

FINISHED FILE

ITU WORLD TELECOMMUNICATION DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE 2017
BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA

18 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.

Welcome back to our 11th Session in Committee 3. We have a
large number of items to cover, and I would like to emphasize
that we need to be as efficient as possible in our work tonight.

Before I start, I would like to thank each and every region
and organization, regional organizations that have been
flexible. Of course, there has been extreme flexibility and
cooperation from all. Let me mention that this extends to the
countries in CITELESA, we really appreciate their cooperation, also
CDTP, we have been fortunate with their flexibility and
cooperation, the Arab Group, the RCC, the Asia-Pacific, the APT
Group has all been very flexible and cooperative in their
approach to various different, sometimes difficult scope before
us. In that light, I extend my gratitude and appreciation all
regions for their cooperation and flexibility in dealing with
different -- and at times -- difficult issues.

I would like to start with the problems that are less of an
issue so we can move as quickly as possible and see what we can
do with the remaining items. I would like to start with
Resolution 15. Applied usage on technology.

Could I ask Russia as the focal point for this resolution

to present DT/38 R1.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you very much, Chairman.

So we worked very fruitfully on the draft of this resolution. We held a number of meetings at which we exchanged opinions. A number of different proposals is were voiced and as a result of this we successfully reached a consensus. We're very happy to present that to you.

The first part, we added a reference to the current resolution, also taking into account the spirit of cooperation between the sectors we noted also the importance of this draft, the work of the Directors of the three bureaus and the importance of the three directors working on this issue. This draft resolution is thus presented for your discussion and consideration.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia Federation, for all your efforts. I understand there is no square brackets and you have had extensive conversations with all interested parties. We have a consolidated text that's agreeable to all.

I see Russian Federation nodding.

United States, are you asking for the floor?

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

We thank the Russian Federation and other administrations for working with us.

We have agreed to text and we have exchanged that text. This file just has not updated yet. People in the room, before you, the text before you, it has been changed and it is in the process of being updated in the system.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States, for this information.

As indicated earlier, it takes time for the different documents to be processed in the system, which is beyond our control. Taking into account that there's been a revised document, revised DT/38 and we are making a decision on that document.

Do I have your agreement that the revised agreement meets with your agreement and approval?

ATDI is asking for the floor.

>> ATDI: Thank you, Chairman.

The Document 38 Rev1 is already uploaded. So is the Agenda. There is a revision and it is -- and you can show us the Revision 4. All of the documents we discuss here, it should be used most updated version. Again, 38 Rev1 is already a DT document.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for that information. Let us check and see whether we can pull up the revised version now.

This is the revised version. I submit this revised version for your approval.

Thank you for pointing that out, that the revised version is available on the web.

Do we agree that we approve this document? The revisions to Resolution 15? Any request for the floor? Silence means agreement. I don't see any objection. So decided, this Revised Resolution 15 is approved. Thank you, Russia, for all your efforts, thank you all who have participated in this work.

Next we go to DT/79.

Thank you for your patience. I intend as I mentioned -- I intend to go to those documents that do not have squared brackets in order to proceed as quickly as we can.

My colleague and Secretariat are checking, let's go to Resolution 20, DT/77. We'll see if that document has any square brackets.

Yes. I think this document has some square brackets so we can come back to it, Saudi Arabia.

Document 37, Resolution 37. Let's check. We have it on the screen. 37, the lead country, the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group is Sudan.

Sudan, do we have any square brackets in this, please?

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

We had ended our work with regard to our group. However, Document 20 with Addendum 7 with added with 50 and 54. We had a meeting yesterday and had an agreement with regard to Document DT/19.

Mr. Chair, I would like to say that this resolution leads to the suppression of both Resolutions 50 and 54. DT/52 Rev1 tackles this.

I take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, in order to thank all those who have participated in this work.

I would like to especially thank the Secretariat, and from the ITU-D I would like to thank Andrea Mya and Marco. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sudan.

We're dealing with three documents. Let's start with DT/19. Can we approve this document as it is?

Any comments on the revised version of Resolution 37?

I do not see any square brackets -- yes, there is some square brackets.

Sudan, can you please tell us about Paragraph V here?

>> SUDAN: Thank you, Chair.

When we presented in document there were no square brackets.

>> CHAIR: The square brackets we're seeing on the screen is only bringing attention that this is something that was added.

It was an earlier edit. We can remove that.

So with this explanation, do I have your agreement that we can approve Revised Resolution 37 as contained in Document DT/19?

Any objection? You agree with this? I take it you approve resolution as it is in DT/19 and we'll remove the edit, the notes that were just for edit of the text have no impact on the content.

Thank you very much. So decided.

Next we go to DT/69. We have a draft new resolution. You may recall that it was two resolutions, one proposed by the African Group, the other proposed by the Arab Group. We encouraged them to combine these two draft new resolutions and now we have Document DT/69.

I invite Japan. I think --

>> JAPAN: Sorry for my interruption.

The 47, it was the issue, so -- which resolution, is it --

>> CHAIR: Yes. Resolutions 50 and 54 will be replaced and Resolution 37 as revised was approved.

I go to Jordan.

Jordan, please present this document.

>> JORDAN: As you can see, there is a -- thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In fact, we have held one meeting between both the Arab Group and African Group with participants from other regions in order to discuss both resolutions. We have come up with this DT/69. This Document DT/69 includes one pair of square brackets and it is IMEI. It is part of recognizing.

I would like here to mention that this is used in concordance with other resolutions, mainly Resolution 97.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan.

Okay. We have a text on the draft new resolution. There are two places that we have square brackets referring to IMEI. We have two options here: The first option is to remove the square brackets, and the second option is to remove the square brackets together with the text.

I'm seeking your views. Any preference of either one? United States.

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

I think the United States believes this text should be removed. We think that in this resolution it is best to keep the text technology neutral rather than pointing out a specific mechanism for how countries are combating mobile device theft.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

Jordan, can I suggest that we remove this text? This is

only one example. There may be other examples in the interest of moving forward. While removing the text would not materially change the intention of the paragraph, it would enable us to move forward.

Jordan, please.

>> JORDAN: We had very lengthy discussion on this issue. We did explain this reference was used in other PP resolution, however, for the sake of cooperation and collaboration we would accept to remove the text in order to proceed and accelerate our work.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Jordan, I'm grateful to you for your cooperation. Many, many thanks.

Then I take it -- then I submit it to you for your approval. We do not have any square brackets in this document. Do you approve of this new draft resolution? Any comment? Any objection? I do not see any requests for the floor, I take it that you approve.

Thank you very much. So decided.

Next we go to another draft new resolution, DT/56. It was a proposal from CITELE.

I have a request from the floor from the United Arab Emirates, U.A.E.

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

Your review of this draft text, I would like to say that we did not have the opportunity to take part in unofficial negotiations, however, we would like to thank all those who have identified this text and we would like to commend them only the content. The content of this resolution was tackled by other resolutions of ITU-D, therefore as the Arab Group we think there was no need for this resolution since the contents of the resolution was covered by other resolutions as well as other study questions within the ITU-D.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Could I ask the focal point for this draft new resolution, I believe it was drafting resolution proposed by CITELE.

I invite Mexico, please.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chair.

This document, which we have put forward in the last few days, put forward important points from United States, from Kenya and refers to unserved areas. These areas are implementation of this Recommendation 19 by this conference has allowed for countries who have implemented this to identify some aspects, which would allow operators who are non-traditional operators who usually work in the communication area to go in these areas, this is seen in the America region as well as the

African countries and in Asian countries. This considered as an important step forward.

For us, we feel we have made this document available to members with the tracked changes. Once again, I put it forward for your consideration, and we would also like to invite comments in order to improve the document, then, of course, we can do this. I also feel this is an opportunity to have a specific resolution in order to work upon other areas which are different to those that we have used in the past in order to reach unserved areas in order to achieve mission to boost communication patterns for those people across the world.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mexico.

We understand that there have been so many Ad Hoc Groups at the same time and some Delegations and regions may not have been able to participate in all Ad Hoc Groups, that's, of course, given. Nevertheless, the fact of the matter is that many Delegations worked on this draft new resolution. While I do understand the position of the United Arab Emirates on behalf of the Arab Group that this resolution may not be needed, but considering the fact that other regions have worked on this resolution and believe that it would be it very wasteful, particularly when the emphasis that it has on unserved areas -- could I request U.A.E. to reconsider their position and enable us to move forward?

United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chair.

If we wish to consider the context of their text, we will see that there are, in fact, a number of difficulties because several paragraphs linked to the mission and mandate of national administrations cause problems because those administrations can take into account the needs of individual countries and address requests for support to BDT, in particular as with regards to this very question, and that is the new approaches for poorly served areas, we could work this through the different Study Groups, we have reservations with respect to a number of terms if we're talking, for example, of non-traditional operators, the Saudi Administration already raised this issue where we're talking about non-profit operators, we have not spoken specific clip about non-profit operators, the terms are slightly different. We do not indicate who specifically is in charge of this work, therefore we consider the fact of attempting of working on this text right now is not productive. The approach is not productive and we also consider that the content of this resolution includes issues that have already been tackled in a number of other resolutions where we can achieve the same goals so we don't need this additional text.

Thank you, Chairman.

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

Colleagues, we have a large number of resolutions before us. If you want to spend even 10 minutes on each resolution, that will take us to the morning. I'm prepared, I can continue working, but if you want to proceed, my humble request is please be as brief as possible in your statements.

