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>> REINHARD SCHOLL: Hello? Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. We're starting now.

>> CHAIR: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the, is it sixth or seventh Plenary session? I forgot to count the Plenary sessions. Anyway welcome to this morning's Plenary session. As you may see that the UAE Delegates are already celebrating our 41st National Day which is due on the 2nd of December so you might find that there's a theme going on within the UAE Delegates, where all Government entities and public places started celebrating since yesterday.

The last two working days of November. Next week, we have our National holiday because of National Day so all the Government entities have started all the celebrating this pleasant occasion for all of us in UAE. And hopefully if you had any time during the weekend, if you go around Dubai, you'd see lots of celebrations on the streets, lots of celebrations in public areas and we hope that you enjoy the time there.

So if you go back to the business of today's Plenary we hope we could conclude the work of the Plenary quite early. Hopefully we could have a very smooth session, and we could finish before the lunch break. That will give you enough time to enjoy the rest of the day and have a nice weekend before the next conference for those who are remaining with us, and for those who are flying back home, probably have a nice weekend before you go back home and you'll have lots of good memories from Dubai. Yes, Secretary‑General, please.

>> HAMADOUN TOURÉ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman Mr. Chairman, and good morning to you all. I just simply couldn't resist the temptation to congratulate all our UAE friends in this room coming with very nice, colorful flags, and they are very proud of and they should be proud of this flag. And we want to celebrate this with them.

We feel sorry for our friends. We are with you here, you're here working hard in this room while the whole nation is celebrating, but trust people in this conference all 110 countries present will be celebrating with you. I take the opportunity to congratulate you. Well done in 41 years, you did a great job, and your country should also be congratulated. We feel happy for you, and we also appreciate the hospitality and the kind care for all of us. Thank you very much.

I think they deserve a round of applause.

[ Applause ]

Can you, Chairman, stand up and show us the flag so that we can all enjoy it?

>> CHAIR: Sure. With pleasure.

[ Applause ]

Thank you. Okay, so the agenda for today's Plenary, document 33, Revision 4. I hope everyone has a copy of the document by now. If the agenda is approved, then we'll proceed, please.

Could we start with the Chairman of Committee 5, Madam Marie‑Thérèse to present the document 116? Thank you.

>> MARIE THÉRÈSE ALAJOUANINE: Thank you, Chairman. And good morning, everyone. The editorial committee is now submitting to this Plenary document 116. This is our last document to this Assembly. This document, 116, contains a draft revised version of Resolution 1, two draft new Resolutions, and a proposed revised version of recommendation ITU‑T A.5. All of these documents are submitted for your approval.

Chairman, once these documents have been approved, I would request that you give me the floor again so that I can say a few words. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Sure, Madam. Thank you very much. So we have document 116 in front of us. The first item in document 116 is Resolution 1. I would like to call upon the Chairman of Committee 3, Mr. Trowbridge, to enlighten us about the square brackets in this Resolution, please. Mr. Trowbridge?

>> STEPHEN TROWBRIDGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think you've gone a little too far down. The only square bracket in this is in considering C, and this was a matter of disagreement at the time among some of the participants about exactly how to describe the possible impact of regulations on the work of the Sector. We did make an amendment and agreed to an amendment earlier where you see "International Telecommunication Regulations in force," rather than Melbourne 1988, realizing that by the time this is taken on board, it will, in fact, be an updated set. My understanding is that those who disagreed in Committee 3 have come to an understanding, and I am not sure which of those countries will take the floor but I believe there's some text prepared to read out to satisfy the square brackets that is agreeable to all. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We have a request for the floor from Brazil. Brazil, you have the floor, please.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, everybody. We'd also like to congratulate the UAE on the 41st National day next Sunday. Perhaps it's the last day that we'll be able to enjoy the UAE before WCIT. Congratulations.

This is a proposal from CITEL, Inter‑American proposal from 8 signatories. Yesterday we met and we seemed to have reached a compromise solution. We would like to change the text in brackets from "set down in the Preamble in Article 1 of those regulations," to "set down in the relevant articles of those regulations." Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. So the compromise text is, to replace the text in between brackets from "set down in the Preamble and Article 1," to "set down in the relevant articles of those regulations." Iran, you have the floor, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning to you and to everybody. Congratulations for your National day. Chairman, first of all, I request you kindly, because this Resolution is the heart of the ITU‑T, raps you don't kindly take it as a lump sum, take it Section by Section in order to enable us to comment if any, I hope there will be no comment. Chairman, rather than going in so much details, I think that objectives of these regulations, whether or not to refer to Preamble or relevant part, may not be quite necessary, because we leave it general, and we don't need to refer to any particular date of regulation. Regulations in force is sufficient, so perhaps one way would be to not go to the detail. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. I believe a text was discussed between the parties who had issues with this text in square brackets, and if we don't have any firm objection to the changes made or the proposal, can we proceed with the proposal made by Brazil?

So the text would be reading, "set out in the relevant articles of those regulations." Rather than to attempt to do a different change here and enter into new arguments if so if the text is fine with everyone, perhaps it's best for us to move forward with it.

I see no objection. Thank you. As suggested by Iran, we will certainly go Section by Section of this important Resolution. Do we have any comments in Section 1? It's been highlighted to me we didn't go through the body of the text but I assume the body of the Resolution, the first part of the Resolution is agreed on, because we had a discussion and change on it.

So we're moving to Section 1 now. If there are no comments, can we move to Section 2 now, please. Any comments or reviews in Section 2?

Thank you. Section 3 now.

Section 4, please.

Section 5.

Yes, Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Sorry, we were not able to attend in all meetings of this group in fact, there is something from the previous Assembly, and it was discussed but not taken into account. In paragraph 5.9, in the second line under 5.9, Chairman, there is a word said, WTSA may report or proposals. Chairman, in earlier part of the entire text duty of the Director we have always discussed the Director report or suggest. In fact, according to the Convention, Director is not entitled to make any proposals to any conference including WTSA. We suggest that simply we replace the word "proposal" by "suggestion." Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. Could you please highlight in which text again? 5.9 on page 11, the second line 5.9?

>> IRAN: Yes, Chairman 5.9, page 11, second line. Which the whole text said, "in addition, the Director may, within the limits specified in the Convention, submit to WTSA any report or," currently it said "proposal." We suggest to replace it by "suggestion." In earlier part of this paragraph, always we refer to suggestion, but here we come to the proposal. As I mention going to the Convention Director is not entitled to proposal to conference. Suggestion, report, yes, but not proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. So the proposal is to change the word "proposal" in 5.9 opening page 11 with the word "suggestion." Any comments on this proposal? Any support? Any suggestion or support for this proposal?

I see no support. Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Is that a new text? If you read paragraph 5.3, the Director shall suggest. We always talking of suggestions, Chairman, and the Convention does not allow that. It's not a problem with the issue whether there's support or not support. It's consistent with the Convention. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, United States, please.

>> STEPHEN TROWBRIDGE: Thank you.

