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 >> CHAIR: Good morning, everyone. This is the sixth meeting of the ADM. Before we get started I would like to check the interpretation and thank the interpreters for today and thank Caption First for today. English?

 >> Good morning, Madam Chair.

 >> CHAIR: 2, French. 3, Spanish. 4, Russian. 5, Chinese. And 6, Arabic.

Okay. Thank you. So our agenda today is in revision 8, C17/DT3. We had a Steering Committee last night and I was being very, very optimistic that we could finish our work this morning and maybe come back for about 30 minutes this afternoon. And then turn it over to the Plenary Committee for the remainder of the afternoon. I feel extremely confident that we can do that with your help, that our team here that we can make it through the morning. We can complete our agenda items and then we come back this afternoon and we can approve the budget resolution. And then we move directly in to Plenary.

So I'm asking you for your help and to setting that goal for ourselves. Okay. With that I would like to start with agenda item 31 ‑‑ oh, yes. And actually before we start the agenda, I would like for us to stand and have a moment of silence for the UK and the victims and their families. So if we can please stand and have a moment of silence. One minute.

(Moment of silence).

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. I would like to ‑‑ thank you very much. I would like to give the floor to the UK, please.

 >> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I'm very much moved by this expression of support. This is a very difficult time for the UK. We are still grieving and I'm still shocked. But to know we have the support of all of you here helps us at this time. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, UK. With that I would like to start with agenda item 31 and the way we ‑‑ the method of work this morning we are going to introduce both documents and then we'll open the floor. So I have implementation of the ITU information and document access policy, Beatrice Pluchon, you have the floor.

 >> BEATRICE PLUCHON: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning, to all. On behalf of the Secretary‑General it is my pleasure to present D16/66, access policy. The Council at its 2016 session approved a draft policy for its implementation on a provisional basis while waiting its definitive approval by the 2018 Plenipotentiary Conference. Council at its 2016 session also instructed the ITU Secretary‑General to implement procedures and processes which are necessary and to begin to implement this policy as of the 1st January 2017.

Moreover Council instructed the Secretary‑General to report to Council at its sessions of 2017 and 2018 on the implementation of this policy, in particular to formulate any suggestions concerning improvements to be made to this policy. This document presents a report on the first months of the implementation of the policy, in particular modifications made to the document management system, DMS, to be able to apply access restrictions to a single document and to deal with cases of redacted versions of documents. Measures taken to inform staff of the policy and implementation modalities, measures taken to inform Delegates, creation of a dedicated web page with an introduction to the policy, which explains the policy and the procedures for its implementation was created. In the ITU page there is a link under governance to this page. As of 1st January 2017 the policy has been applied to input and output documents of regional preparatory meetings for WTDC‑17.

The cluster of Council Working Group meetings, the meetings of the advisory groups of the three sectors and the 2017 Council section. Secular letters of the Secretary‑General have been made available to the public. The policy will also be applied to documents submitted to input and output documents of WTDC‑17 in October 2017, requests from entities submitting documents and wishing to restrict access under Article 3.2 of the policy have been managed within the document management system. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Beatrice Pluchon. I would like to call on Saudi Arabia to introduce document 107, please.

 >> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning to all. We would like to thank the Secretariat for preparing their document. As for the contribution from Saudi Arabia on the implementation on a provisional basis of the ITU information document access policy as you know Council at its last session approved a policy document. Saudi Arabia thanks the Secretary‑General for approving this policy and the beginning of its implementation is a good step in the right direction.

Since we are conducting a provisional implementation we are aware that there could be some unforeseen occurrences which need to be addressed. We think now is the time to make a provision for these. Therefore Saudi Arabia has three proposals, proposal 1, the Secretariat should have the approval of the submitter which is submit a document submitted through the Web page. So as to authorize access to the document proposal. 2, for contributions by members submitted through e‑mail if the submitter did not notify the Secretariat with the chosen position. The status quo before the policy came in to force should remain. Input will remain Ties protected until the submitter requests otherwise. Proposal 3, input documents that are not outcomes of bodies covered by the scope of the information document access policy should remain Ties protected until the submitter requests otherwise, until the submitter requests otherwise. That is our proposal in document 107. And we are ready to answer any questions.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Before I open the floor for discussion, I would like to propose ‑‑ I would like the ADM Committee to consider the following. I had informal consultations with Saudi Arabia to further understand their proposal. And if there was a difference in the policy that we adopted in 2016. When you look at 3.2 that has the policy of which document should be opened, upon reading and reflecting on proposals 1, 2 and 3 in the Saudi Arabia proposal it is not out of scope of the policy that we adopted in 2016.