I have three requests for the floor. I would close the list at this time. Only I have Egypt, Russian Federation and South Africa.

Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chair.

In addition to the arguments voiced by the Distinguished Delegate who spoke previously with respect to the procedures followed with Resolution 11, the merging of 46 and 68, we consider that a large part of this text can already be found in Resolutions 46 and 11. Moreover, he would with like to reiterate that within the part of the document there are a number of questions presented by the Distinguished Delegate of Mexico. Here we're talking about interference in general mandates of national administrations. Therefore, our opposition to that text.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt.

Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you very much, Chairman.

We due to a large load already was unable to participate in the drafting of this text. At the same time, having studied the draft text we would like to note the following: Indeed a large part of the text, which is proposed in this resolution, is already contained in other resolutions such as Resolution 11, also contained in a question which we approved and that is 1/1, also 5/1, some can also be found in Recommendations D/19. We understand that this is a very important question, and therefore the CITELE administration has every reason to propose, consider and adopt it, but in our opinion this question, because it is of such great importance has already been considered in a whole chain of different areas in the sector. There are already -- there is a recommendation on this issue. We already have a special resolution on this. Therefore, Chairman, we also consider just like the previous speakers that there is no need to adopt this new resolution.

I would also like to note in addition that as you, yourself, Mr. Chairman, noted, we do not have sufficient time due to the large number of resolutions. We conducted a special effort to streamline and reduce the number of resolutions, and so therefore, once again, we would like to emphasize that

despite the great importance of the significant issue raised by the countries of CITELE, notwithstanding we consider that this question is being considered in the sector in due manner.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Saudi Arabia, please be brief.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair.

Very briefly we would like to thank the Distinguished Delegate of Mexico for the enormous efforts plowed into compiling this text. We also note the position of the U.A.E., Egypt and Russia, some of the questions have already been tackled within Resolution 11 and 64, Resolution 37 on the reduction or closing of the digital gap covers the task of connecting the next billion users of Internet.

Given the lack of time, I think we need to stick to the text we already have.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

South Africa.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, Chair.

I think as many that spoke before us, we welcome the principles, Chair, in terms of the opinions, especially coming from developing country. We want to ensure that all citizens are connected. However, Chair, I think that we have some serious concerns with regards to the crafting of this resolution as we think it interferes with national jurisdiction and mandates of governments, such as issues related to public policy of which we have agreed under the WSIS framework that's the mandate when it comes to issues. The issue of spectrum, again, an issue as well that's within each national government and national laws. We also have some serious concern with some of the text, such as under the resolve area where you are talking about I think we need to define further who are the non-profit operators, and then also when we talk about generating the recommendations and collect best practice for creating regulatory and public policy frameworks, again that's again interfering within the jurisdiction of Member States. We have concerns with the resolve Paragraph D as well as F, and then under the institutes and some of the questions, we want to associate ourselves to say that we already have existing questions that deal with these issues. We don't know why then perhaps we would have these duplication.

Chair, I think as I indicated that we do welcome, and therefore, if perhaps the document can be reworked to just ensure that we respect the authorities of the sovereignty of Member States and make sure that we align them, the principles of ensuring that we connect the next billion, but without

necessarily interfering in the public policy space.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, South Africa.

Next is Mexico.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chair.

In the revisions made to the document which you can see, we asked -- so there was a previous version of the text which is being presented, perhaps therefore we could go back to this and go back to the changes made because some of the comments heard today from the Distinguished Delegates are with the previous version of this. Could we perhaps postpone this discussion and consider it with the previous version of this document?

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, Mexico.

I think it is evident in its current form that we're unable to move on this draft new resolution and I encourage you to get in touch with those who have raised their concerns on the current version. If you can come up with quickly with a revised version that would be agreeable to all, we may be able to consider this given the very short time that we do have available in this Committee. Otherwise, then this situation would be quite different.

I think we better suspend our discussion at this time. If there's a need, we could come back to it. There's no decision on adoption of this drafting resolution at this time.

Thank you very much.

Next we go to Resolution 34. We have Document DT/71. Morocco was in charge of this draft resolution.

>> MOROCCO: Thank you very much we have had the honor of leading the work of the Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 34. This is on the role of telecommunications. As you know three proposals were received to modify and amend Resolution 34, this is from CITEL, the RCC and group of Arab States. We take into consideration the results of our various formal and informal consultations. We held one single official group meeting on Tuesday evening, the Ad Hoc Group, at 1930 with about 30 different Delegates attending. We discussed the resolution and took in account all of the proposals. I have the honor to present to you happy news, we achieved the consensus on a bracket-free text which can be found in Resolution DT/71. It is fairly long. It is available currently only in English unfortunately. However, we still submit it, DT/71 to this meeting for adoption at Committee 3.

In conclusion I would warmly like to ask all those parties that participated in the hard work of this Ad Hoc Group. I think all the staff who assisted in our work, I specifically thank the ITU-T who gave us critical assistance.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Morocco, for your hard work. We have revised Resolution 34 before us in Document DT/71. As explained by the Chair of the Ad Hoc on Resolution 34, there is consensus, there is no square brackets in this text and I support this for approval.

Any comments? Any objections to approving this, the revision to Resolution 34 as contained in this document? No objections. So decided. Thank you very much.

Next we go to Resolution 22, DT/65. I invite Egypt as the focal point, the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 22. Please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chair.

The Ad Hoc Group analyzed all the contributions from various Regional Groups with Resolution 22. In DT/65 you can find the agreed text from our Ad Hoc meeting. The meeting agreed on all points in Resolution 22, no square brackets.

Only one point, Mr. Chairman, in considering E I request Secretariat to the remove considering E. It is already reflected. To reflect the same agreement in the Ad Hoc Group meeting.

Mr. Chairman, DT/65 reflecting the agreed text of 22 without square brackets for approval.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt, for your hard work.

We have a revised Resolution 22 as contained in the modified version of DT/65. I don't know if it is DT/65 or DT/65 Rev1 that would -- considering E removed as was indicated by my distinguished colleague from Egypt.

In any case, do I have your agreement on the revised Resolution 22 as explained by the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group on revising Resolution 22? Any requests for the floor?

None? Do we agree with the approval of this document, revising Resolution 22 as contained in Document DT/65 with the explanation that the square brackets have already been removed? I do not see any requests for the floor. I take it that you agree. So decided. Thank you very much.

Next we go to Resolution 48, DT/72. I invite my distinguished colleague, the Chair of Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 48 from South Africa to please present this document.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, Chair.

Chair, we met as the Ad Hoc Group -- my apologies -- we would like to express our sincere thanks and appreciation to the countries who participated in the informal and Ad Hoc meeting which took place on the 16th and 17th regarding Resolution 38. We also wish to thank Sophia Meadows for coordinating and help with her guidance. We met and tried to consolidate the two

proposals that were received calling for the modification of the resolution and the proposals were from RCC as well as from ACT. We were overwhelmed by the coordination.

The resolution, there is no square brackets and the resolution has been shortened and succinct. I, therefore, wish to present this for consideration of the meeting.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, South Africa.

We have revised Resolution 48, in Document DT/72 which was presented by South Africa.

As mentioned, there are no square brackets in this document, and I invite comments.

I see ATDI is asking for the floor.

>> ATDI: Thank you, Chairman.

In resolve 1 it is -- it has the -- can we delete in resolve 1 when we talk about exchange matters regulatory issues electronically the G with something with government and resolution but in Google I couldn't find it, I didn't know until now what is that so maybe other people -- it is only mentioned only once in this resolution. Can we delete it, please?

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

I believe this is a terminology used frequently in ITU, and ITU documents, there are numerous examples that this has been used. Within the ITU this is a used term. I hope this is satisfactory to ATDI?

Any other comments?

Vietnam.

>> VIETNAM: Thank you, Chair.

Could you please go back to the considering?

Just a minor comment, we could possibly see that there is a -- there is an issue with E and D, we would like to delete the D. It is just an editorial thing it seems.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Vietnam.

South Africa, could you examine this, please?

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, Chair.

Yes. We fully agree. I think there is a duplication. We had spotted it earlier and tried to bring this to the attention of the Secretariat. So we are in full agreement that we delete under considering Paragraph D.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

Procedurally there would be a revised DT/72 in which Paragraph D in considering would need to be removed.

With this change, do I have your agreement that we can adopt and approve the revised Resolution 48 as contained in Document DT with the modifications that I just explained?

Any requests for the floor? Any objection? I do not see any requests for the floor, so I take it that you agree to approve the revision of Resolution 48 as contained in this document with the other removable of considering D, which was only for editorial purposes.

I do not see any requests for the floor. I take you agree with this proposal. So decided. Thank you very much.

Next we go to Resolution 64. Resolution 64, we have DT/64. I invite my distinguished colleague from Romania to please present this document.

You have the floor, Madam.

>> ROMANIA: Thank you very much.

I'm grateful to you for entrusting me with this work and I'm happy to present the text of Resolution 64 in this document with no square brackets.

Mr. Chairman, our Ad Hoc on Resolution 64 was held yesterday morning, one meeting, and therefore I present to you the results of that meeting in DT/64 for your consideration at the Committee 3 meeting for approval. First of all, I would like to thank all participants from interested parties for their efforts and for the spirit of cooperation that they showed. I would also like to express special thanks to the ITU for her excellent work and guidance. I present to you the text of Resolution 64 on protecting and supporting users, consumers of telecommunication, information and technology services. We have amended the considering part with some resolutions of the plenipotentiary conference in 2014, WTSA2016, Resolution 70 approved by the General Assembly by the United Nations and more regulations from Bussan.