Not United States but Chairman of Committee 3. I think I'm always a little reluctant to change text that has been stable from previous versions of this Resolution without consideration of a proposal in writing and full discussion of the Committee. But if we could scroll down to the text, I think the intent here, if you look at 5.8, just above the 5.9, where the suggested Revision was made, TSAG develops the proposals, and those arrive at WTSA via a report that comes from the Director to the WTSA. So the Director has responsibility for conveying the proposals from TSAG.

And so that's where I think that proposal is something that occurs, so in the Director's report, you will, in fact, find the proposals from TSAG. So that would be my reading of this text. I think it's text that has been here for a long time, and I would have a little reluctance simply wearing the hat of Com 3 to take on Board changes to text that has been stable for a long time and I think has worked well. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Chairman of Com 3. And in line of not talking more debates about text that has passed through Com 3 and has been there for a long time I would suggest moving forward with the existing text so there will be no change and the text will remain as it is. "WTSA any report or proposal which would help," and the text continues.

Could we please move to Section 6 now?

Section 7, please.

Section 8.

Section 9.

And the Appendices.

Thank you. So Resolution 1 with the amendment made in considering C, to read, "set down in the relevant articles of these regulations," and remove the square brackets, is approved by the Plenary. Thank you.

Our next item is the Draft New Resolution CAN‑1, Strengthening collaboration. And we see a square bracket at the end of Resolution, and after invites the Telecommunication Standardization Advisory Group. Would Chairman of Committee 3 highlight what's the situation of the text in the square brackets?

>> STEPHEN TROWBRIDGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. These square brackets were provided because we recognized in Committee 3 that there may be a relationship between this activity of TSAG and the Strategic Review Committee established under Committee 4, and not understanding what the implications of that might be, we had some placeholder text to indicate that relationship.

And so this is text that needed to be verified based on the results of the Strategic Review Committee proposal. I think that is behind us, and I would invite Mr. Gracie who chaired the drafting group to enlighten us as to whether at this point we can simply remove the square brackets from the placeholder text or if there's any minor amendment needed these square brackets were there for alignment and not due to any controversy. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Mr. Gracie you have the floor please.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, everyone. Mr. Chairman, the square brackets were simply placed pending the result in the discussion that took place in Committee 4, and in light of the decision taken yesterday with respect to the Review Committee I would suggest that the square brackets simply be removed.

And, Chairman, while I have the floor, if I could suggest an additional minor amendment. This would be to considering C, where we refer to external cooperation being guided by A‑series Recommendations and Supplements, I would suggest we replace the word "selected" by "relevant," and after "ITU‑T," I would suggest the addition of the word "Resolutions."

We had overlooked the fact that we do have two relevant Resolutions, number 7 and number 11. So I do believe that we should make reference in a general way to those Resolutions.

So we consider this to be strictly editorial, but I would offer those minor amendments for your further consideration. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Gracie. So the proposals are to remove the square brackets under inviting the Telecommunication Standardization Advisory Group, and keeping the text as it is, and the amendments to the considering C to read, "that ITU Telecommunication Standardization Sector, ITU‑T, external cooperation is guided by relevant ITU‑T Resolutions," and then probably we need to add, "and A‑series Recommendations and Supplements."

So this is the proposal. Do we have any comments on this? Any objections to the changes made? I see none, thank you. Any general comments on the Resolution, on the Draft New Resolution? Yes, Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Thank you Chairman. Good morning and congratulations to the UAE. I would like, since we removed the square brackets under invites, I would suggest to remove one additional word and that's "complementary." Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. So the proposal is to remove the word "complementary" under "invites." I would call Chairman of Committee 3 to comment on this. Mr. Steve, please.

>> STEPHEN TROWBRIDGE: Thank you. I think that that word was originally inserted simply to indicate that the two activities should complement each other rather than duplicate the work. If it's clear from the scope of the Review Committee to all that there was no intent to do the same work in both places, certainly maintaining a close relationship would cover it and we could take that as editorial. If people feel that we need some clearer delineation, if the word "complementary" provides reassurance that there wouldn't be duplication of work across the Committees, that certainly is something that's harmless to keep.

So I'm fine with the text either way. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Do we have any objections on the removal of "complementary," the word "complementary," under "invites"? Thank you. I see none. So we remove the word "complementary" under "invites," and the remaining text stays as it is.

So are there any further comments on the Draft New Resolution, CAN‑1? If there are no further comments, the Resolution is approved, with amendments discussed earlier.

Thank you. The Plenary approves the Draft New Resolution CAN‑1.

Our next item is the Draft New Resolution B‑1, acknowledging the active involvement of the membership in the development of ITU‑T deliverables.

Mr. Trowbridge, can we please highlight the text between brackets?

>> STEPHEN TROWBRIDGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Under "invites Member States," we have some text in square brackets that essentially resulted from a late discovery that text coming from the drafting group was not particularly understandable, and that in fact wasn't discovered until late in the evening when we tried to have the text translated and we couldn't figure out what it meant. We traced back through some of the documents. We didn't have the contributors available and made our best guess, and as to what the intended meaning was, and composed some text that had that meaning, and put it in square brackets so we could confirm that we had the correct understanding.

I have heard privately from Brazil that we came very close. I don't know if they have any amendment to offer, or if they would like to simply remove the square brackets at this time and advise the Editorial Committee of any minor adjustments to the text, and take that on an editorial basis.

So if Brazil could clarify that, I suspect we have an easy Resolution here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Brazil, could you please comment?

>> Brazil: Thank you, Mr. President. And first, good morning everyone. And I would like to first appreciate the great job that has been done with this proposed new Resolution, especially the participants of the drafting group, and principally the Chairman and the Secretariat for their efforts in this regard.

And actually, we do have some amendments in this "invites Member States," and if I may, Mr. President, would like to add them right now so that we can clarify the text and its sense.

Instead of "their national," we would like to replace it to "ITU‑T." After "visibility," we would like to add, "and acknowledgment." And instead of "roles," after "and roles," we would like to add, "outputs," instead of "roles."

These amendments would better clarify the intention of inviting Member States, as our intention is to invite them to recognize that the contributory process inside ITU‑T is variable, and they must acknowledge this work as eligible activities for research and development, productivity, evaluation. Therefore, those are our contributions to this text for the Plenary to evaluate. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you. First Claire clarification, what does it mean contributory process? It is contributions, text, documents submitted or contributory means defraying of the expenses of the Union? Contributory process? And then what is the purpose of that? Is it encouraging Member States to take into account the contributions of the academia in the process? Is it not sufficient to leave that matter to the Member States to decide accordingly? Do we need that invitation? That is a question, Chairman. First, what does it mean contributory process? And second, is it really required here?

We have a Resolution for academia sufficiently and properly crafted, and why we need to add this one? Is it not a National issue, that we lead ever leave it to the National administrations to decide as appropriate? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. I would leave to it the owners of the text to respond, please. Who wants to take the floor? Brazil or ‑‑ yeah, Brazil, please.