What the proposal in document 107 is just clarifying the process even more. I'd like to look at it as when I'm putting together a toy for my kids it has instructions 1, 2 and 3. So here's ‑‑ I would like to make the following proposal. Unless I see objection from the Council, this is what I propose the ADM Committee submit to Council and the ADM report. To clarify the decision of the submitter as per 3.2 of the policy I instruct that the secretary by any means seeks the approval of this submitter regarding whether his or her submission is to be made open or Ties protected. That is consistent with 3.2 because if you look at 3.2 and then you look at the annex, each section of the annex says the submitter will decide if it is open or Ties protected.

For the second point, output documents from those bodies not covered by the policy will remain Ties protected. That is my suggestion as a path forward. We have approved this policy. I do not ‑‑ from reading this policy and discussing with some Member States this policy is just a clarification. So I put that for consideration. I see no one taking the floor. It is approved. I will put these new revisions ‑‑ well, this summary review in my report. Thank you very much.

(Gavel).

 >> CHAIR: Item 32, I would like to call on Brazil to introduce their document 97, please.

 >> BRAZIL: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning, everyone. Document 97 reflects Brazil's views on the division of roles in terms of governing the Information Society. This division of roles is clearly identified in the Tunis Agenda from the Information Society. And we believe in Para 5 and we believe that this division of roles should be reflected in the work of the ITU. And for that we need to emphasize the role of the private sector academia and Civil Society in the technical and economic development of ICTs. For that we propose three principles. First, we should always look to provide more value for ITU membership. If we look at our Constitution and Convention we will see that the role of sector members, associates in academia is emphasized, particularly in the sectors, Study Groups and their variants. We see that in Article 4 of the Constitution, Article 20 of the Convention and in Resolution 169, Rev Busan 2014. We believe that ‑‑ that the role of these stakeholders is extremely important to advance the work of the ITU. Therefore we should always look to encourage their participation and provide more value.

How can we do that? We should continue discussing the creation of new categories of membership to attract Small and Medium Enterprises, SMEs and we should continue discussing how to increase the participation of sector members. In Brazil particularly we had this complaint from a sector member that they are not able to participate in regional groups. Yes, of course, we have Resolution 154 of the WTSA that limits the participation of sector members to their respective regions but we should look further on this issue. We should analyze if we are able to provide more values for global corporations and if we should allow their regional branches to participate without paying additional contributory units. We should look from the cost benefit point of view and evaluate if we would have more revenue going forward with the way that we are doing things or if we should change and allow regional branches to participate in the regional groups.

The second principle is for fostering participation by avoiding duplication of work. And in here we provide an example of the regional ITU‑T Study Groups. Of course, this is only an example but we have seen that this example has brought some complaints. Some Member States are aware that we are against regional Study Groups and actually we are not. But they do provide a potential for duplication of work. And we see that happening in the Americas region. We should avoid that as much as possible.

The third principle is respecting nonstate members competencies, expertise and inputs. And this may not apply to every sector member. And this may not apply to every Study Group but we did have complaints that some ‑‑ in some groups Chairs give more value to Member States' contribution than to sector members' contribution and this is not ideal. We should respect the principle of the division of roles in the ICT governance. Therefore, as a principle we would like to see asymmetry of treatment of contributions of Study Groups of ITU. Also there were complaints, and again we are not saying that this happened specifically, specifically in Study Groups or with specific sector members but in general we should always respect the documented ITU process and procedures. And to summarize, this is our view on how to respect sector members' participation. And we should look further in to the categories of participation. And so we don't ask the ‑‑ for the floor again after Argentina presents we believe that their contribution is very valuable. And we support it even before the presentation. Thank you very much.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. Argentina, would you introduce your document, C17/100? Thank you.