In the taking into account part, there are some Amendments that the meeting agreed to in order to better protect users. Also in the results part, there are no square brackets. We had mentioning of Persons with Disabilities which we -- we have used for this part, we used the text that was agreed in the Working Group and we thank our colleague from the U.A.E. on working on putting together the text for Persons with Disabilities and for Persons with Specific Needs which we integrated here in two sections.

I submit to your approval this document.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Many thanks, Romania, for all your hard work.

I do appreciate your efforts.

Before us we have Document 64 on Revisions to Resolution 64 and as mentioned about I my distinguished colleague from Romania, there is no square brackets and it has been it extensively gone through, consultations. I invite comments.

I don't see any requests for the floor. Can I take it that

we have your approval of revisions to Resolution 64 as contained in DT/64? No objections? Thank you very much. So decided.

Next we go to Resolution 68, it is DT/68 -- I'm sorry. Resolution 66, Resolution 66, it is DT/66. I invite Argentina to please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair.

Argentina Delegation coordinated this item, the person in charge of this is not in the room at the moment. This person has just entered the room.

>> Thank you, Chair.

I would like to present Document DT/66 which makes reference to the work undertaken with regards to Resolution 66 on ICTs and climate change. We were working on this resolution, there were different proposals from the different regions, the Arab Group, CITELE and the RCC. These regions worked offline to consolidate a text and then we had an Ad Hoc Group meeting. Here we're presenting to you a text which we feel is consensual text. There are no square brackets in it. Therefore, we put it to you for your consideration.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Argentina, for the work you have done in revising Resolution 66 together with other participants as indicated by my distinguished colleague from Argentina, we do not have any square brackets in this document. I propose that we approve revisions to Resolution 66 as contained in DT/66.

Any comment? Any requests for the floor? None? Thank you very much. So decided. Revisions to Resolution 66 as contained in Document DT/66 are approved.

Next we go to Resolution 76. We have Document DT/65. I invite my distinguished colleague from Sweden to please present this document.

I see Czech Republic is asking for the floor.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Yes, I am. Thank you, Chair.

As obvious at the moment, our colleague from Sweden is not present at the moment in the room. So the, please, in we can get some more minutes before we present this document.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: No problem.

Can we go to Resolution 58, DT/68? Sweden again, I think? No?

Chairman is asking for the floor?

Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Chairman.

It was not Sweden, but Germany coordinating the Resolution 76. If you wish, I could introduce Document DT/55.

>> CHAIR: Yes, please.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Chair.

We met yesterday morning in a small Drafting Group and less than an hour we achieved a consensus text on the revision of Resolution 76 promoting Information and Communication Technologies among young women and men for social and economic empowerment basically we updated references in this resolution and we amended it, the amendments, most of the amendments which are not update, they were proposed by the CITELE. I won't go into each and everything, I just go to what I believe is important.

We include under invited the telecommunication bill to assist Member States an issue with a matter with regard to early education, that was not existing in the previous version of the resolution because we believe that as early as possible one should start with educating young people in the ICT area.

Furthermore, encourages Member States, we add a paragraph, it is number 6, to acknowledge the importance of Entrepreneurship among youths. I think this an issue that's dealt in many, many countries and not only in Developing Countries, but also in developed countries. We consider this very important. Finally, we have introduced a new -- it is instructs -- it is academic members, but it should read invites the academic members -- sorry for this typo -- and here we invite our academic members and we take advantage that we do have them here in our organization and also to foster the academic exchange programs between the countries.

With this -- there are no square brackets in the document, Mr. Chairman.

With this, I leave to you to ask for approval of Document DT/55 and I wanted to thank in particular all participants of the small Working Group and the able-help of the Secretariat, in particular Madam Susan Shaw.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I'm grateful to you for the hard work that you have put on revising Resolution 76. I also indicated my distinguished colleague from Germany, we do not have any square brackets in the revision to Resolution 36 and the only correction is to replace the word instruct with invite the academia.

Do I have your agreement to approve this revision to Resolution 36 in Document DT/55 with the minor change of the word instructs to invite?

ATDI is asking for the floor.

>> ATDI: Thank you, Chair.

In Page No. 4, encourages Member States and sector members, as academia are invited to the WTDC, we can add encourage Member States, academia and sector members in page 4 after the

encourages Member States.

Thank you. Encourages, exactly, the Member States, sector members and academia because we speak on academia, we invite them, so we also encourage them.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, ATDI.

Germany.

>> GERMANY: We accept the amendment. We don't have a problem.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

Are there any other comments? I see no requests for the floor. I take it that you are in agreement with approval of the revisions to Resolution 76 with two minor modifications, one for the instructs the academic members, changing it to invites. Then on encouraging the members of sector members, also academic members of the ITU as well.

With these changes, do you agree to approve the revisions to Resolution 76 as described? I do not see any requests for the floor. I take it that you agree. So decided.

Thank you very much.

Next we go to Resolution 11. We have DT/45 Rev2. I invite my distinguished colleague from Azerbaijan, Chair of the Ad Hoc Group of 11.

>> AZERBAIJAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Good evening to everyone.

Resolution 11, we considered the text yesterday evening after the Committee 3 meeting. All Delegates of interested states participated. We reached a single consensus-based text of the resolution free of square brackets and I request the meeting to consider and hopefully adopt this resolution.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Many thanks, distinguished colleague from Azerbaijan.

As described by the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group on revising Resolution 11, there are no square brackets and this is a consolidated text. I submit this for your approval. Any comments? None? Can I take it that you approve the revisions in Resolution 11 as contained in document DT/45Rev2 and as presented by Azerbaijan? No requests for the floor. I take it that you agree with my proposal. So decided.

Thank you very much.

I'm asking whether Sweden is now in the room that we can proceed with Resolutions 58 and 55? Maybe not. Okay.

We go to other resolutions.

Sweden is in the room. Yes. Sweden, please.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just arrived into the room from other meetings. If you take Resolution 55 first and put it on the screen, I can make just a few comments.

>> CHAIR: Yes. We start with Resolution 55. Resolution 55 in Document 67 is now displayed.

Please proceed.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Ad Hoc Group had a few meetings to discuss the issue. On the screen now you see the final which we believe on the proposal to amend Resolution 55.

I'm not sure it is necessary to go through all the amendments or if it is possible to accept it in one go. That would speed up the process.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Sweden.

I think we can actually go by the with a I you're proposing to consider this, as you explained there are no square brackets in this document.

Of course, there's been extensive consultations and this is the consolidated text. Any views on this?

None. Can I take it that you approve revisions to Resolution 55 as contained in Document DT/67 and presented by the distinguished colleague from Sweden? No requests for the floor. I take it that you approve. So decided.

Thank you very much.

Next is Resolution 58 in DT/68. Sweden, please.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair.

Also Resolution 58 was discussed on several occasions in the Ad Hoc Group, and this is the text that was agreed. I would make the same proposal here, that we do not go over the individual paragraphs but we adopt this text as the agreed text. There should be no square brackets in the text coming out of the Ad Hoc Group.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Many, many thanks, Sweden, for all your efforts.

Any comments on 58 as in Document DT/68 and presented by the distinguished colleague from Sweden? No comments? No requests for the floor. Can I take it that you approve of revisions to Resolution 58 as contained in DT/68? Yes. Thank you very much. So decided.

Next we go to Resolution 63. It is in Document DT/79. I invite my distinguished colleague from the United Kingdom to please present this document.

Yes, Document 79 on Resolution 63. Of course, we do not have any square brackets, but it is not on the system yet. It will take some time.

We'll come back to it subsequently.

Can we go to Document DT/59? It is on Resolution 73.

I invite my distinguished colleague from Czech Republic to please present this document.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you, Chair.

Good afternoon to everybody.

I just caught up on the Action Plan, forgive me.

This Resolution was discussed with interested parties. I would like to thank all those who participated. They prepared the text that was in square brackets and we would like to propose to have this considered as approval in this Committee.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Czech Republic.

Revisions to Resolution 73 as contained in Document DT/59. It is displayed on the screen.

Any comment?

ATDI.

>> ATDI: Thank you, Chairman.

I don't like too much adjectives to undertake in results one, to undertake a major strategic review, can we delete please major. Strategic review is enough and we don't need major strategic review in resolve 1. I hope you found it. Resolve 1. A major -- so remove -- so we start to undertake a major -- yes, please, if you delete major.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Czech Republic, please.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you, Chair.

We have no objections, but we tried to be consistent with the past versions.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: ATDI, can I ask you to be flexible on this? This will require a revision to the document and it has to go through the system in order to reduce the workload for the Secretariat if you can live with this. I know you don't like adjectives, but nevertheless, in this case --

>> ATDI: Thank you very much.

It is a revision. It is not in the original document. I see the revision mark. Why do we sit here and look at the documents in order to improve them? If we can improve them, even if we don't need to translate, only to delete. So, please, if you can delete a major. We don't need the revision. I see the revision mark. Please, Czech Republic, be flexible enough not to have the major in this results.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: I think my understanding was the Czech Republic was fairly flexible.

Yes, we understand, this is a revision to this document. This is Document DT/59, and then if we change this, we have to have Document 59 Rev1 that has to be processed in the system.

That's the point I was trying to make.

