think this Paragraph is unnecessary and doesn't capture the full context of the document.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

It appears that we need further discussion on this Paragraph E.

Ghana, can we move to another part of this resolution to see whether we can remove or resolve some of the square brackets?

>> GHANA: Thank you, Chair.

Under recognizing we have 7 square brackets and considering your time, we have just about 2 minutes so I don't think I can proceed.

The A, here the issue is about global level. Global level.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Ghana.

Before we can continue, can I ask the interpreters for maybe 15 minutes?

>> 15 minutes is fine, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

So we have 15 more minutes maximum.

Ghana, do you have a way forward with respect to this, recognizing A?

>> GHANA: Thank you, Chair.

We're in a global conference. We are looking at cooperation at an international level. If it is acceptable I don't find global a very strange way to ask. If membership would agree, we could keep mobile.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, very much, Ghana, for your way forward.

Can I suggest that we keep the text as it is and remove the square brackets around recognizing A? Saying this in light of the many flexibilities that we have seen from the Arab Group.

United Kingdom, are you prepared to be flexible?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I should mention that I'm speaking on behalf of CPTA and we're prepared to be very flexible, however, on this paragraph we have concern or concerns about this language which was dear to us and we were unable to have any clear view as to what collective preventative measures were particularly in conjunction with the global level. Incidentally, we consider that cyberspace is a global entity and we weren't sure of the purposes of those words either.

There is such uncertainty about this language, we didn't know what it meant and we felt that we were unable to commit to this being text in an ITU resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: United States.

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

I also wanted to note here that the concern of this Paragraph was not just at the global level. Indeed, this is a global conference and cyberspace is indeed global and there are any number of international cooperative engagements that entities can take part in. Like our colleagues from the United Kingdom, we also wondered what the collective preventive measures was intended to capture in this context. It is a new concept here and not something that we have had discussed before and also given the amount of deference to cooperation in this resolution that it was confusing and also possibly unnecessary.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you very much, Chair.

Paragraphs could be acceptable for us as the Arab Group, however, if drafting of A is not suitable for some parties we may be able to accept the drafting in Paragraph B.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Saudi Arabia. You're showing extreme cooperation. I'm grateful for your cooperation and understanding.

Can we delete -- recognizing A and keep recognizing B instead? Any views?

Any objection? United Kingdom

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you and we're grateful for the suggestions.

We wonder if we should look at these proposals in the Ad Hoc Group rather than going through them in Com 3. There is no formal discussions that need to happen to schedule these issues, and we're not quite sure if we're in the right venue to do this. I would be grateful to have your guidance on this matter.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Well what can I say? The Chair of the Ad Hoc Group informed us that the discussion in his group is not really leading to any specific outcome and the meeting was -- they were repeating themselves, the countries, that was my understanding of the position. I tried to make an effort to see whether together we would be able to move forward and so far we have seen extreme flexibility. Let's finish this recognizing A and B and then I would have other proposals.

Any objection to removing -- recognizing A and keeping -- recognizing B instead?

United Kingdom

>> UNITED KINGDOM: I'm speaking on behalf of CPTE.

This discussion is difficult for us. Our colleagues in the

Arab Group, we very much appreciate the constructive approach here have proposals that we have not seen. The first we know about the Arab Group proposals is when we hear them on the floor of Com 3. We do wonder if perhaps the discussions would allow us to proceed in an easy way, for us to consult among the colleagues, if we were in a different venue. It is difficult for us to react to the set of proposals that we think may be available as a result of the very helpful discussions that the Arab Group have been having. May we see the proposals in a straightforward manner and then we could please consider them in a much more efficient way.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom.

We have only 8 minutes left. Considering the fact that we have tried our best to see whether we could proceed forward in this document, it appears that maybe Committee 3 at this time is maybe not the best place to continue discussion.

I would like to request that maybe the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group could continue his efforts and encourage participants to be more flexible so that we would be able to remove additional square brackets. If you're agreeable to this, then I would like to -- by all means.

The discussion by the Ad Hoc Group?

>> Yes. Of course, Chair.

We agree to follow discussions, in the Ad Hoc Group. However, I would like to draw your attention to the Ad Hoc Group. We met until midnight last night given that the Arab Group would like to rack up the work on this question. We have tried to put forward its proposals at the end of the Ad Hoc Group work.

We're in your hands, Chair, if you think that it may be better to follow-up the work in an Ad Hoc Group.