 >> ARGENTINA: Thank you. At the request of the Ministry of Communications of Argentina I'm presenting this contribution on promoting the preparation of SMEs in the work of the ITU. Since the announcement of the global ICT, ICT entrepreneurship Argentina has supported and promoted the participation of Small and Medium Enterprises, SMEs, in the work of the ITU. We are convinced that SMEs especially in Developing Countries are essential when it comes to ensuring economic growth and facilitating development, reducing employment, particularly for young people and promoting innovation and progress in the ICT sector. This has borne out various data relating to our country, Argentina. 99% of the companies are SMEs and generate over 4 million jobs. This accounts for 70% of the countries' formal employment. This is why we decided to support all initiatives seeking to incorporate the potential SMEs, bring to the ITU. Such as the platform that has started to take shape as part of ITU Telecom which is organized each year to provide a space for such companies to meet and interact amongst themselves and with other SMEs. Likewise we have been looking at ways for SMEs to participate as effectively in the ITU's work particularly specific characteristics need to be taken in to account. There is need to consider issues related to size, number of employees, revenue, country of origin, if these are Developing Countries and any other circumstance that places SMEs in a different situation compared to the other countries that currently form part of the ITU, whether they be associates or sector members. For its part in the WTSA report there is an invitation for the Council to tackle as soon as possible the question of SME participation in the work of the ITU and in particular that of the ITU‑T.

There is also worth mentioning that the Chairman of the ITU‑T Study Group 20 on the Internet of Things in a document put forward in 2015 proposed that a pilot trial be implemented to ‑‑ within Study Group 20 to assist ‑‑ assess the participation of SMEs. The Argentinean Delegation submitted a contribution on the same lines in March of 2016. The ITU Secretariat submitted a report to the Council Working Group of human resources in 2016 analyzing the situation regarding the participation of SMEs in the work of the Union and the reasons why these companies might or might not be interested to participate.

This was based on a telephone survey of SMEs in June of 2016, surveying SMEs currently associated with the ITU. This reflects the fact that difficulties of participating for the SMEs themselves were costs associated with participation in the meeting and cost of travel and stay and insufficient human resources to deal with a variety of topics and meeting insufficient time to attend meetings and the cost of membership. Some of the recommendations which the SMEs voiced it would be good to organize information meetings solely for SMEs and to plan meetings to include related events in the same week and to reduce the cost of membership and information on the Web page. We believe that what should also be analyzed is activities carried out in associations or chambers of commerce in a regional level aimed at promoting growth and the development of SMEs. And then each state could contribute to disseminating information and activities of the ITU in this regard.

It is important to reach out to the associations and chambers of commerce in the various regions to look to organizing regional events involving the SMEs in the ITU's work, identifying possible areas of collaboration and it might also be useful to look at activities organized on more specific topics such as ITU‑T's Study Group activities or ITU‑T telecoms or the smart ABC initiatives.

To summarize what we are proposing is that it is important to identify options for the effective participation of SMEs in the work of the ITU which should include assessing the following, implement after pilot project and Study Group to be identified, participation in ‑‑ identification of criteria defining SMEs with a view to their participation in the ITU as ITU associates taking in to account their specific characteristics mainly and accept if they come from Developing Countries. And finally we believe it is important to promote more sensibly those ITU activities that are focused on SME participation so that Developing Countries in particular can disseminate information, the aim of assessing potential for collaboration between ITU and the SMEs. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Argentina. Mr. Plesse, do we need to reintroduce ‑‑ do you need to introduce section 1.7 of the Council Working Group report?

 >> DIETMAR PLESSE: In principle not, Madam Chair. I would remind the conclusion of the group with regard to the participation of SMEs which reads it is further recommended that Council note the additional information provided in the analysis of SME participation in ITU and consider making proposals to this topic. This relates in particular, of course, to the proposals made by Argentina. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I now open the floor for discussion on document 97, 100 as well as approving the resolution on annex 2 of document 50. The floor is open.

Okay. I have UAE. You have the floor.

 >> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning to all. First, I'd like to thank Brazil and Argentina for presenting their documents which were very useful. On Brazil's position enhancing the participation of nonstate members in the work of ITU I think this topic was already discussed in the WTSA. And we feel that the regional meetings can have such participation in them. But we think that the Chairs of regional groups can invite nonstate members to participate but there shouldn't be open participation without invitation of the Chair of a given group.

As for principle 2, fostering participation by avoiding duplication of work, we have a reservation on the first paragraph. Sector conferences, assemblies and sector advisory groups when deciding on the structure of the sector and groups should take a look at other ITU sectors and other international organizations and avoid duplication of work.