Czech Republic, please.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Yes. We can -- we can agree, but again, we would like to stress that even if it is not in this resolution, it is in ITU documents. We wanted to be consistent with the ITU work.

We're in your hands, Mr. Chairman. We do not insist, but we really do not want to complicate things.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

United States, please. Can you propose a way forward?

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

Only to underscore the fact that in the discussions to establish this text with which when you fully agree there was significant dialogue about the importance of the fact that the strategic review should be comprehensive and, indeed, significant. We did settle upon the word major, which we will truly support. We would ask our esteemed colleague from ATDI to perhaps save us by way of efficiencies having to do a revision of this document, and indeed having the document more properly reflect the dialogue of all of those that worked on it and wanted a thorough review.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States.

ATDI, in light of the explanations, would you insist?

While ATDI is considering my request, can we go do South Africa, please.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, Chair.

We just wanted to add our voice to the Member States who spoke before us. We would like to facilitate your work as indicated, therefore we support your proposal.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

The revisions to Resolution 73 as contained in Document DT/59 would be approved. Do I have your agreement? Any objections? None. Thank you, Chair.

So decided.

Next we go to Resolution 71, it is contained in document 73.

I invite Czech Republic again to please present this.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you, Chair.

Again, the same situation, we worked in a small group with interested parties and I would like very much to thank all the participants that took efforts to make it better and we're prepared to present it as it is on the screen.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Many thanks, Czech Republic, for all your

efforts.

As explained, there are no square brackets in this document, and I submit this document for your approval. Any comments? Any objection? I do not see any requests for the floor. I take it that you approve the revisions in Resolution 71 as contained in Document DT/73. So decided.

Thank you very much.

Distinguished colleagues, we have a few more resolutions and while my colleagues are checking to see whether we have any other resolutions that does not have any square brackets, we'll see what the distinguished colleague from Czech Republic has to say.

Czech Republic, you have the floor.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you, Chair.

We wanted to ask whether there will be also Resolution 40? We also prepared with small group of interested parties and we thank all of them for the resolutions that they took part and cooperated. We would like to know whether this resolution is also prepared? As I told you upstairs, there's work on Action Plan and we would like to continue.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

We will go to Resolution 40 contained in Document DT/61. Czech Republic, please.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you, Chair.

As we already mentioned, this resolution is also without square brackets and thanks to all the parties, it was very, very good to cooperate and improve this text.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Czech Republic.

Now we have Document DT/61 on revisions to Resolution 30 as described by my distinguished colleague from Czech Republic, there is no square brackets. Can I set this for your approval?

Any comments? Any objection? None? So decided. The revisions to Resolution 30 as contained in DT/61 are approved. So decided.

Thank you very much.

I want to seize this opportunity and especially thank Czech Republic, I know you had a very small Delegation, but nevertheless helped me in providing the revisions in three resolutions. That's an exemplary way of cooperation. Many, many thanks for your cooperation.

Thank you very much.

[Applause]

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you very much.

We couldn't do it without our colleagues from several countries, Ukraine, U.S., Ghana, sector members and also our academic members. A big thanks.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you again.

Next we go to Resolution 78 contained in Document DT/78.
Is this document available?

DT/59. Can we see DT/59, please?

Let's see Document DT/78.

Could I ask my distinguished colleague from Azerbaijan to please present this?

>> AZERBAIJAN: Thank you, Chair.

This resolution was discussed this morning by our Working Party. We involved all interested Delegations and country members. The group worked very well. There are no square brackets in this resolution. I would like to thank all those who actively participated and helped us produce this single consolidated text. It is, thus, submitted for consideration by Committee 3.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Azerbaijan.

We are considering revisions to Resolution 78 as contained in DT/78, and as explained by the distinguish colleague from Azerbaijan there is no square brackets. I submit this document for your approval. Can I take it that revisions to Resolution 78 as contained in DT/78 are acceptable? Thank you very much. I take it that you approve these revisions? So decided.

Next we go to DT/28, it is on modification of Resolution 46 and suppression of Resolution 68.

Can I ask Senegal, please, to present this if they're in the room?

Senegal, please.

>> SENEGAL: Thank you, Chair.

Indeed, this document of our group on Resolution 46 and 68 that was deleted, moving 46 with changes. We worked on this document based on work achieving consensus with the other regions, that is the Arab region and the CITELE region also working with Asia-Pacific and the African regions with help from others that gave us important assistance of an editorial character. We worked in a spirit of consensus and we're submitting this document without any square brackets and we ask for its approval.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, distinguished colleague from Senegal.

As explained, there are no square brackets in this Document DT/28 it. I submit this for your approval. Any comments? None? Thank you very much. So decided.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have a few resolutions to consider.

I'm not sure if remaining resolutions are on the system.
Can we check the status of Resolution 67?

We don't have any document yet on the system.

69, I know we have a document on the system, but let's take it at a later time.

For your information, these resolutions remain to be considered, Resolution 8, Resolution 20, Resolution 23, Resolution 45, Resolution 63, Resolution 67, Resolution 69, plus some additional new resolutions.

While we're waiting for the system to provide us with additional document, with your permission, I would like to go back to Study Group questions. As was indicated by the decisions of Committee 4, two questions, 6/2 and 8/2 have been merged. We need to provide them with substance on the merging of the two questions.

In the documents we receive in the contributions there are no specific contributions for modifications to the substance of Question 6/2 and 8/2. What needs to be done is consider the existing text on Study Question 6/2 it and 8/2 and merge them together and provide one consolidated text.

I would start to approach those Delegations whose numbers are higher than the average. I ask United States to please help us in this regard. They have kindly agreed. I now am asking other Distinguished Delegates to join the work on this so that it would be at a later document.

I see you're asking for the floor, is it on this subject or other ones? Kenya.

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

It is not on this subject. I requested the floor to draw your attention to the fact that the draft new resolution on the promotion of IoT, Document DT/81 is ready and does not have any brackets. I thought we could take that as we proceed.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, distinguished colleague.

Can I go to this resolution next? Before that, while we're on study questions, United States, please.

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

Yes, the United States has agreed to help merge the two questions, Question 6 on ICT and climate change and on Question 8 on eWaste. I would like to clarify the request because we have not seen any proposals, I want to make sure -- we have taken the existing text and put them together in one document, but because we have no proposals on changing the substance or content, I want to understand if we're to convene a group what is, on what basis do we want to modify the text?

>> CHAIR: We need the substance of the combined Question 6/2 and 8/2 and the only thing available at this time is the

current text. I would like to suggest that maybe we could benefit from my distinguished colleague from Nepal that was the Rapporteur for Question 8. I believe he could join you and we could benefit from his expertise in the subject and I invite other colleagues that are interested in these two topics, which are of relevance to Sustainable Development Goals to join the United States to provide us with a consolidated text.

Could I ask the United States to be as speedy as possible so that we could have a text hopefully by tomorrow morning in one way or another. From tomorrow morning from 8:00 to 9:30, that's our only chance to consider everything, including the combined and merged Question 6/2 and 8/2.

Thank you very much for your understanding and cooperation and so this would be the way that we should move.

In the meantime, if there are any -- if there is a need for clarification, I would be available for -- to be at your side and help you in this endeavor.

We can go back to the existing resolutions as mentioned by Kenya, we have DT/81 on a draft new resolution and I invite Kenya to please present this document, DT/81.

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

Good evening, dear colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, we did coordinate the consolidation of two proposals for a draft new resolution to promote the adoption of IoT, smart cities and communities within the context of SDGs and Connect 2020 Agenda.

Mr. Chairman, we had two meetings and eventually succeeded to merge the two proposals and came up with a consolidated text that was arrived at through extensive consultations.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to present to you this particular new draft resolution in DT/81 and in the process I wish to thank all participants that participated in this process, Mr. Chairman, it was a very cordial discussion indeed.

Thank you, very much, Mr. Chairman. I submit this to you for your consideration.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your hard work on this draft new resolution.

We have Document DT/81 before us. There are no square brackets and it has gone through extensive consultations. Can I present this document to you for your approval? Any comments?

Saudi Arabia, please.

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

I would like to thank the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group for conducting and producing such a great consensus document.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a small amendment to the resolve part of the resolution. For the ITU-D,

in close collaboration with ITU-T and ITU-R, and continue with the sentence. For the ITU-D, in close collaboration with ITU-T and with ITU-R. After ITU-D, in close collaboration with ITU-T and ITU-R, and will continue the sentence as is.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

Are there any other comments?

South Africa, please.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, Chair.

South Africa supports the proposed resolution and wish to thank those that have worked on it.

However, Chair, we just have a small question, perhaps if we could just receive clarity: Under instructs the director of BDT in collaboration with the director of TSB and BR, number one says to prepare a report identifying the needs of the mapping countries related to IoT and smart cities and communities based on the work adapted by ITU-R and ITU-D as well as other stakeholder organizations. We just needed clarity, Chair, as to who are the stakeholder organizations that are being referred to here.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, South Africa, any other comment before I give the floor to Kenya to please clarify the situation.

There is no other requests for the floor.

Kenya, please.

There was one proposal by --

>> KENYA: Thank you very much, Chairman.

In drafting that part, there was recognition that there was a need to provide an opportunity to gather as much information from us, you know, as stakeholder community as possible, as wide, it goes towards bridging the output of the -- the output of the process of gathering information.

Mr. Chairman, it is recognized that there are stakeholders that do extensive work and it in that recognition that the text is drafted as such. Maybe my colleagues can add further justification to that.