>> BRAZIL: Thanks to the Delegate of Iran for the question. And actually, we also think that it's a matter for Member States to decide. That's why we are inviting them to think about it. And that's an important thing so that they must think about recognizing this work of professors inside ITU and academia, but not only academia, and that's why it's in the invites Section of the text.

Regarding contributory process, in order not to confuse to the contributory units, we would accept changing contributory to "contribution." That would be a better word, also. But to conclude, Mr. President, we would like to keep invites as it's an important issue for Member States to consider. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. So as a change, you would be changing contributory process into "contributions." So the text would read as you proposed, to consider participation of academia in ITU‑T contributions." Is that the proposal?

>> BRAZIL: Yes, Mr. President. Is contribution and after visibility, I can see that on the screen that we would like to add, after "visibility," "and acknowledgment," which is the sense ‑‑ most important sense of the text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to all colleagues. Mr. Chairman, we wish to support this position or this invites as offered by Brazil. Perhaps we can refine the language a bit more, but regardless, we are satisfied with the language, because we believe it is very important for the ITU‑T to continue its outreach to universities.

We note that there are now over 40 academic institutions that are participating in ITU work. This is the future, Mr. Chairman, and we believe that this invites to Member States to facilitate and to stimulate that involvement of universities in the work of the ITU is a very noble undertaking. We support Brazil. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Yes, Chairman. We have no difficulty with the proposed amendment. Perhaps we need to add "as appropriate," because we leave it to the discretion and the decision of the Government of Member States to go along with this invitation, and make necessary action as appropriate.

So we would like to propose that "as appropriate" in perhaps the first part of the sentence, when "to consider participation," and after "contributions," "and as appropriate" in the appropriate part of the text to not diminish the role of the government in decisions with respect to these actions, but we encourage, and that is a good sentence. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. So in order to keep the content of the text stable first, then we'll add the proposal from Iran, the words "as appropriate," so the text as it should read now in front of us, "to consider participation of academia in the ITU‑T contribution process, and provide visibility and acknowledgment of their contributions, editorships, and other outputs," and the text continues as it is.

And then there was a proposal from Iran to add "as appropriate" at the beginning of the sentence. And we would look at the right place to be added. Probably, to consider as appropriate, comma, participation of.

Egypt, you have the floor, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. While in general we have no objection on the Resolution as it is, just a small comment on the "invites Member States." It is mentioned here at the end of the sentence," and other outputs so they may be considered as eligible activity for research and development productivity evaluation." We think that eligible activities for R & D productivity evaluation usually depends on scientific panels that are usually being held in the scientific community, so as far as we understand the contributions from the Member States, or from any contributions in general in the ITU‑T, they are not really evaluated in this scientific way as it is being done in the scientific community.

So I don't feel that contributions in general could be held as eligible activities for R & D productivity evaluation. Perhaps a slight change for the language, acknowledge their work, of course. We can acknowledge their contributions, but to account that work as scientific contributions, I doubt if that is possible. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Did you have a specific proposal for the change of the text? Because it would be difficult to get into discussions here. Any specific proposal for the amendment? We don't open discussion here.

Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: If it is possible, I think so that they may be considered as eligible activities for research and development productivity evaluation, should be striked out of the text, and that's it. "And other outputs." And acknowledgment of their contributions, editorships, and other outputs. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I would like to go back again to the owner of the proposals made by Brazil and probably Chairman of Committee 3, because this text was brought forward by them. Brazil?

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Regarding the proposition of Egypt, and though we think that are very important consideration, but we think that it should have been done, because there are here some important concepts during the drafting group meetings so I think that the striking out part of the text would mislead the concept and change dramatically the concept of the text, and we think that the term "may" grants to the text, the word "may" grants to the text the possibility of Member States to consider whether or not that these activity of ITU should be considered eligible so we don't think appropriate to strike it out from the text right now. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. United States?

>> STEPHEN TROWBRIDGE: Thank you. Not United States, but the Chairman of Committee 3. As much as I hesitate to be doing this kind of wordsmithing in full Plenary, I think I understand the point that perhaps the words may be overly specific and I wonder if we might say something more along the lines of, "so that the merits of this work may be considered by their institutions."

So I think we want to provide visibility to their contributions, but I think it is not for us to tell the academic institutions the light in which they need to consider that. As has been pointed out, this may not be considered to be fully the equivalent of any kind of scientific peer review of the outputs.

But leave to it the institutions to consider the merits of the work. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Trowbridge. Iran, you have the floor, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On the concept of mutual cooperation between academia and ITU‑T, particularly in their contributions, I think we should provide sufficient motivation for the academia to take part. This is a two‑way street. At the same time that ITU benefits from their contributions, the motivation should also be there.

So I would like to support the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group what Brazil also mentioned, that the maintaining of the existing text provides sufficient motivation for those academia that they want their work recognized by their own academic institutions. So we would like to express our support for maintaining the text as it was originally proposed. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. So the proposal ahead of us again we go back to the original text, the final text I read out without the new additions so that the merits of the work may be considered by their institutions.

So if you'll remove this part, please. We'll go back to the original text. So the text would read, as we highlighted last time, "to consider," with the addition made by Iran, "as appropriate, participation of academia in ITU‑T contribution process, and to provide visibility and acknowledgment of their contributions, editorships, and other outputs so that they may be considered as eligible activities for research and development productivity evaluation."

This is the original text we have, which we have ‑‑ we've reached an amount of consensus upon. In light of the explanations made, I would suggest we move forward with the text that we have in front of us. Unless we have strong opposition to it, or any objection to the text.

I see none. Thank you, so text remains as we've proposed, and we can remove the square brackets. Thank you. Chairman of Committee 3, was this the only issue in this text?

>> STEPHEN TROWBRIDGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That was the only issue to be resolved. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sir. So can we move ahead with the approval of the Draft New Resolution B‑1 with the amendments made in the invites? I see no objection. Thank you very much. Draft New Resolution B‑1 is approved by the Plenary.

Our next item is recommendation ITU‑T A.5. Mr. Trowbridge, would you please walk us through the recommendation?

>> STEPHEN TROWBRIDGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The only change that had been proposed by Committee 3 to recommendation A.5 was one in clause 2.5, where some sentences were added. Now, unfortunately the wrong copy of the text late was picked up and sent to the Editorial Committee and we've issued a Corrigendum which has been translated in all languages to document 108 which makes some editorial corrections to one of the sentences so the Corrigendum to 108 does make a slight amendment to this text and I think there was no quarrel with the text as included with the Corrigendum.

Unfortunately that hasn't been through the Editorial Committee, and that's something that can be taken care of with the post‑work in Geneva, so that is in fact the only thing that we had in this.

Now, I'd also call your attention, and this is listed in our main report, to the fact that we also, during this discussion wanted to invite TSAG to undertake some work, and this is something that is in document 112, where we have just posted a Revision filling in the final document numbers, and bringing that up to date. Not all the documents were available when we reviewed contribution 112 yesterday,.