We think that advisory groups should be aware of the work in other sectors and this would avoid duplication of work in the three sectors, but for the other international organizations we have a reservation on this subject. For instance, if there is a specific topic to discuss, the standardization sector sets up a Working Group on this, is that really a good idea. We have to make sure to avoid duplication in the work of the ITU, but when we are talking about other international organizations we must remember that Developing Countries participate in these other international organizations. ITU is part of the UN family. So there are Member States in ITU. There are academia sector members. And now coming on to principle 3, respecting nonmember ‑‑ nonstate members competencies, expertise and inputs we agree with Brazil on participation of the private sector in the Study Group meetings. This is what we see in Study Group 20 where all the proposals and documents are studied without discrimination between the submitters. So we submit principle 3. We support principle 3. As for the Argentinean document it is also very important. Study Group 20 and here I'm speaking as Chair of Study Group 20, this Study Group has experimented with involving the SMEs. We agree with Argentina on this subject. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. Spain, you have the floor.

 >> SPAIN: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. We would like to thank the administrations of Brazil and Argentina for presenting these two documents. With regard to the participation of SMEs in the activities of the ITU this administration is in favor of this approach. This is also in line with our national policy on supporting SMEs which is reflected in the digital agenda for Spain. We agree with the proposal. It is for the continuation of work as reflected in contribution No. 100. We also agree with the definition of SMEs. Our suggestion would be to consider the definition made by the European Commission which is based on two indicators, the number of employees and either the assets of the company or its income. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Spain. Japan, you have the floor.

 >> JAPAN: Thank you, Madam Chair and good morning. I would like to express my thanks to Brazil and Argentina for their respective contributions. Japan would like ‑‑ it is very desirable for ITU to promote and enhance participation of nonstate members in the ITU activities. Though we should continue to study measures to propose ‑‑ provide more value to some stakeholders. For Brazil contribution 97 I support principle No. 1 providing more value for ITU membership. And for Argentina contribution 100 we need to ‑‑ the definition of SMEs and consider the financial impact taking in to account potential decreases of revenues. Thank you, Madam Chair.

 >> CHAIR: Saudi Arabia, you have the floor. Sorry about that.

 >> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. At the outset we would like to thank Brazil and Argentina for submitting these contributions. Briefly we support the comments made by the Distinguished Delegate of the UAE, in particular we would like to avoid any duplication of tasks. This issue was considered in depth during the last meeting. We believe that every standardization organization has the right to study all issues falling under its mandate or the mandate given to it by higher instances. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Saudi Arabia. I have Germany asking for the floor.

 >> GERMANY: Thank you, Madam Chair. Well, I don't know, this document of Brazil could be a German document indeed. So we thank Brazil for submitting document 97 and we thank Argentina for submitting document 100. The Brazilian document we would like to associate ourselves fully to it. I think it is driven by the experience the Brazilian administration had when talking to sector members. If we talked to our sector members in particular with regard to the participation in the standardization sector, we experience the same concerns and we would have the same analysis as established in this document. So we associate ourselves fully to document 97.

With regard to Argentina I think there are some very good ideas that ITU should try to follow, in particular the participation through national original business associations or chambers of commerce. Not in all countries the SMEs have a mandatory membership in the chambers of commerce but in many countries they have. So this is certainly a good vehicle to promote ITU's activities and to make more SMEs interested in the work of the ITU. Of course, as far as the participation of the SMEs is concerned ITU should probably also along with this document but also along with the proposals or the findings in the Brazilian document improve the position of the private sector in general and the SMEs in particular in the work of the ITU. And here I'm referring to the work in the Study Groups. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Germany. France, you have the floor.

 >> FRANCE: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning, everyone. I would also like to thank Brazil and Argentina for their contributions. We fully support their aims. We believe it is crucial for the ITU to fully involve the private sector in its work, particularly when it is a question of SMEs, Small and Medium Enterprises. I am thinking of startups but at the moment they only participate in a marginal basis of the ITU's work. So we can only be in favor of continued considerations of this subject. We believe there is a need to pursue three objectives. Firstly to increase the ‑‑ their activity in the Union. Secondly to attract stable financial resources or even increase them. And thirdly provide greater clarity about the rules of participation of entities for the private sector in the work of the ITU.

With regard to the redefinition of criteria for the exemption of members we fully support the conclusions of the Council Working Group on financial and human resources aimed at limiting this exemption for not‑for‑profit companies or organizations. We can approve annex 2 to document 50.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, France. Canada, you have the floor.