Thank you, Chair.

.

>> CHAIR: ATDI.

>> ATDI: I see in the resolution that you refer to Questions and there is a Question on IoT and smart cities.

May I kindly propose two things, first of all, in the resolution to refer to the question, and more important, in the question to refer to this new resolution. If the question was already approved in the plenary there is another issue. Again, we have a question on IoT and smart cities in this resolution and may refer to -- they're recalling, for example, and in the question itself, this is a match -- this is important to refer

to this in your resolution.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

I think we approved the question already on IoT. I think we cannot go back to -- go back the material and the substance of the question on IoT.

It is a possibility to refer to the question as this time in this drafting resolution.

We have two proposals, one by Saudi Arabia to add a few words that would indicate there is a need for close collaboration in ITU-D and ITU-R and also there is a proposal to refer to Study Group Question to the specific question that we have for IoT. Do you agree with these additions to these -- to this draft new resolution? Any objection, none? So decided.

Thank you very much.

Then we go to another resolution, Resolution 63 and we refer to DT/79.

Can I invite my distinguished colleague from the United Kingdom to please present this document?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you and good evening, colleagues.

I'm happy to present this to Committee 3 and I'm thankful for all that took part in the Ad Hoc Group. There were two proposals made on this resolution, one from CITELE and one from CPT. We started with a consolidated text and then we held three meetings to discuss the proposals. They were very friendly discussions but they were not always easy, and there were very strong views on either side. We discussed a number of proposals to try to find a middle ground and finally I held some informal consultations today and I now present the results of the informal consultations.

Mr. Chairman, there is no square brackets in the document, but I know that Member States on both sides of the discussion would prefer to see different language in different places. All of my colleagues have been very flexible and made some difficult concessions.

I believe the text here is a good compromise though. The document as a whole is a very carefully balanced text. I hope it can be approved by Com3.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United Kingdom.

As was explained by my distinguished colleague from the United Kingdom, we do not have any square brackets in this revision to Resolution 63.

I see Saudi Arabia is asking for the floor. You have the floor, sir.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair.

I take this opportunity to thank the U.K. for all the

efforts within the Drafting Group. Indeed we have participated with a number of other participants and in a number of meetings, the last of which was this afternoon, in order to arrive to this document. However, Mr. Chair, we still have some concerns to Resolution 63 and DT/79.

Full example: Some wordings referring to IP4 has been removed or suppressed. This is a matter of concern for the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and for a number of Developing Countries too.

We're still dependent on several versions of IP4.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, we think it would be difficult to accept the suppression of reference to the IP version 4.

Furthermore, other text relating to assistance to Developing Countries has been equally suppressed. In our opinion, it is important to review and revise this resolution once again, in order to find a middle ground that would be acceptable to all parties, especially since we're looking into the developmental issues which are of high importance.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

Any other comment?

So United Kingdom, my understanding of the intervention by my distinguished colleague from Saudi Arabia was that they would like to see IP version 4 be referred to in this revised resolution and also they would like to have some language that would indicate the importance of assisting Developing Countries in these matters.

United Kingdom, would you think that this would create difficulties or can you accommodate these two requests?

United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you very much yes. As has been said, we spent a very long time discussing exactly these questions of how best to balance references to IPV4 and IPV6 and the support for Developing Countries. Both of those things are in the text, but the discussion has been around the balance. I'm very happy and I'm at your disposal to take forward any work to make sure that that balance works for everybody in the room if that's possible.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom.

Let's briefly hear other views. There is a request from an observer. We cannot identify -- okay. You have the floor.

>> APNIC: Thank you, Chair.

I'm representing APNIC, a sector member and responsible for IP addressing in the Asian Pacific. I would like to remind you that as the distinguished colleague from the United Kingdom pointed out, these were very Delegate negotiations. I fear that

reopening them to open a new can of worms and we would spend a great deal of time renouncing a great deal of the text.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Yes. We would like to support the comments made by the United Kingdom, we support the resolution as is.

>> CHAIR: In order to facilitate the discussion, I would like to mention that one of the major objectives of the ITU-D is to assist Developing Countries. There's no need to overemphasize this in resolutions. Maybe because of this fact and the revisions of the constitution which specifically and clearly identifies the mandate and the objectives of the ITU-D there may not be any real need to refer to the assistance of Developing Countries.

As to the other suggestion that was proposed by Saudi Arabia on inclusion of IP4, considering the comments that we have already heard I'm asking Saudi Arabia whether you insist on these additions? We're at such a late stage in our conference that I'm afraid spending extensive amount of time on such matters may not be very productive.

Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair.

The text is the fourth edition of IP and the text originally was part of this resolution, and it is in square brackets when we met for the consultation of the text. Nevertheless, we're surprised to see that this part has been entirely stiked out.

As we have already explained to the Honorable delegate from the United Kingdom, there was an exchange of views today, we cannot see the content of our agreement of which we spoke about yesterday which was to retain this part in square brackets and to submit this version to this Committee. Consequently, it would it be preferable to ask to review this document, once again. Currently we're not in a position to support this document as it stands.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

I see many requests for the floor. Maybe we could avoid further discussion if I ask United Kingdom to please take another effort to see whether it would be possible to have more agreement on this. I'm afraid spending more time on this resolution would consume a lot of time that we're very much in need to consider other items on the Agenda and at the same time if you're not able to agree, then we would be passing this on to the plenary with the repetition of the same arguments. It is

for that reason that I'm asking United Kingdom to please make another effort to be as accommodating as possible. I'm sure there are creative ways of modifying the text that would be satisfactory to those who have other points.

United Kingdom, would you agree to my request?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

I'm happy to help in any way that I can.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United Kingdom.

Can I ask those who have requested the floor, Canada, Sudan, Uruguay, Czech Republic, now that United Kingdom has accepted to have another go on this, could you please convey your remarks to my distinguished colleague from the United Kingdom and those that have other views also please join this Ad Hoc Group Chaired by United Kingdom to see whether we can have a consolidated text available to all.

Would you insist on taking the floor?

Sweden, please, very briefly.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Of course, we would participate in further discussion, however, taken into account this has been debated before, we would like to clarify a few issues.

The question of transition from IPV4 to IPV6 is mentioned in several places in the document. It is not removed. However, this is an attempt to ensure that we have a shorter text, so once we have the transition from IPV4 to IPV6 as mentioned several times although it has been stated several times before.

Recognizing E and taking in account A, there is also the question of the needs of Developing Countries mentioned. I think that's also covered in the existing text of the revision of the resolution. We're not really sure what the issue is since this has been raised in debate and it is already covered in the document. It may have been words that everybody is happy with, but I think we have a situation here where we have a carefully developed compromise, everybody is equally unhappy or equally happy with. It doesn't satisfy all countries' requirements but the issues raised in debate are already covered in the document. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sweden.

I think your clarifications are helpful. I'm sure our colleagues will take into account what you just mentioned.

Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you.

To support the interventions is of the U.K., United States, APNIK and Sweden.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada.

Czech Republic.

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

Just completely agree with what's said by our colleague from Sweden and to add something: There was a great amount of time spent with the discussion within the Ad Hoc Group. Further, another amount of time discussing the message bilaterally and finally coming with a sensitive, yet rational compromise.

I think, and as I read the document, the language, it is covering all we need to cover here. I'm really surprised that there is a statement that says something on the contrary. So, of course, I'm happy to follow the discussions when needed.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Czech Republic.

Uruguay.

>> URUGUAY: Thank you, Chair.

We would like to align ourselves with the previous speakers in order to support the current drafting as it stands, and also as mentioned the reference to the concern from the Arab Group with regards to IPV4, and the names of Developing Countries. Both of these points are included in resolves and instructs the BDT and invites the Member States and in particular instructs the BDT part in Number 2 expressly states the intention to assist Developing Countries.

In Point No. 6, it invites Member States, and also refers to IPV4. This is Item 5, sorry.

This protocol is on the deployment from IPV4 to IPV6, and that's really the topic of this resolution here. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Next is Sudan.

>> SUDAN: Thank you, Chair.

Mr. Chairman, we have counseled our previous request of speaking when you asked our colleague from U.K. to lead an offline discussion, but I have seen many colleagues started to go deeply in the document again.

We as Developing Countries, Mr. Chairman, have still IP before it is 90% of our devices, they're using IP and I'm speaking of transition, not only deployment of IPV6, we are in line with our colleague from Saudi Arabia and we have some issues with this text.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sudan.

Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Brazil, we would like to support the document as it is presented now. I would like to it trait that Brazil is fully committed to the transition from IPV4 to IPV6. We think that this resolution presents a very clear and very understandable

way in which this transition can occur, especially the BDT and we think that the instructions are clear and this also provides us with a clear view of what the sector can do in terms of having countries to develop the best guidelines in order to fully complete this transition from IPV4 to IPV6.

To resume, Mr. Chairman, Brazil would like to support this document and we don't -- we may not be necessary for the discussions on this.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

South Africa, please.

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

Chair, I think firstly we wanted to support your direction in terms of saying let there be an Ad Hoc Group that will look into this. We don't want to delay the discussions any further. We also equally share some concerns with regards to some of the text and, therefore, we welcome this and South Africa would be happy to join the Ad Hoc Group.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Next, Mexico.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chair.