But the text I'd call your attention to in document 112 is that we will also "instruct TSAG to investigate identified problems with referencing, noting WTSA‑12 Contribution 55, to develop the necessary strengthening of the rules of Recommendation ITU‑T A.5, or improvements needed in its application." So that text, which is something that was part of our report accompanies this small modification to recommendation A.5 so be aware that there is an editorial correction or replacement of one of the sentences we've proposed new in clause 2.5 of this recommendation that you'll find in the Corrigendum to document 108. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Trowbridge. Now keeping in mind that the draft new recommendation ‑‑ the recommendation A.5 has no changes as the Chairman of the Committee highlighted and there's only editorial change, I would seek your approval to move ahead with the acceptance or adoption of this recommendation. With the notation that the editorial changes will take place by Editorial Committee.

Do we have consent on that, please? can we move ahead with recommendation ITU‑T A.5? I see no objection to that. Thank you. Recommendation A.5 is approved.

Chairman of Committee 5, you have the floor now, please. Madam Marie‑Thérèse, you asked for the floor.

>> MARIE THÉRÈSE ALAJOUANINE: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, I will not take up too much of your time. I just wanted to say this: Com 5 traditionally does not submit an official report. Our report is in fact the texts that we submit to the Plenary Meeting. I just wanted to make a few points, however, at this stage. The first texts that we received within the Editorial Committee were received on Friday, the 23rd, and dealt with immediately. Then all of the texts that came in were handled this week without any delay, and only 15%, to give you a statistic, only 15% of the pages submitted to us by the various Committees were not dealt with by the Editorial Committee. They couldn't be handled because we didn't have enough time to deal with them.

As you know, between the transmission of texts from a Committee and the Plenary today, you have to have a certain amount of time for us to do the work that has to be done, and given the volume of text transmitted to us, that was the situation, because we got a lot of texts coming to us at the same time.

So the number of pages that we were not able to handle is not very high, but nonetheless, there was such a number of pages. We would therefore as is customary ask for the consent of the Assembly for an additional meeting to be held in Geneva. This will be in January, because, of course, we have another conference next week here.

So it will probably be January, because after that, we have the end of year holidays. I just wanted to ask that you would agree to our having a meeting in January in Geneva. I wanted to ask for your agreement to that.

Having said that, I would like to conclude by thanking everyone who helped us in our work. I'd certainly like to thank my Vice‑Chairs who dealt with the different languages and all of the ITU staff who helped us. They worked around the clock ensuring that we could do our work well. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Madam. I think no one from the Assembly would object to your proposal, and knowing the amount of work that you had to carry out through this week and the pressure that you and your team were under, so I believe that no one would have any problem with convening your meeting in January.

And I would quote the statement you made that 15% of the documents were not presented by you, I would look at it from the other side, the other angle, that 85% have been conducted so that is a positive thing. So we congratulate you and your team for this achievement and it's hard work and we all appreciate what you have done. Probably you were the only Committee that worked around the clock, overnight, and you would be the only group that will still be working after the closing of the Assembly.

And probably the only part of the Assembly which will be working next year, as well, so thank you very much for your efforts, for you and your team, and that's excellent work and we all appreciate that. Thank you.

[ Applause ]

Next document on our agenda is document 120, the appointment of Chairmen and Vice‑Chairmen of Study Groups, TSAG, Regional Groups of ITU‑T Study Group 3, and the Review Committee.

Just to bring to your attention that this document has been already approved by the Delegation meeting. It's been discussed extensively there. I would ask the Director of TSB to present the document first, please.

>> MALCOLM JOHNSON: Thank you, Chairman.

Good morning, everybody. So the list of candidates for TSAG and the Study Groups and the SCV and the Regional Groups of Study Group 3 was approved at the Heads of Delegation meeting yesterday. It was pointed out that one additional candidate from Africa would be presented subsequent to that meeting for Study Group 9. So you see Mr. Habib Tall from Guinea was added to Study Group 9.

Turning to the last page, you'll see that for the SCV, we are still awaiting a name for the Vice‑Chairman to deal with the English language so we're waiting for in particular U.K. and U.S. to provide a name. And also for the French language and of course, we still need a Chairman to be appointed to the SCV.

And for the Review Committee, we have ‑‑ we're still looking for Vice‑Chairmen from the five other regions. We have Mr. Ki‑Shik Park for the Asia Pacific region, and Bahrain did offer pending discussion in the Arab group a candidate for the Arab Region.

So we're still waiting for names from the other regions for the Review Committee, and for the SCV. I suggest they could either be provided today or if they could inform me subsequent to the Assembly and preferably before the end of the year. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Johnson.

>> MALCOLM JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was just reminded the Heads of Delegation did agree that in future Assemblies, the Assembly will not appoint the Chairmen and Vice‑Chairmen of the Regional Groups for Study Group 3. It will be left for Study Group 3 to do that, in the same way that the other Study Groups will be appointing the Chairmen and Vice‑Chairmen of their Regional Groups. We did have some candidates put forward for Regional Groups of other Study Groups to this Assembly, but they will be passed to the Study Groups to consider at their next meeting. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Johnson. So we have the document 120 in front of us. Do we have any comments, observations on the document, please? Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Thank you, President, and good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I fully support the efforts that have been put into striking this balance in the nomination of candidates, and I think the decision taken by the Heads of Delegation was very important. As far as the Review Committee is concerned and the position of Arab States, I have to point out that we need some extra time for further deliberations, and I'm sure we'll be able to present you with a name before the end of this year. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. You could forward all your nominations to the TSB directly, and this is applicable to all Regional Groups, as well. Germany, you have the floor, please.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Chair. Unfortunately we were not able to consult concerning the Review Committee within CEPT. However, Germany can provide a very eligible candidate. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. France?

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. Germany has just spoken, but I actually wanted to speak this time on behalf of the CEPT and to say that we have not as yet had time to undertake consultations on this but we are going to hold consultations over the next few weeks and we will then have a name to put forward, and we will propose that name to Mr. Malcolm Johnson within a few weeks. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, France. Noted. South Africa.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, Chairperson. Consultations are taking place within the Africa group so we hope actually to provide a name later today before the close of business. Thank you, Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, South Africa. Noted. Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. We've had consultation already in the CITEL region and we have a name to put forth today before the end of the conference. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Noted. Armenia?

>> ARMENIA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, we are also considering this issue. We are involved in consultations right now, and an appropriate candidate will be put forward to the TSB at an appropriate time.

At any rate, it will be before January. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Armenia. Noted. Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Thank you, President. In addition to what I have pointed out, we have Dr. Hamed Abdullah as our candidate for the SCV, and I would like the Bureau to take note of this nomination, Dr. Hamed Abdullah for the SCV. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Noted.

So if there are no further comments, then the document 120 is approved by the Plenary. Congratulations to all Chairmen and Vice‑Chairmen of all the Study Groups, TSAG first of all then Study Groups, Regional Group for Study Group 3, and the Review Committee. Congratulations to all.

[ Applause ]

Argentina?