 >> CANADA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning to you and to all colleagues. We would like to start by thanking the administrations of Brazil and Argentina for the submission of their documents. We are supportive of principles 1 and 2 as highlighted in the Brazilian contribution. And in regards to the document by Argentina we are also fully supportive of the principle behind a more dedicated effort to ensure an active participation of SMEs and micro enterprises in the activities of the Union. With that said we have to work carefully towards ensuring that in the case of Developing and Least Developed Countries the definition of SMEs should go beyond those that have been established by organizations like the OECD or the European Commission because it is clear that an SME or a micro enterprise in a Developing Country doesn't have 250 employees or the revenues as indicated in documents that have been published to that effect.

It is critically important in our work towards ensuring the active participation of SMEs that we work at least in our region with the assistance of our regional office in seeing how we can bring to the fold of the ITU, the associations or chambers of commerce which throughout Latin America and the Caribbean have a very active participation, not only in engaging SMEs and micro enterprises but on fostering the adoption of ICTs as a critical tool for development for generation of employment as well. So we look forward to a prompt action on our part to see how we can better structure the approach, starting with a more accurate definition or definitions of SMEs to ensure that when we are going to promote the participation of SMEs we look at the chambers of commerce and be careful enough to identify for them the value that their participation in ITU would have.

I believe, we believe also, Madam Chair, that this would go beyond ITU‑T participation, ITU‑T Study Groups. I think it is essential that their participation in Study Groups 1 and 2 of the development sector be considered. We very much look forward to working with this ‑‑ on this item. And particularly if I may, in my closing remarks on this issue, ensure also that when looking at SMEs and micro enterprises and specifically in our region the Americas, we look at the incredible role that women as sole bread winners have statistically shown in SMEs and micro enterprises. This should be another consideration as we move forward on this issue. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Tunisia, you have the floor.

 >> TUNISIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would also like to thank Argentina and Brazil for their important contributions. Tunisia participates in a number of work, regional Study Groups and we believe that SMEs are essential, too. So we support all efforts aimed at supporting the participation of SMEs and startups in these meetings. I also support the comments made by the Distinguished Delegate from the UAE. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I have no more requests for the floor. Let me summarize what I have heard. I have heard overall support for the principles outlined in document 107, especially ‑‑ excuse me, document 97, especially principles 1 and 2. However, there needs to be further discussion of those principles outlined in document 97. I have heard overall support for SMEs. However, there is still more work that needs to be done. I have heard that Study Group 20 has a pilot project that they are working on ‑‑ and have been gaining some experience with inviting SMEs in to the work of their group. So here's what I would like to propose, that the ADM group conclude on this issue. If there are no objections, I recommend that the ADM Committee send this to the Council Working Group on FHR for further study of the ideas articulated in C17/97 and C17/100.

I recommend that the ADM Committee instruct Study Group 20 to submit a report to the Council Working Group on FHR so that can be included in the report to Council on their experience with SMEs, their pilot project. I did not hear anyone object to ‑‑ yes. I did not hear anyone object to approving annex 2 in document 50. With that I ‑‑ that is my conclusion. So I have two administrations asking ‑‑ Member States asking for the floor. Three. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

 >> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. We listened carefully to the presentation of your conclusions and as regards the principles to be sent to the Council Working Group on financial and human resources, we believe that this is a premature decision. If a Member State wishes to submit a document to the next meeting of that Council Working Group, yes, that's quite possible. But nevertheless, we would hesitate over sending this document to the Council Working Group. What is the mandate of this Council Working Group? What is it going to do with the document? Is it going to discuss the content? Is it going to adopt the document? Is it going to modify it or edit it? We are not certain how relevant this measure would be. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. I will respond to all questions after. I have UAE. You have the floor.

 >> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. As was explained by my colleagues the Distinguished Delegate from the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia this is a question which has been at the heart of our debate for our discussions for a number of years. And if there is no objection then we could create a group to consider the role of SMEs and their involvement and see what the mechanism could be to enable them to participate in our work instead of sending this document to the Council Working Group on financial and human resources. We are aware that we don't have a great deal of time available to us. However, we do need clarification as to what on this matter, what is the role of the Council Working Group on financial and human resources. In fact, we have been discussing this issue for two years before coming up with this document. We haven't yet carried out a pilot project. Nevertheless, if agreement could be found on new procedures for the involvement of Small and Medium Enterprises, then Study Group 20 stands ready to be the first Study Group to welcome these Small and Medium Enterprises. That is the clarification I wish to make with regards to the participation of SMEs in the work of study ‑‑ the Study Groups.