We would like to support the document on the screen. We participated in the Ad Hoc Groups and we think that our negotiations, we're trying to find a balanced view. Therefore, we support that we use the text as it stands, and we are in accordance, we would like to support the text as it stands on the screen.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We would also like to support the current text. We believe that this the resolve of the negotiation and hard work and reopening that whole process over again at this 11th hour of the conference may perhaps not be the most productive use of time. We would like to get on with the next resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you.

Mongolia.

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

Mongolia is a developing country, and I have no problems with the text presented. I would like to align myself to the speakers in favor of the draft.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Jordan, please.

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

I want to align with my colleagues from Brazil to these changes. In fact, this resolution was heavily discussed and negotiated to arrive on the text without introducing amendments in the previous WTDC. Now if we want to discuss, and we are not reaching a consensus to this introduced text we can put efforts to discuss it further, but at the end, if there is no consensus on this new introduced text, some believe that the language, that they're sitting -- that there is clarity that is important for Developing Countries, we cannot, Mr. Chairman, agree that the way forward is to accept the changes and to move ahead.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Lithuania.

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

We would like to support what you had said at this late hour, we need to move on and do not need to reopen this issue.

We would like to support Australia, United States, United Kingdom, Czech Republic, Sweden and countries.

>> CHAIR: Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Sorry for asking for the floor, once again.

We could discuss this for hours. I think we need to move on. There seems to be a large support for the compromised text that we see on the screen in Document DT/79. On behalf of CPT, I would ask you to conclude on this issue and continue with other issues that are also important.

With the previous intervention, this conversion is covered in the document and the question of support to Developing Countries is covered in the document. We don't see why this has to be reopened again and taken into account that we need to have a successful outcome of this.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Czech Republic.

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

Quick and brief remark, previously I mentioned certain amount of time spent on the discussion on this document. I mean it. I really am not sure whether we have enough time to reopen the discussions again. If I may, I recall the statement made about I the counsel this a.m. that the discussion in this conference should not go over 11:00 p.m., 2300. It was not the case yesterday, and I hope it is not going to happen again today.

>> CHAIR: Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair.

I'm sorry to take the floor, once again.

We have listened to the comments and we still have some

concerns. A number of administrations have shared their concerns on this resolution. Therefore, it seems that we are not in a position to support this text. We support your approach, which is to have further discussions on this resolution.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

Jordan, please.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chair.

I'm sorry for taking the floor, once again.

Chair, we haven't been in a position to participate actively on the drafting of the text. Nevertheless, we're trying to explain the position of Developing Countries and the way in which the new drafting has an impact on this resolution when we are talking of invites BDT director, instructs -- in general aspect, we are aware of the fact that this Paragraph is really important from a legal point of view and should be supported by members. Therefore, we cannot support this drafting and where it may be possible to follow discussions that would be great and all of the paragraphs should be put under square brackets.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jordan.

Distinguished colleagues, we have a number of options before us on this resolution. Considering the fact that we have a divided house, it would be easy and very quick to make a decision, and the decision would be to adopt this resolution, but some Delegations would make their reservations on this and they would take it up in the plenary. That would not solve all the problems. We're just postponing the resolving of the problem.

I would like to suggest that maybe it would be prudent for us if we could postpone our decision and take tomorrow morning. In the meantime, we provide the time available to different views to try to engage in further discussions. We could make the same decision that we can make now tomorrow morning but if we make the decision now we cannot reverse it tomorrow.

It is in this reason that I suggest and encourage further discussions on this and take tomorrow morning, but if the house is divided tomorrow morning, then we would have to make a very quick decision, we would not reopen the floor for further discussion and would need to make quick decision on this resolution tomorrow morning very softly.

Do you agree with my proposal? Thank you. We can move to other resolutions. The decision is that we suspend this discussion at this time and we'll make a decision on this resolution tomorrow morning. If everybody would be agreeable,

fine, we would have a consolidated text. If in the meantime there is creative approaches to solving the problem by amending the text through explanations, some concerns could be elevated, then we would, again be in this situation to have a quick decision.

My intention is not to open the floor for discussion tomorrow morning. That's based on this decision and this understanding that I would like to suggest that we move forward.

I see there are no requests for the floor. I take it that we agree with my suggestion. Thank you very much.

We can now go to other resolutions. We have Resolution 8, DT/85.

I invite Brazil to present this document.

Al Botswana?

>> BOTSWANA: Thank you very much, Chair.

The collection and dissemination of information and statistics, Resolution 8, it is presented to you without square brackets. The group met to look at monitoring and collecting data in line with the Sustainable Development Goals and achieving the 2030 Agenda for the United Nations and made necessary updates in the references to emphasize the importance of indicators as a key part to help towards planning of national public policies, furthermore, it instructs the BDT to continue to work in close collaboration with Member States in order to share best practices in terms of policies and strategies on a national scope and to develop statistics and looking at desegregated gender by age in order to develop national public policies.

It also invites Member States to report and contribute to the work of the expert groups of the BDT. It also asks for the global symposium of regulators of indicators to continue and to have a workshop on this when necessary.

To close, Chair, I would like to thank the cooperative spirit of my colleagues from the Arab States and the RCC and other colleagues in order for us to be able to achieve this text.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil, for your hard work.

As indicated by with the distinguished colleague from Brazil, there are no square brackets in this document. I invite comments. Any requests for the floor? None? Can I take it that we can approve Resolution 8 as contained in Document DT/85? Any objection? None. So I'll take it that you agree to approve revisions to Resolution 8 as contained in Document DT/85. Thank you very much. So decided.

We have Resolution 67. The document is not uploaded yet. We need to wait.

We have another of more difficult topics to consider.

I would like to go back if you're agreeable to study questions and we have Question 4/1. The substance of 4/1, we discussed extensively yesterday.

I would like to see whether there's been any new development on the discussions that we have had.

Could I ask Mexico, please to be the focal point for this question.

Mexico, please.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chair.

We just had a meeting with the interested parties in order to review this question. Unfortunately we were not able to reach agreement, therefore it is still in square brackets.

What we did identify, there are certain similarities as to what's been established in Question 3/1, however, we were not able to reach an agreement on this.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mexico.

Other views? Suggestions to move forward on this question?

The differences were not that great in my own judgment. In informal consultations I try to provide a way forward, but I see that you did not have any way forward.

South Africa, please.

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

Chair, I think we note the comments and we were a part of the discussions and rightfully stated that we still are not finding common ground. Chairperson, looking at the two documents -- the two questions, Question 4/1 looks at the Economic Policy Assessment so that you can actually assess in terms of whether or not there would be any form ever regulatory policy interventions required. For us, Question 3/1 purely talks about access. You can still have the same subject matter, but the one just is a blanket that looks at access, so open door policy in terms of the IoTs coming in, but yet we have not yet put the parameters from a regulatory perspective as to how these would be regulated, one is the economic model which is what we're trying to seek under Question 4/1.

Unfortunately, Chair, South Africa still stands by to say that we need to have the inclusion both within the subject title as well as what's contained under Paragraph 6 so that we can be able to have a truly defined scope and clarity on these issues so we would then have an appreciation as to what regulatory mechanisms can be applied.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, South Africa.

The way forward on this Question 4/1 is to consider the text with the square brackets and decide on the text with square

brackets and then we have to move forward with this and take the issue to the plenary of the conference if that is what you wish.

United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

For CEPT, as we explained in the consultations, it is our view and it was discussed at some length that we were unable to find any element of the issues that were put into the proposal we questioned, which were not covered either by T Sector Study Group 3, by Question 3/1 previously mentioned, and we also note that there is a specific possibility to raise questions in Question 4/1 related to services as well and when we left this question, the discussion earlier this evening, we understood that those countries who still had a quarry about whether any element of the discussion they wish to have could not be raised would have a look and come back if they found any specific items they felt could not be raised and that we would then see if there needed to be any further text added to the question to cover that.

We continue to believe in the absence of any point to the contrary that there isn't actually anything that's not covered, since the Question 3/1 texts was actually agreed two days after the text which is in brackets was introduced that it was covered ultimately by Question 3/1.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom.

United States, please.

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

I agree with the U.K. I think. The discussion we're having about the study question and one of the points that I think is important that we discuss is wanting to be able to have a full discussion of OTT issues and within one study question and not spread against two different ones. I believe the points raised by South Africa regarding policy and regulatory issues are within the terms of reference of the question as we defined them with Question 3/1 and the Development Sector and study questions. I know we have a lot of issues that are still remaining and I'm hoping this could not be a plenary issue because I think it is -- I'm hoping it is a simple matter of making sure we have some efficiencies within our study questions.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Jordan, please.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I listened carefully to what's been mentioned by the Distinguished Delegate from the United States and U.K. in this regard.

Yesterday we talked about this and with the work

that's taken place with the Standard Sector, I explained that the scope of the T Sector is focusing on the international telecommunications and the scope of this question is related to national issues. There is an important to be focused and keep this reference in the title.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Senegal, please.

>> SENEGAL: Thank you, Chairman.

Senegal also participated in the meeting that we had this afternoon on this question. We think that as regards to the scope of the Question 4/1 and 4/3.1 the scopes were different as underscored by South Africa.

We align ourselves with the position of South Africa on that issue. These are two different scopes. There are political, economic and other aspects of ICT services and OTT services even if we stop at that level, at the level of the title I believe we need to handle OTT services because these are emergent services and the problems are not necessarily the same, whether we're talking about the Standardization Sector or indeed Question 3/1. We can go deep and see what's not covered by one or other of the question in the sectors but we believe that these things should be covered in 4/1.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Any other requests for the floor?