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If you would let me take you back to candidates to represent the Americas region on the Review Committee, our proposal is Mr. Macfie from Canada.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Argentina. It's noted. Our next item on the agenda is the approval of Resolution 64. I would ask the Plenary to allow us to have further discussion of this Resolution, because gladly today we've reached to sort of an understanding there will be a compromised text that will be brought forward, but the text needs to be worked on a little bit, so we are going to have a coffee break now and during the coffee break those interested parties could meet us in Room F and hopefully we could come up with a quick solution to the proposed text that will be presented to the Plenary or to the closing ceremony, actually. So it's a good gesture that we celebrate with the resolving of the Resolution 64 issue and closing of the Plenary.

And those who are interested, please join us in Room F at the coffee break, and we shall resume at 11:30 with the next session. We will resume at 11:30. United States, you have the floor, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And, of course, it's never a good idea to stand between Delegates and a coffee break, so I will be very brief.

But, Mr. Chairman, we would ask, and we have been very supportive of your efforts to find a solution to document ‑‑ to Resolution 64, and we wish to express our appreciation to you on that subject. However, Mr. Chairman, we believe that prior to going to a drafting group, it would be beneficial if we could raise this issue again within the Plenary to hear all colleagues' views, so that the views that may be expressed in Plenary and that we may all hear could help us understand better whether or not it is possible to reach a conclusion in a drafting group.

So, Mr. Chairman, with your indulgence, we would ask that you invite comments by Delegates on issues that have been raised with respect to the Revision of Resolution 64 prior to the drafting group. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. In brief, the only item which is pending Resolution 64 was related to considering F, and the discussion of Committee 4 was to remove the square brackets of considering F. The Resolution 64 you can find it in document 109 as presented by Chairman of Committee 4. Did cushion was on the conditions under which the square brackets under considering F would be removed, and there were a number of texts proposed to be brought forward. A number of modifications were proposed as well but there was no chance ‑‑ there was a chance to be discussed in Committee 4 because of the shortage of time so the text was brought forward to the Plenary.

However, during the Plenary sessions, there were side discussions going on so we never had the chance actually to display the text. So there was an attempt from the Chairman of the Assembly in consultation with the interested parties to propose a text which would satisfy both sides, or all concerned parties, actually. And the compromised solution is being presented in document 117. I would appreciate if we could present document 117 on the screen, please.

Document 117 presents the compromised solution regarding the considering F of the Resolution and the associated additions that have been proposed. You could find that considering F now reflects a balanced view between those parties who would believe and who would want the ITU‑T to become a registry of IP addresses, and the other party who believes that the existing system is what is to be considered without any changes to the current system.

And there's an addition of instructions to the Director of TSB, to conduct feasibility study. And this text I'm obliged to highlight that the text is a compromise solution because the original text that was proposed but unfortunately never presented in Committee 4, was to instruct the TSB to become ‑‑ the ITU to become a registry so as a compromise, all parties have agreed that the appropriate text would be to invite the ITU, or ITU‑T specifically, to conduct relevant studies of the feasibility of becoming a registry.

Then there was a notation that all the relevant work and studies must be reviewed or addressed at the Council, at the Council for the consideration, and then inviting all Member States to actively participate this the Plenipotentiary with proposals supporting the reviews on whether the ITU should become a registry or not.

So overall, the essence of the proposal is to ask the TSB Director for further studies of the possibility of becoming a registry, and inviting all the Member States to participate with the contributions of the Plenipotentiary. So this is in general the sense of the proposal. The text is in front of you and you can find the document 117. We've had some informal discussions in the morning and would hope we could come up with modifications to the text which would satisfy all parties and we would invite all interested parties to join us in Room F in the coffee break hoping that we could finish quickly to come back at 11:30 to the closing ceremony and enjoy the Resolution of this issue, and the closing of the Assembly.

I hope I made a clear presentation of the document and the situation here. Australia, you have the floor, please.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We were surprised to see document 117. We participated in the Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 64 in good faith, and we believe that all those present at the ad hoc meetings made a genuine attempt to achieve consensus. We were an interested party. We have not previously seen the text in document 117, so we've not had the opportunity to consult on it, nor to consider it.

We also note the findings of the IPv6 group that current IPv6 allocation policies and processes met the needs of stakeholders. We also note the presentation yesterday on the ITU‑T budgetary challenges.

Given that, we are reluctant to give a task to the Director of the ITU‑T without the time to properly consider the budgetary and other implications. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia. Yes, I agree with you. The discussion we had during the presentation of Chairman of Committee 2 highlighted the additional task that the Director of TSB is being responsible for as an outcome of this conference, this Assembly. However, as it's been highlighted in the meeting yesterday, as well, that all additional tasks has to be aligned with the budgetary requirements and the Director of TSB would need to manage within the limited or the available budget, so that applies to all actions and all the outputs of the Assembly, and not specifically to this specific requirement.

Iran, you have the floor, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We fully support your kind effort trying to build the consensus. In accordance with the rules of procedure of conference and meeting, the Chairman is entitled whenever there is different views, try to find the ways and means and to submit a text of consensus in order to resolve the problem. Therefore, the action you have taken is quite legitimate as has been already supported by the necessary rules of procedure. Chairman, you very kindly and very rightly mentioned that there was a difficulty in considering F. In fact, people agreed that is a fact.

And then there was discussions that whether or not we should take follow‑up action. You put it this the balance describing the views of the two sides. One side wants that ITU become a registry. The other side, they said no, we don't want. And what you put, Mr. Chairman, here in this, simply to call for a feasibility study. That's all. And send that to the Council.

Reference to the Council was mentioned by one distinguished delegate that this matter has a particular area of responsibility of the Council of the Plenipot and you have kindly included all of them. So in our view, Mr. Chairman, you put together a combination of all points of view from all sides and it is a compromise text. Nevertheless, you went one step further and called upon distinguished colleagues to have a possibility to discuss it further at an Ad Hoc Group or informal group under your Chairmanship and that is also another positive step. Therefore, we fully support the document and the way you have proposed to carry it forward. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. United States?

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And we, of course, join with others in expressing our appreciation to you for the manner in which you have tried to move the discussion towards a conclusion.

Mr. Chairman, and we have also been engaged in our own discussions with respect to these proposals and conversations and discussions, and it's a very difficult matter. It is one that is not simply dealt with, and I can assure you that we are making every effort to find a proper way forward, given all considerations.

But, Mr. Chairman, we must, in all respect to our colleagues from Australia, associate with their concerns, and they have a concern that we are increasingly sharing, which is that as you've indicated in 30 minutes, we will have the closing ceremony. It always seems to be the experience of WTSAs that an issue of great substance is brought to the attention of the Plenary in its final moments, and all of us who have attended multiple WTSAs know that we are now in the same position that we have been in historically at WTSA after WTSA, where an issue of great substance is forced upon the Delegates in the last moments.

So, Mr. Chairman, we associate with Australia.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, as we are struggling with the issues that you have put before us, we cannot go beyond what is a fundamental principle of the World Summit on the Information Society, and that is that the United Nations should not be engaged in the day‑to‑day technical operations of the Internet.