We haven't yet had a pilot project. However we have requested the Council and the Council Working Group on financial and human resources via the director of the TSB this request was sent to the CWG‑FHR and it was about whether or not SMEs were authorized to participate in the work of the ITU or the work of the Study Groups of ITU‑T. If they are unable to do so, then SG20 will be the first to welcome them as part of a pilot project. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. Canada, you have the floor.

 >> CANADA: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. Very briefly. I think that the fundamental issue when we are going to talk to SMEs and micro enterprises would be to inform them what we do, the value we could add. I don't think that to that effect our discussions should focus on the procedural issues associated to how and when an SME should be allowed or not allowed to go to a Study Group whether on the T sector, D sector, whether Study Group 20 or 17 or 3 or 2. I think that moving ahead in terms of conveying an engaging message could be, and this is just a suggestion, which I will make in our regional meetings in the Americas, how we can organize where we can have people represented by chambers of commerce so we can convey a clear message what we do is of value to them and then go to the next step which would be this is how you could participate and this is how we are working towards it.

At this stage and in regards to the Council's Working Group on finance and human resources it seems that every issue that we are not able to completely address is sent to the Council's Working Group on finance and human resources. There could be financial implications for the Union for allowing participation of SMEs and micro enterprise but that seems to be an issue of lower gravity than the one of conveying a message to SMEs and micro enterprises to welcome them and inform them of what we do and particularly in the context of where moving forward to WTDC, closing the digital divide, ICTs and Sustainable Development Goals.

If I am an SME in a Developing Country which questions would I ask. Why would I go to a meeting of ITU. What's in it for me and the community I represent. I think focusing on that is the first step towards ensuring a long‑term engagement by SMEs and micro enterprises. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. The director of TSB you have the floor.

 >> CHAESUB LEE: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning, everyone. Let me try to show my experience on the SMEs for startups of micro enterprise. The last three years I have had a chance to visit many areas and I visited these countries, most specific areas, sometimes in the course of this attending Study Group meetings or some Study Group meetings held in specific regions. I had a chance to visit many industries or academias. I remember this, I requested one of the countries, they have SME associations. They ‑‑ I have a good discussion with them. They recognize this valuable ITU. But unfortunately I still didn't give any information to them, how they join with us. Only I guide them two directions. One is Government you can participate ITU activities. Another way, you can think about associate. That is the only way. Unfortunately we didn't give any of this information yet. By the nature of this SMEs and the startups micro enterprise most of those industries, their relevance of in market is very limited. Localized or nationalized but they want to look at some guidance from the international standard activities.

That is the nature of the business models. So it would be very nice to have some associates with the regional activities. So this is what I tried. Still we don't have any clear guidance. It is more than three years. So a listing of this what Council you discussed it would be good to ‑‑ we ‑‑ it is a time to provide some action plans. So provide these procedures as well. So we have to develop what contents would be valuable for our candidate SMEs or startups but also in the other sense we have to prepare some good procedures, even pilot phases is okay. Because of this each SMEs and SMEs in each country or region have different nature. I don't believe this would ‑‑ we can develop a single procedure to fit everyone. Might be very challenging but we have to find some solutions to attract them. This is a ‑‑ I want to share with you this is really effect ‑‑ factual situation in ITU‑T side. Thank you very much.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. I now have Germany asking for the floor.

 >> GERMANY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I agree with Canada that if it is like a ping pong game, everything that cannot be resolved totally at Council is sent to this Council Working Group on financial and human resources where it cannot be solved and it comes back to the Council. With regard to the question of the participation of SMEs and micro enterprise, I think that, in fact, the main matter here to be attacked immediately is the promotion of ITU activities and make them interested. Now, of course, it is ‑‑ it would be a pity if then the rules in place at ITU after making these enterprises interested would not allow them to participate. But I think I have a resolution for this, if the rules are too restrictive, then the Council maybe even today could agree that the participation at least on a provisional basis will be based on a kind of pilot project which does not necessarily follow all the strict rules. If it turns out that these rules are not very favorable to the participation of those kind of enterprises. I think this would be a solution rather than defining the rules before you even have a sufficient interest by those type of enterprises. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. Tunisia, you have the floor.

 >> TUNISIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Briefly we support the creation of a Working Group during this Council session so as to find solutions enabling the participation of SMEs. We could also select Study Group 20 to lead this pilot project. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: United States, you have the floor.