Brazil, please.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We have had a fruitful discussion. Unfortunately I could not stay for the whole discussion of the group, the Ad Hoc Group. I would like to just reiterate some items that -- for these items.

Item 6 seems really to duplicate its objectives with ITU-T Study Group 3, moreover it seems to duplicate its objectives with discussion 3 which we have previously approved in this plenary.

With the efforts in ITU, it is useless duplication of efforts and besides, Mr. Chairman, we as a developing country, we cannot bear financially efforts within different sectors of ITU-T, we're devoted on SDG3 relating to the OTT issues and the economic issues of telecommunications and we truly believe that in this respect especially terms of OTT ITU-T can offer the best and more proper arena for this kind of asking. We think our efforts with ITU membership should be put in that

arena.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

>> Thank you very much, Chairman.

Well, we believe that perhaps this discussion could continue for some time on yes or no whether the results would fall under the scope of Question 4, but we must remember other things such as the Internet of Things, furthermore, other concepts appear under different questions, but they may fall under the scope of ITU-D and this may be the case in a number of cases.

To say that all the aspects are already covered by 3, ITU-D we believe this is to go a little bit too far to say this. We have the impressions that we're taken with the concept of the ITU-T services. I don't know if Senegal's proposal is possible FBI we delete the OTT services in the title of the question and within the terms of reference themselves at 6 we could have a reference to the OTT services without reaching the development that we had mentioned there at the moment. When we talk about duplication of resources at the ITU the Rapporteur on the question is not copying exactly what's done at Study Group 3, no Rapporteur is going to repeat exactly what was done at Study Group 3. It is not going to be an exact duplication.

Can we say that everything that might be studied at Study Group 1 was already taken into account of Study Group 3 if Study Group 3 recently started working a year ago on that issue, less than that. I have some difficulty in understanding if we're looking specifically at the concept of OTT services. I don't want to extend the discussion any longer, but looking at that proposal of deleting OTT services we could end up deleting everything on development and then it could be covered by Question 4, OTT services taken into account the work that's been done at Study Group 3.

The Rapporteur, I must repeat, is not there to repeat exactly what is done by different Study Group, it is not exact duplication.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, TOGO.

Before I give the floor to Romania, I want to clearly understand what was proposed by TOGO.

Did I understand it correctly that your proposing to delete the reference to OTT in the title, but to keep the sections in the text that are -- TOGO, please.

>> TOGO: Thank you, Chairman, for giving me the

floor.

We propose deleting in the title everything on OTT services that's within the title and in the body of the mandate on 6 we could also delete all the details, all the small details in the scope and just keep the reference with respect to the title by taking into account what's done in Study Group 3. I think that would be simpler because we have no interest at ITU at repeating what's done in a Study Group and repeating it in the report word for word. That's of no benefit to us.

So if 6/1, 6/2, 6/3, 6/4 could be deleted completely with the title that studies may cover OTT issues, but taking into account what was done at Study Group 3 of ITU-D.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Now the situation is clear with respect to your proposal.

Just, I would like to repeat what the proposal is: In the title it is proposed to delete any reference to OTT. In Paragraph 6 -- if you come down -- right there.

We keep Paragraph 6 but delete 6/1, 6/2, 6/3 and 6 of/4. That's the proposal from the distinguished colleague from TOGO. Would that be satisfactory to those who would like less emphasis on OTTs? Could that be a middle ground that we could all agree to?

Romania is asking for the floor.

>> ROMANIA: Thank you, Chair.

I was a little bit confused on why we are raising this issue of OTTs in Question 4/1 although we already agreed for Question 3/1 to have -- to study this matter.

Having heard the proposal from our colleague, from TOGO, I just want to raise an issue in the text of the question I can read out for you that it says there pricing of emerging services, that's OTT big data and OTT and it is still mentioned, the OTT, it is still mentioned, right at the beginning of Question 4/1.

Let me check. Yeah. Right at the beginning of the text.

Where it says Question 4/1 at the top. Keep going up, please.

Such as OTT, big data and -- it is still there. The text in 6, we don't see a need for it, and of course we actually agree with the proposal from TOGO that studies from Study Group 3 and ITU-T should be taken into account when we talk about this question. The topic, okay, here we talk about national

telecommunication and ICT networks, and there we talk about international, but they're new to each other and they should work together.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Romania.

Could I ask colleagues to please speak on the last proposal raised by my distinguished colleague from TOGO? Again, the proposal was to delete the reference to OTT in the title of the question and also delete 6/1, 6/2 it, 6/3 and 6/4 in Paragraph 6. Would you have any strong objections to go along with this so that we could have a text that appears to be the middle ground? I'm seeking your views on this proposal. Otherwise, if you want to repeat what you have already said, it will not get us anywhere.

Jordan, please.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chair.

The floor was -- you're not giving me the floor at the appropriate time.

In fact, we want to support you, Mr. Chairman. I think this proposal cannot be -- if you read from the Article 6 it says that during the study carried out in OTT services the following matters should be also studied. Now we're deleting all the following matters. There will be no meaning for 6 without keeping 6/1, 6/2, 6 of/3, I think this is not an adequate proposal for the reformat.

To get back to what was said from the Distinguished Delegate, the question on 4/1, even though we know that the title of the questions are touching only economic issues, however, the subject of reprisal of emerging services and OTTs is a small part of what we want to do so from regulatory and principle perspective regarding OTT. This was not completely addressed in Question 4/1. This is why we wanted to have an emphasis on that in the other question. Basically, I don't see the TOGO proposal could be a middle ground for a way for moving forward.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan.

The United States, briefly, please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you.

We want to thank TOGO for the attempt to find middle ground. We agree with Jordan that it does not go far enough for us. We're trying to avoid duplication of the studies of OTT in two different study questions, and if we leave it in the question without the title it

results in duplication. I think we need to maybe do some work on this and take it back.

Thank you

>> CHAIR: Thank you, U.S.

United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

We would also like to thank TOGO for the proposal.

The -- we would agree with Jordan and the United States on this. In no small measure because the text in 6 has another problem with it, it refers to a study being carried out on OTT services which is not actually referenced anywhere else in the text. It is not even clear what that study would be or anything else about it. I think perhaps something -- some subsequent edit changed some text somewhere else. In fact, the section 6 is not actually a complete piece of work in any case. I agree with my distinguished colleague from the United States. I think we have to have a further offline conversation and perhaps compare the remits of ITU SD3 related to OTT, contents of Question 3/1 and this question and see what, if anything, would be missing given the reference my distinguished colleague from Romania read out that already existed to study OTT in this question as well.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Before I give the floor to Senegal, it is 9:30 in the evening. Could I ask the interpreters for another 15 minutes?

>> As a courtesy, the interpreters can work 15 more minutes.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

We have 15 more minutes.

you want to continue after 15 more minutes then we can continue, but without any interpretation.

Before continuing with this discussion that we were having, I just want to seek your feeling whether you would like to continue after 15 minutes or you want to quit?

We have quite a number of difficult issues that we still have to consider.

Can I take it you would continue after 15 minutes without interpretation? Any objection?

Okay.

We will have interpretation for 15 more minutes, but then afterwards, if you want to continue there will

not be any interpretation.

Now I give the floor to Senegal.

You have the floor.

>> SENEGAL: I think TOGO tried to make a more conclusive proposal with regards to the changes in section 6 in order to avoid the concern of other Delegations I think we can work upon this section in order to redraft it.

What I recall, in the title, I think there are some words which are not usable in ITU such as OTT. I think in the same resolution big data and OTT is used, there is nothing to hide here with that use of terminology with regard to OTT I would just like to say that we need to address OTT in Question 4/1 in the title as it stands.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair.

In brief, we would like to support our colleague from Jordan. We think this is not clear, especially with regard to pricing of services, including the OTT. Do we have a definition of big data? Do we have a definition of IoT? We have not seen such terms with regard to -- we have not seen such definitions with regard to OTT and IoT.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

Swaziland.

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

Good evening, Delegates.

We have followed the discussion from yesterday in terms of what's been the issues. I want to just concur with the Delegates from South Africa with regards to the issue -- the question, they actually do address different elements as far as the issue that's being considered here, as far as it is considered.

If you read carefully, Question 3/1, the title of the question, access to emerging technologies, including Cloud computing and services and challenges and opportunities for Developing Countries. If you look at what Question 4/1 addresses, you can say that these are actually different elements.

I just want to say that from our side we support the position that we like to maintain the discussion and the issues that have been raised on Question 4/1.

Thank you, Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: We have a common space with Jordan. The Question 4/1 #, we have issues on pricing of emerging surfaces such as OTT, big data and IoT, do we have pricing for big data? Do we have pricing for IoT?

We haven't heard of such a thing.

This is really a question on something that's not been -- we don't have the pricing on such technologies.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, distinguished colleagues.

We have come to a point that we have heard many different views. Some attempts were made to resolve the differences and have a unified text.

Nevertheless, I think we have to face the reality, the reality is that the house is divided.

I propose that we conclude our consideration of Question 4/1. We have a text before us. There are some square brackets. We cannot do anything about them.

We just consider this and approve this document as it is with square brackets and then forward them to the plenary of the conference.

Are we in the agreement with this? No objection? So decided.

Thank you. Thank you very much.

Next we go to 8/1. Question 8/1, could I ask the focal point on Question 8/1 from Brazil to please present the outcome of the discussions?

You have the floor, sir.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you.