Mr. Chairman, that is a fundamental principle for the United States, and in 30 minutes, we cannot resolve that issue and that principle with respect to a possible compromise. So, Mr. Chairman, we would ask your indulgence, given the importance of these issues, given their substance and their wide‑ranging implications ‑‑ and I must also note, the world is watching ‑‑ that we give consideration to this issue in due time, and not force a conclusion in 30 minutes.

So, Mr. Chairman, we would ask your indulgence consistent with the intervention of Australia, and I am certain many Delegates that are in the same position, and that we defer any decision on this matter as being of a great importance and a great matter of substance for the U.N. system. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Secretary‑General, please.

>> HAMADOUN TOURÉ: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry to intervene in this moment, but there's no consensus on this issue, and the true tradition of the Union is to have true consensus on all issues we discuss and everybody should come out of this conference equally happy. That's the tradition of the Union. I would like to ask you kindly to withdraw this topic and it's not something we discussed and certainly not proposed by the ITU Secretariat.

Some members have some difficulties. Let's find ways to resolve those difficulties without necessarily giving additional tasks to the Union. I always say, the work that ITU does is complementary to the work that the Internet world is doing. Telecommunication services are the networks that are carrying the Internet, and we are complementary, and there's some things they do and do well, and let them do it.

And what we do and do well, let's continue to do that, and try to find middle ways to work together, because we are condemned to work together, and it's a good thing. It's been successful so far. You cannot have an Internet access today in a house or business without having a phone line. The ISP will ask you for a phone line.

Now, if you don't have a phone line, they can still find a way to give you Internet access but they will give you a phone line on top of it, as well. The two go together. The 6 billion or so mobile phones are the future carriers of ‑‑ the future devices of access with Internet, and the two worlds need to work together.

There have been some unnecessary tension over the past few weeks that will not take us anywhere. Certainly it's not the interest of the users that we're trying to defend here. And I'm simply sorry to see that tensions are reviving. I thought the cold war was over back in 1990. It's coming back. Cooler than ever. I thought the North‑South division is getting closer and closer, but I see with the financial difficulties in the Northern countries is becoming more problem. This is a small world, and the work we are doing is really fundamental, and having a real good impact in the rest of the world.

All of the other sectors of social and economic life are depending on ICT today and on the work that you have done here. You have done such a marvelous job over the past 10 days here in this work, in this conference room. It will benefit the whole world not only for the next cycle, four year cycle, but for a long, long time.

Let's not, you know, dilute all of the things that we've done here, all of the successful things over this issue. We should not a primary function for the Union, but for which we will have to work with the other communities in any case. Because IPv6, of every device will have an IP address. That's normal starting with all of the 6 billion mobile phones we have today and I hope 7 billion to come by 2015.

Every other single device will have an IP address, so we'll have to work together. Let's find that way without a division. So, Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry to have been long, but I would like you to withdraw this part from that Resolution so that we continue in the true spirit of consensus building of this Union. That's my call as Secretary‑General, and I hope that our members will understand that we can survive, we can do a lot of things without having this little thing in our Resolution.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Dr. Touré. I value what you said, and I truly respect it. You've been very wise throughout the Assembly. I've learned a lot of wisdom from you and lots of decisions have been tailored through your wisdom, so I do agree with your statements, and I would like to withdraw the document presented in front of you, 117.

This document has been presented as a Chairman contribution, so I would withdraw it in line with what has been discussed so far, and with the spirits of the Assembly so far, and with the advice from the Secretary‑General.

However, the removal of the document or the withdrawal of the position of the Chairman would not close the open bracket text that we have in F, so I will try to attempt in one minute hopefully to come up with an agreement on the square bracket text in considering F and I would like to ask the parties who have engaged in the discussion whether the newly considering F be accepted if it's replaced under the text of the Resolution.

We've had the discussion on the Resolution. The entire Resolution has been passed as you heard from Committee 4 Chairman. There was only the part of Resolution F, so if we replace the considering F under the document 109, with the newly proposed considering, would that be accepted by all parties?

Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson, and good morning to you all. In view of the heavy agenda of the Assembly and since we no longer have any other meetings except this Plenary to finish our work, we support the proposal made in document 117, taking into consideration what you have said in terms of your intervention, the last intervention you made. But please permit me, Mr. Chairperson, to clarify the concept behind our request that the ITU‑T be the recorder of the Internet Protocol.

When the ITU was requested as a Governmental organisation, an international organisation specialized Agency of the United Nations, to put regulations in place, those regulations that would guarantee protection to countries from frequencies that are ‑‑ that might cross the borders and that can be harmful to countries, and to put regulations for the orbital satellites in space, countries did not fear nor did the ITU‑T from the competence of the ITU, and here we are altogether benefiting from using the latest technologies in ICTs.

Dear Delegates and Honorable Delegates, it is up to you to imagine that if we determined, or if the determination of frequencies was in the hands of another entity other than the ITU, and that this entity in the private Sector can actually control this field, and there are no regulations or international standards agreed upon by states, that would prevent this entity from impacting on communications of other countries in any way it likes and whenever it likes.

The communications between countries is a question of sovereignty, and that is why the ITU was established. And through the proposal that was presented that the ITU‑T and the ITU would record the Internet Protocol, this is because when we distribute the Internet Protocol, and according to the fourth issuance, this is a clear example of the disturbances that can take place within the allocations, and such disruption has been referred to clearly in the Resolution of the ITU‑T, Resolution 64 of 2008, and paragraph taking into consideration, or Section considering, because paragraph A can be read as, that the Internet Protocol addresses are fundamental resources in order the communication technologies IP‑based networks develop currently and in the future that are based on the Internet Protocols, and for the development of the world's economy.

And paragraph B stipulates many countries believe that there are historical discrepancies that are related with the allocation of the fourth issuance of the Internet Protocol and it is called the IPv6 so is it possible for countries to spend or invest in millions of dollars in creating their networks and transforming all their transactions into electronic transactions, e‑trade, e‑education, e‑governmental services, e‑health services, et cetera, and these countries cannot guarantee a balanced allocation, including the Internet Protocol.

Mr. Chairperson, our request at this WTSA is compatible with the Resolutions of the PP conference because Resolution 180 entitled, facilitating IPv4 to IPv6 does stipulate in paragraph 4 the necessity to help Member States that require support in allocation and distribution of the IPv6 of the Internet.

And also, a number of Resolutions of the PP conference do request that an exploration should be undertaken and coordination between the ITU and competent organisation with regard to the IPv6 and the future Internet Protocol through cooperation agreements according to the necessity and to increase the role of the ITU in managing the Internet in order to achieve a maximum benefit for the world's community.

And as we have already stated at the outset, Mr. Chairperson, and in view of the spirit of compromise, and through the last intervention we heard made by Your Excellency, that we should look into any other proposal made that would help and enable the achievement of reviewing this Resolution. And thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. To remind you that the proposal in document 117 has been withdrawn, except for the part where considering F is under discussion yet, and the only part of the proposal which I would like to consider is considering F to be included in the body of the Resolution in the document 109.