 >> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would say that the colleague from Tunisia has come up with a good suggestion, that we need some sort of drafting group to come up with a framework for a pilot project. So that we all understand who the SMEs are that we are trying to attract and with their participation what their rights and responsibilities would be. Because this is fundamental to how one engages in the ITU. To understand rights to submit contributions, to make proposals, to participate in the decision‑making process.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

 >> CHAIR: Bulgaria, you have the floor.

 >> BULGARIA: Good morning. We are sympathetic to this approach. And well, whatever rules you are trying to draft a priori, perhaps they will be out of date or they will not be 100% applicable. So some ‑‑ in some way we have to post ‑‑ to put this idea on the test bench. Perhaps having the basic agreement allows them to ‑‑ I mean Small and Medium Size Enterprises to participate in the work should be widely known to them. And we have to see how much interest they have. Perhaps we can have this trial period, if I may use this term as, from the end of this Council until the beginning of the next Council. And then we can see what this is going to come up with. And then based on the interest and the real issues which our colleagues in the Secretariat, in the three sectors would face, let's elaborate that the rules to see how this is going to be done in practical way. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

 >> CHAIR: Deputy Secretary‑General Johnson, you have the floor.

 >> MALCOLM JOHNSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to add my thanks to Argentina for their proposal. Argentina did work closely with the Secretariat on this issue and has done so for some time. Of course, we put a document in to the last meeting of the Council Working Group FHR on this issue. It is clear that it is a very important issue for ITU and the main objective is to encourage industry in Developing Countries to participate in the work of the ITU. Of course, the industry in Developing Countries if it is not a subsidiary of a big multi‑national they are very small companies. And as Canada has pointed out we need to be careful with the definition of SMEs which is what Argentina is suggesting we need to look at. So that we do include these very small companies in Developing Countries in the possibility of participating in our work. And we have also had a number of business associations approach us expressing interest in working with ITU to facilitate small companies in Developing Countries, participating with us.

So an event as Canada suggested on the regional basis in association with business associations to help explain the advantages to them of entering in to work in ITU would be very beneficial I believe.

And then the pilot project which Study Group 20 in the T sector is very keen to run would be helpful in getting some experience. So clearly we need to look at the rights of participation for such small companies. They would be paying presumably a very low fee. Academia is paying 2,000 francs a year for all three sectors but academia doesn't participate in the final decision making. So maybe it is something along the same lines for these very small companies would be the best approach. So perhaps as suggested by Tunisia a small group could clarify these issues a bit more clearly. And we can get something out of this Council meeting and as Argentina's proposal is to move ahead for this issue and not to pass it back and forth. Let's try to move ahead on this issue which everyone agrees is very important for the Union. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So I'll revise my proposal. I would like to ‑‑ I see there is two issues. We have document 97 that is recommending principles for nonstate membership participation which could feed in to the SMEs but it is ‑‑ it also has a different twist. I know that in the past the FHR group has dealt with membership issues. So that's one issue. The other issue is the SMEs and there is general agreement and support for moving forward with something. So I would like to take ‑‑ it was proposed by Tunisia and also proposed by Germany and U.S. to have a small group to look at the framework for the SMEs and with the aim of having a pilot project between now and the next Council. And if I could ask the Tunisian Delegation if you would like to Chair that little small group. Tunisia, can I get your support for that?

 >> TUNISIA: (Speaking in a non‑English language).

 >> CHAIR: United Arab Emirates, you have the floor.

 >> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. And I thank Tunisia for accepting chairing this group and we would participate actively in this group. One point, Madam Chair, is that you have mentioned that this pilot will be ‑‑ would run until the next Council, but from now until the next Council it is very short time. So my proposal is that we run this pilot until the Plenipotentiary Conference and accordingly the final decision on the participation of SMEs could be taken at the Plenipotentiary Conference. This is my humble proposal, Madam Chair, because until the next Council would be a very short time and the reporting on that might not be accurate because of the time that we have from now until the next Council. Thank you very much.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. The reason I said until the next Council, because if we want to have this as a report in to the Plenipotentiary the Secretary‑General has to have a report posted four months before the Plenipotentiary, I was thinking about Study Group 20 because it has a meeting coming up this fall and possibly next year that would hopefully give some indication of how this is working. I am trying to find the best information for the Plenipot to make a decision. So that is why I said until next Council. So thank you, Tunisia, for taking that on. There is a time constraint however. It would need to come back to our meeting at 2:30 with any text. So that's a short time because our goal if you remember this morning was to come back for 30 minutes and then turn it over to the Plenary.