The results of our discussion on Question 8/1 are reflected on DT/24 Rev2. The title of final discussions would be strategies, policies is, regulations and methods of migration and adoption of digital broadcasting and implementation of new services. We discussed and updated the question to reflect two main issues, to not restrict the question to analog for digital, there are types of transitions that may happen, for example, digital to digital, this is reflected in questions of Study 2.1 and also transition to digital sound broadcasting, for example, and we are including the studies of the Question of socioeconomic aspects and strategies related to introduction of new broadcasting technologies and emerging capabilities in 2.2 and other related items, for example, spectrum, planning activities for the switch-off and interference

mitigation, the use of the digital dividend and all related matters and expected outputs of the question would be a report, dissemination of information to members and compilation of national experiences on strategies, socioeconomic aspects of the introduction of new broadcasting technologies, services and capabilities.

We put forward for the appreciation of the room.

Thank you for all that collaborated to the work for this result that we now present to everybody.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: We have a consolidated text. I submit this document, revision 2 to DT/24 which contains the substance of Study Group Question 8/1 for your approval.

I take you approve of the substance of the Study Group Question 8/1 # as contained in DT/24.

Thank you very much.

We go to Question 4/2. I invite the focal point on Question 4/2, my distinguished colleague from Japan, please present the result of your work.

>> JAPAN: Thank you. This is a proposal on Question 4 Study Group 2.

This document is the output from yesterday and the proposal, the revision for Question 4 to Study Group 2.

The current question for Study Group 2, we have contributions in ADT drafted and Mexico and these contributions proposed to add combating counterfeit on mobile devices on Question 4/2. This document is consolidated proposals of the proposals and have been reviewed in the Ad Hoc, but we could not get a consensus of this proposal in the Ad Hoc meeting.

The other issue, it is the title, combating counterfeit ICT and other mobile device, this is pending in the square brackets.

Mr. Chairman, this is not showing the wording of the title (technical issue).

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: We have a lot on our plate. I want to give context on the buckets.

The con firm man's and interoperability does not affect the mobile theft and counterfeit issues.

We're concerned by including the two issues in a single Study Group question it will result in outputs that -- the separate issue, the issues requiring different tools and approaches and joining them together, we certainly appreciate the need for efficiencies within the Study Group questions, but in this case we believe that having one question merging

all of these issues would limit a full discussion and consideration of important topics for Developing Countries.

It would also result in less useful outputs on these important topics.

During the Study Group Ad Hoc we considered text, but we could not agree on the placement of where the text should go, whether this text on counterfeit and mobile device theft should go in perhaps the consumer protection question or treated as a separate question. With that in mind, the United States view is that this should not be joined in a single Question.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

Could I -- since my proposal -- my feeling is that we may not be able to reach consensus even if we spent a long time in trying to convince each other. Can we request colleagues to be as brief as possible so we can move on with other Agenda items?

>> Brazil?

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, I'll be brief.

Just want to remind that in Resolution 2 we discussed and approved the combating counterfeit communication ICT devices and combating theft of mobile telecommunication devices are a topic of study included in Study Group 2. We wouldn't be able to address this issue on consumers on Study Group 1 and I want to point out that in the new resolution that we addressed here and approved on mobile theft, we think we should have studies on this matter, the right place to address this is Question 4/2 because of information and dissemination of best practices with the interoperability can provide and can help in combating the proliferation of these devices.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil.

United Arab Emirates, please.

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

Good evening.

Mr. Chairman, we support intervention from Brazil on this matter. We believe, Mr. Chairman, by having these topics, combating counterfeit and also the theft and the question, the consumer protection, it will limit the scope of this study. We do have, Mr. Chairman, two new resolutions, one is put forward for the reference on mobile theft and then we have an existing resolution on

combating counterfeit where many, many countries express the importance of that issue of that matter and combating counterfeit.

There was also another country that proposed a new resolution on the same topic. We have seen the importance of this.

If it is an issue of -- after hearing the intervention from colleagues from United States, after having to address the two issues in the consumer protection question, it is not preferable for us, we don't think we want that.

Also the intervention that was mentioned, that they're fine with a separate question on the two issues to be discussed, but now it is too late to do that text. That's where -- I do agree, it is -- I mean, it may not be -- it may not be a relation between the two issues and the issue of compatibility, however, we're trying to group topics under same question in order to limit the number of questions.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I urge colleagues to agree on handling the two items and combating counterfeit and mobile to this question and we support the intervention from Brazil on this.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: It is 17 minutes past schedule, conclusion of today's session.

I think we would not be able to have any further interpretation.

You agree, we can continue to have our discussions. The discussions would be in English only.

Any objection to the continuation of the discussion?

My suggestion is that if you can, please stay so that we can do some additional work tonight.

I do not see any strong objection.

Yes, I see Algeria is objecting -- no? Okay.

Any objections? No.

>> Thank you, Chairman, it is not an objection, but I think taken into account you have tomorrow morning also a Committee, please, just make deadline to finish this late session without interpretation, what is the time that you foresee to finish our work.

It should not be open until midnight or so on.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Yes. Excellent question by distinguished colleague from Algeria.

I think that there is a decision by the council we

should not go beyond 2300 hours.

We would be here until then.

>> We would like to support the proposal.

We think that this topic has to be studied in this study question.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Japan, please.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of the APT members, we support this.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan.

Could I ask, United States, in light of the items on -- the discussions that we have heard, and recognizing that U.S. has an additional coverage from the U.A.E. has already mentioned a combination of these two may not be ideal, but taking in account the situation that we're in at this time would you be agreeable to remove the square brackets?

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: We appreciate the need for efficiencies is. A request that we have for you, perhaps we can work with our colleagues who are preparing this question and perhaps make some slight modifications from the text to make it more clear that we can have possibly separate outputs on the different top it cans and not to result in one single output in topics if we intend to group them together. It may be simple language to take into account some of the differences on the topics. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your understanding. The way forward is that we suspend ore conversation on this topic until tomorrow morning when hopefully some new modification to the text may be agreeable to everybody.

Do I have your agreement on this? Any objections.

So decided. We reconsider Question 4/2 tomorrow morning. I'm asking United States if you could help with the redrafting of some of the text tomorrow morning so that we would be able to revisit this question.

I see the U.S. nodding, I appreciate your cooperation.

Next, Question 3/2. That is a real tough one.

I see a request from Jordan?

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

It is for clarification.

Are we able to engage in discussion and tomorrow we won't have a Committee 3 meeting, they would have feedback for you to report back to you? Is that the way forward?

>> CHAIR: Distinguished colleague from Jordan, we

would be having a Committee 3 meeting tomorrow morning from 8:00, 8:00 to 9:30 we'll be meeting.

So we have from now until 8 in the morning to reword this question. I see you're nodding, thank you for your understanding.

Next, Question 3/2.

Could I ask my distinguished colleague from Bahama to brief us on the progress of the work on this document 21? Bahamas, please.

>> BAHAMAS: Thank you, Chairman.

The work that we have done so far, we have made considerable progress in reaching agreement on some text. We do have remaining some areas of square brackets that we have not been able to resolve. You know, the group has worked very hard to reach the text we have so far.

I think one of the key issues is the relationship between the study Question and Resolution 45 which as you know still is very keenly debated. So if I may, we can go through the text now and look at the areas of square brackets, but it may be more useful to have the Resolution 45 issues resolved before trying to resolve the issues here. I suspect there may be some countries that will take the position that they will wish to see what the outcomes of Resolution 45 are before committing to this proposal.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Bahamas.

Yes, I clearly see your point. It would be not of significant value to open the discussion on issues that are relevant to Resolution 45. Now that we have this before us, could I ask you to point us to certain paragraphs that are still pending so that we could get a sense of progress that's already been made due to your very able leadership?

>> BAHAMAS: The first area of square brackets, the document that's up, it may not be the most recent version. I think we managed to clear a bit more since this document.

The first area where we still have square brackets is highlighted, showing at the bottom of the screen now, or it is in the statement of the issue, referencing the NGA resolution, and the references that follow on the WSIS+10 outcomes.

Then, those that are following Resolution 45 will note this language also appears in that resolution.

The other area of square brackets -- give me one

second, please -- it is in the question for study, so M, it is also in square brackets, that's the WSIS+10 reference.

(Captioner will disconnect at 10PM Local time).

>> We can continue on until we get to -- those square brackets, those have not been cleared.

Other than that, subject to agreement on -- subject to resolution of issues in Resolution 45, it is just these two areas where square brackets remain in the text h

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Bahamas, for your extraordinary work.

I think you have been able to reduce the number of different paragraphs and sentences that were disputed and maybe the way forward on this question is that now that we have noted this, we come back to this document when we have the opportunity to consider Resolution 45 and 69 for that matter.

Do I have your agreement that we have -- that we can now suspend discussion on this Question 3/2? Any objection? None. Thank you very much.

We'll come back to this question subsequently.

The only remaining question that remains in this Study Group is the combination of merger of Question 6/2 and 8/2 and I'm sure my colleagues are working on it. Hopefully by tomorrow morning we would have the opportunity to get some text from them.

(Captioner will disconnect at 10PM local time).

There is a number of resolutions still pending, and we also have to consider the Action Plan. If I could start with Resolution 20, I would like to ask my distinguished colleague from Saudi Arabia who is the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 20, we have a Document DT/77 and I invite my distinguished colleague from Saudi Arabia to please present this document.

The document is shown on the screen.

(Captioner disconnecting, 10:00)

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.