We're absolutely ready to do this. However, I would just like to remind you that the Ad Hoc Group finished its work yesterday evening at midnight and we couldn't continue our work after that.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

Thank you very much for your understanding.

As you see, it is getting late. Can I have the agreement of the house that we request that the Chair of the Ad Hoc to resume his work and to make every effort to reduce the number of square brackets to the extent possible. If there is a need, we could come back to it at a later stage.

I see people are asking for the floor. If everybody agrees, we can go on.

I see that people are cooperating.

Jordan, are you asking for the floor? You insist?

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chair.

We agree to follow-up the discussion. I would ask you to take into consideration that we have other meetings tomorrow morning for the Ad Hoc Groups. We also have meetings of the Committee, therefore if we could just take this into account the Ad Hoc Group meeting should not clash with these Ad Hoc meetings. We could ask to hold the Ad Hoc Group meeting so that we can present our work to you.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jordan.

Ghana.

>> GHANA: Thank you, Chair.

I realize that Com3 tomorrow has an hour, I also remember other work that you have given to another Ad Hoc Group tomorrow morning and then the preference as Jordan said, wanting to be a part of this meeting and others tomorrow. With respect to this, if distinguished delegates could agree, we would continue today after this meeting and see as many square brackets could be removed so that as much time as you have in that hour tomorrow you can use it to address that.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Ghana.

Yes. I think it would be worthwhile for us to work as much as we can. Of course, I do recognize that people are tired, would like some rest. Nevertheless, we only have come to this conference to finish the work and if you do not finish the work then it is useless. I suggest that in spite of all the problems and the fact that everybody is tired, that we could continue the discussion in the Ad Hoc Group, taking into account that in 2 minutes we should address the plenary if you want to continue, it would not be any interpretation.

>> GHANA: I suggest that we currently continue to meet now with the exception of -- if we can do that, see that we're asking for this room, can you -

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We would consider discussing this as the Ad Hoc Group, we note that we are not able to see this proposal that was now addressed in the meeting here in advance, we hope it is possible to discuss these items in the Ad Hoc Group.

However, maybe that would be a need for at least having a short time to consult between the Regional Groups if or between the finish of this meeting until the start. I think it was inferred by previous speakers also that there are new proposals coming on the table and we need to possibly see the proposals before if possible before we continue the discussions. Maybe we should have a 30-minute break between this meeting and the next

meeting.

>> CHAIR: It is important that all proposals with the Ad Hoc Groups and the work carried out efficiently, we assume if there is no agreement that we would probably come back to the regional document.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Sweden, I think it is reasonable to have a 30-minutes break just for the people to stretch and to relax a little bit and to engage in this-house consultation and then the work of the Ad Hoc group will continue after a half hour.

If everybody is agreeable to this -- I see Saudi Arabia is asking for the floor.

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

First of all, we support the idea to hold the Ad Hoc Group meeting after this meeting because tomorrow we have so many meetings to attend. Another point, I would like to emphasize, Mr. Chair, that the Arab Group did not come up with new proposals. We are trying to find proposals that could be consensual based on our proposals.

Once again, I would like to emphasize that there is no new proposals, but just an attempt by the Arab Group to find a consensual solution agreeable to all regions.

Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: United States, last speaker.

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

I was wondering if I could make a suggestion to help make our workload a little lighter tomorrow on a different matter? We had set up an Ad Hoc Group on looking again at the text related to question 4/1 on economic policies. One of the points that was unresolved during the Ad Hoc Group was related to the inclusion of OTT services and the terms of reference of the study question.

I think that based on the discussions from the Ad Hoc, we really came -- we could not come to consensus on the conclusion of this topic into the terms of reference for suppression or on the new text that was brought in by the Arab region related to OTT services. It is in square brackets and I don't think another Ad Hoc Group tomorrow morning will help resolve that. Perhaps we can appeal to you to not have another Ad Hoc Group tomorrow for everybody.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

With collective wisdom of the Ad Hoc Group is that there will not be any progress on this topic, then first we have to consider it in the plenary tomorrow morning.

Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, we have come to the end of our meeting. We have one session tomorrow starting at 11:30.

We have also requested another evening session tomorrow.

Be prepared. We'll meet after our first session tomorrow. We'll come back to reconvene the Committee 3 meeting at 18:30 tomorrow evening.

Thank you very much for your participation, for your cooperation and the meeting is closed.

(Concluded at 21:49).

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.