I believe that was your last intervention you support. I have a number of requests for the floor. I would like to give the floor to Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. First of all, I would like to thank you and thank the Secretary‑General for the efforts that have been undertaken in order to strengthen our Union and to find a compromise.

The issue that we are examining is extremely important, and there is no doubt about it. It would be a pity to see a situation where developing countries see de facto that they have a problem, and that they present their problems to an organisation of the United Nations in telecommunications and requested aid elsewhere for this, and as the representative from Saudi Arabia has said, this seems just fully comprehensible and we understand that, because we see that ITU must continue as the first port of call for all of these matters.

And now we see other monopolies coming about, such as private organisations. It's extremely dangerous for that to happen, and it's also ‑‑ if a monopoly is part of a country and it's under its jurisdiction, currently the United Nations regulates all the legal relationships, and for example, planes fly in accordance with certain standards and recommendations, and navigate following security recommendations, so there are always standards and regulations which allow for that to function.

And so our organisation is going through a moment of truth, because we are setting out a new Committee, and we've looked at the issues relating to other organisations, and we have looked at certain situations to see which are the most important standards. Is it those adopted by Member States or private organisations? It's a very dangerous situation, and we would once more like to say that we are in favor of the compromise.

We are willing to accept a compromise, of course, but we are very concerned by the situation which is currently being created in the area of regulations.

I've just opened up a Web page which says, for example, that one in 16 people throughout the world has become ‑‑ has been a victim of Cybercrime this year. This is an official statistic, but of course, there must be a lot more of these cases, so at the ITU, we make every effort to look at the matters of regulation, but security is extremely important to us as is the allocation of resources, and as the delegate from Saudi Arabia has said, if we have the right to allocate the frequencies and allocate the spectrum and numbering, then we can't discuss this matter, and it's really not understandable, and we're very concerned by this situation, where we see countries with high technologies, which pre‑define the right to veto certain matters relating to the Union.

But we are willing to accept your compromise. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Now, we are under short of time actually now and we would like to move ahead.

I would appreciate and I would kindly ask all the ‑‑ all those who have asked or the floor to limit their discussions on the proposal that I made forward. We've heard lots of views and positions here, and we do understand that there are a number of countries who do have very strong position with regards to this specific matter, but we would like to limit our discussion in this session to the proposal which was made forward, hoping that we could conclude within the time available for us.

So I would appreciate if all the deliberations made are to the substance of the proposal which I brought forward, and that is, in the considering part F, with the replacement of the text that was presented initially in document 117, to replace the text in document 109.

So I would ask your indulgence to keep your deliberations within the scope of the proposal that's brought forward.

United States, you have the floor, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, to be brief, we accept your proposal with respect to considering F as the compromise that you have proposed, with the understanding that the other items in 117 have been withdrawn. So we can accept your compromise of accepting considering F as you have presented it, and asked for our views. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. China?

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We appreciate all the effort by the Plenary Chairman for the issue. Indeed, we've seen the high hope of developing countries on the issue. We agree with the intervention of the Secretary‑General. Both sides should cooperate. In the spirit of cooperation and compromise, and according to our understanding of the discussion, actually consensus has already been reached on considering F, because additions were made in resolves, that's why other opinions were raised on considering F.

Now that we have agreed to withdraw the contents in instructs and resolves, I think we all agreed actually on the considering F. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China. Are you indicating that the agreement was in considering F as it was presented in document 109, without the change proposed in 117? My understanding was that the considering was brought forward under square brackets for further deliberation.

Could I ask the Chairman of Committee 4 to advise on this, please? Mr. Maeda?

>> YOICHI MAEDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to appreciate your compromise solution. But as Com 4 Chair, I have offered this issue to the working party Plenary, so I do not have any specific proposal, but I'd like to appreciate the discussion keeping the considering part of F, and take out other part. If it become a compromise, I think I'd like to resupport that way for your final solution. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Maeda. Togo, you are the floor please.

>> TOGO: I'm talking about recommendation 64. Now, I will just simply ‑‑

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We have a request of the floor from Uganda.

>> UGANDA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank you and the SG for helping us to try to arrive at a compromise Mr. Chairman, let's be clear on what is on the table now. My understanding is that we are going back to what we had in DT109, where we had considering F in square brackets, but that we are replacing that considering F with your proposed F in document 117. Is that the understanding, Mr. Chairman, before I proceed?

>> CHAIR: Yes, Uganda, that's the correct understanding, because there was an expression of the view that considering F, although it's a fact, but it may not represent the absolute fact, and considering that there are some countries who believe that the existing systems are sufficient, and that was very obvious from deliberations that we've heard in this Plenary, so there was a proposal to amend considering F in 109 with the addition, "whilst other countries prefer to use the current system."

In order to express both sides of the matter and express both views, so the proposal in front of you is the one in document 117, to replace the considering F in 109.

Do you still need the floor, Uganda?

>> UGANDA: Yes, Chairman. Chairman, if indeed we are replacing the original F with your proposed F, then we fully support your proposed text as it represents a balance between the two parties, and we are ready to support it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Uganda. United Kingdom, please.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The United Kingdom would support the Chairman's proposal to replace the text shown in considering F in document 109 with the text shown under considering F in document 117. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom. South Africa?

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, Chairperson. I think for South Africa we've had some very profound discussions on this issue already, but we'd like to just note that the issue of IP address allocation is part of a fundamental right to communicate. Whilst we feel in Africa we do have a successfully functioning Regional Internet Registry, namely AFRINIK, that does not detract from the importance of the issue if any Member States are having problems in terms of IP address allocation. The question would be, where would they be able to take these challenges and these problems? And I believe as a U.N. organisation we need to take note if there are some problems. So we would support your compromise fully, Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, South Africa. France?

>> FRANCE: Yes, thank you, Chairman. I'm going to be as brief as possible, and we support the proposal that you have proposed to the conference, and I think it has been clearly explained by yourself and the United Kingdom. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Now, we've got requests from Greece, Australia and Portugal. I would like to ‑‑ and United Arab Emirates. I would like to close the list, if possible. And if they are on the same matter, please try to be brief. We're coming to the end of this session and the end of the conclusion.

So we've got Greece, Australia, Portugal and United Arab Emirates. I would appreciate if you're brief. Thank you. Greece?

>> GREECE: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. We support your proposal.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Australia?

>> AUSTRALIA: Likewise, Mr. Chairman. I'll be very, very brief. We do also support your proposal.

>> CHAIR: Portugal?

>> PORTUGAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The same, we support your proposal and we thank you for making compromise possible. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all I would like to reiterate our appreciation on your great leadership in bringing the views into one kind of consensus. Considering the different interventions in this room, and the fact that we have almost reached to a consensus regarding F in the document 117, we would like to show our support to the compromised text that you have reached upon, Mr. Chairman, and at the same time, we would like to include the discussions which has arisen regarding the topic on Resolution 64 in your minutes of meeting, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. So with that in mind, I would like to proceed with approval of Resolution 64, with the amendments made in considering F, on removing square brackets. Any objection to this proposal? I see a couple of requests for the floor. Is this an objection to the proposal I'm bringing forward? Saudi Arabia, you still request the floor?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Allow me to express my deep appreciation to yourself to the Secretary‑General, to his Deputy, as well to Mr. Malcolm Johnson, and all distinguished Delegates. And this Plenary has said previously we support your proposal, Sir with regard to considering F of document 117. Again, thank you very much, Sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. I see no further requests for the floor. Resolution 64 with the amendments in considering F is approved by the Plenary. Thank you.

[ Applause ]

Okay, ladies and gentlemen, that concludes our Agenda Item for this Plenary, and probably for the remaining of the Assembly official work.

We have no further items on the agenda. Is there any requests for the floor on any items under any other business?

Canada, you have the floor, please.

>> CANADA: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. And we would like to offer our sincere congratulations to you and all others who have achieved this very satisfactory result.

Chairman, we would, through you, we would ask the TSB if they would be so kind as to provide a report to the next conference, to the World Conference on International Telecommunications, on the results of this Assembly. I do believe it would be very helpful for Member States attending the WCIT to have the benefit of the results of the last two weeks in order to take that into consideration in the discussions that will take place very soon.

Thank you very much, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Your request is noted. Thank you. Japan?

>> YOICHI MAEDA: Good morning ladies and gentlemen. As Chairman of Committee 4 I'd like to have the opportunity to express my thanks to the distinguished participants through you. Just by having the approval of the Resolution 64 as sent to you from Committee 4. But I'm very glad to see the best achievement for our agreement.

When I was asked to take this Honorable role of the Chairmanship for this Assembly, I did not imagine how difficult this task could be. I have had really hard 10 days, but they were also very fruitful 10 days. I am happy to have this rewarding experience with you here in Dubai, one of the most fascinating cities in the world.

The great progress and achievement we have made in this Assembly lets us confirm again what our mutual trust and the spirit of collaboration can bring to the global standardization led by ITU. This is my last day as Study Group 15 Chairman, but also the first day as the Chairman of the new Review Committee.

I hope I can continue to contribute to the ITU standardization and look forward to working with all of you.

Finally, I would like to express again my great thanks to all of you for your sincere support, especially to ITU management and the other TSB staff, and lastly, but not the least, to Mr. Simao Campos the counselor of Committee 4. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Maeda, and thank you for your excellent work in Committee 4. Special thanks to your colleagues, the Vice‑Chairs and the Chairmen of the Working Groups and all the participants of the work of Committee 4. You've done an excellent job. You made the work of the Plenary easy, except for the last part, which we had a discussion here.

And we appreciate the effort. We wish you good luck in the Review Committee, and we hope ‑‑ I personally hope to work with you in the future. So thank you very much for the Committee 4's work. Appreciate it.

[ Applause ]

Mr. Trowbridge, Chairman of Committee 3, you have the floor, please.

>> STEPHEN TROWBRIDGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to repeat some of the thanks I gave yesterday when I introduced document 112, which was our report, I want to appreciate the contribution and the hard work of everyone in Committee 3, and thanks for the help of my Vice‑Chairman, Mr. Abdullah, Mr. Gracie, Mr. Mukhanov, and Mr. Lee, as well as my Working Group Chairman Mr. Dubuisson, and again Mr. Gracie. Certainly we had a productive two weeks, and we're very pleased we were able to complete our work without leaving too much trouble for your Plenary, and as with Committee 4, also we had great assistance from TSB, from Ms. Kurakova, from Mr. Jones, Mr. Rada and our Assistant, we can't forget why our documents get there, Ms. Scott was able to help in the back to make sure that all of the documents were available, and of course, as always, let's not forget the interpreters. So thank you to everybody involved in Committee 3.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Trowbridge. We would like to thank you, because you've done an excellent job you and your colleagues as Vice‑Chairs and the Chairmen of the Working Groups, and all the participants of Committee 3. It's been a very difficult job. The number of items on your agenda were quite long and we all appreciate your work and yes indeed, you made our life much easier in the Plenaries.

We had to go through lots of easy approvals of Resolutions, so thank you very much again, and look forward to work with you again. Thank you.

[ Applause ]

Mr. Wee, we had concluded your work yesterday. I never had a chance to have the final words from Chairman of Committee 2. So the floor is yours, Sir.

>> KYU‑JIN WEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was very honored that I had the chance to convene Committee 2 with the two Vice‑Chairs, and even there's not so many participants in my Committee 2 but those participants who joined my Committee 2 are really provide very good comments and views, and with that, we had completed our job in a successful manner.

And also, we noted that some difficulties of the financial issues as a whole of the ITU and also particularly in ITU‑T, and then in future, these difficulties have been getting better as a whole ITU.

Also, I should say my appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, to make a successful meeting of the WTSA. So ‑‑ and also, I do appreciate my Vice‑Chairmen and particularly my Secretary teams, those who are working in the ITU financial departments, so I appreciate them, as well. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Wee. And thank you and your colleagues in Committee 2 and all the participants. The report which you presented yesterday was an excellent report, very comprehensive and detailed and it was praised in yesterday's Plenary. So thank you again and your team, all of you.

[ Applause ]

If there are no further requests for the floor ‑‑ yes, we've got one request. Egypt? We have a closing ceremony in 20 minutes, so if any interventions are related to the closing ceremony, please bear in mind that we will start the closing ceremony in 20 minutes, at 12:00 p.m. Yes, thank you.

If this Plenary has no further business, no further issues to be discussed, no further comments, Kenya, you requested the floor?

>> KENYA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I understand we will have a closing ceremony in the next 20 minutes, but I would request you to allow me, on behalf of my Delegation, to sincerely express our thanks to you, and to convey our additional thanks to your Government for having accommodated us here for the last two weeks.

Mr. Chairman, discussion and dialogue are a process but decisions are meant to facilitate progress. It is our sincere hope that the decisions through Resolutions that we have made here will reinvigorate this very important facet of the global telecommunications agenda. That is the standardization Sector.

Mr. Chairman, whatever has been said here has just been hadn't to facilitate the intended growth. We want to thank you most sincerely for your able stewardship of the process of negotiation. We also want to thank the TSB, through Mr. Malcolm Johnson, for his outstanding stewardship of the standardization Sector, and also thank most sincerely the Secretary‑General for his fatherly guidance.

Some of us sometimes have been so vehement on some issues but please understand that it was in the process and spirit of compromise to facilitate decisions that will benefit the entire global community. Mr. Chairman, accept our thanks, and wish you best of luck in your forthcoming endeavors. Thank you.

[ Applause ]

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Kenya, for your kind words. I will have my thanks in the closing ceremony and the words of appreciation.

So just as a personal thanks to all the interpreters who have beared with us so far and all the captioners who are helping us on the screen and on making the documents available online, as well. We thank them all.

With that, I would like to declare that the works of WTSA has completed and finished, and we close the Plenary. Thank you all.

[ Applause ]

[ End of meeting ]
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