But there is still an outstanding issue of how do we deal with the Brazilian principles document. I still believe that that ‑‑ sending that to the FHR is the appropriate place to ‑‑ we can still deal with it in the SMEs but I also think it should go to the FHR as they have been dealing with membership. If there is no objection that's what I propose the ADM group do.

Russia, do you need the floor? Russian Federation?

 >> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Madam Chair. I shall try to be brief. We would like to support the proposal made by the United Arab Emirates. We see that this issue has to be examined by the Plenipotentiary Conference. So we think right now we have very effective mechanisms provided by the Convention and we have to be very rigorous in fulfilling them. So we think that this issue should be brought before the Plenipotentiary Conference. Moreover we would like a clarification of the terms of reference of the group now being established and how will its work be carried out during the Intersessional period. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: UAE, you have the floor. And then after your intervention I would like to take a coffee break and speak with the Secretariat on the best way forward. Okay. Thank you.

 >> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Very briefly very quickly, concerning your proposal to present this idea to the Plenipotentiary I would like that we look in to the meeting of the Council that is held directly before PP. We should look at that meeting so we give more time to Study Group 20 in order to implement a pilot project. Concerning the proposal in document 97 presented by Brazil we would like to support the proposal to send the document to the group in charge of human resources and financial resources. We would like to present this document with the remarks made by the Delegates. Not only the document but also the ideas expressed by the Council members. Thank you, Madam.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. With that I would like ask that we take a coffee break and we come back at 11 o'clock. Thank you very much.

(Coffee break).

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, everyone. And welcome back from the coffee break. During the coffee break I had ‑‑ I consulted with the Secretariat and consulted with those Member States regarding the proposal. And here's what I would like to propose that the ADM committee add to their report. We ‑‑ there is general agreement so far to send document 97 principles to FHR for further consideration. As for the Ad Hoc Group, the drafting group that will take place at ‑‑ it needs to take place during lunch because we had a meeting ‑‑ we need to complete our meeting this afternoon by 3 o'clock. And so this is the terms of reference for the drafting group. So draft terms of reference for Ad Hoc Group on SMEs pilot project. Develop a framework for a pilot project for SME participation and interested Study Groups of the three sectors. Implementation of this project would be done in collaboration with regional telecommunication organizations and the ITU regional and area offices.

Outline the general principles related to the rights and obligations of SMEs in this pilot project. Refer to Plenipot Resolution 169 related to academia participation including the principle that academia participate with reduced fees but not involved in decision‑making processes. The requests ‑‑ the request of an SME will be submitted via the relevant administration which can in turn confirm that they meet national criteria recognized as an SME. The pilot project would run until PP‑18. The Secretariat would provide a progress report to the next Council with a view towards presenting a full report for PP‑18 including benefits experienced and challenges to be addressed.

I put this forward as the terms of reference for the Ad Hoc Group that will meet before the afternoon session. Thank you very much.

Brazil, you have the floor. I'm sorry.

 >> BRAZIL: Thank you, Madam Chair. We agree with forwarding our principles to the FHR. And we will participate in this group. But let's be careful not to put this group in parallel with the first meeting of the Council Working Group on strategic and financial plan that will take place at 12:30 in room A today. This is a very important meeting. It is the first meeting. We don't want to reduce the attendance in that meeting. So let's try to schedule another time for this Ad Hoc Group. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Can I ask what time is your meeting? 12:30 to 2:30? 1:30. Okay. So the Strategic Plan group is meeting from 12:30 to 1:30. So can I ask the Ad Hoc Group to meet from 1:30 to 2:30? Would that be okay? Okay. Brazil, you have the floor.

 >> BRAZIL: Yes. Madam Chair, if people are going to attend two meetings they will not have lunch.
 (Laughter).

 >> BRAZIL: It is still ‑‑ they are still competing. The Ad Hoc Group is still competing with the Strategic Plan group.

 >> CHAIR: Canada, you have the floor.

 >> CANADA: Yes. Very briefly. I would concur with Brazil on not overlapping those two meetings and particularly given the relevance of the meeting that would be chaired by Mr. Canazza, it is an absolute priority. It is the first meeting. If I understood correctly, Madam Chair, the document or draft document you read is it a draft decision by Council or it would be just a text that we include in the report as to the next steps in addressing the issue of SMEs? Because if such is the case we, of course, would concur with the text as you have read and to that effect I think that there would be in principle no need for an Ad Hoc Group if your suggestion is clearly reflected in the text that you have read. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada, for that good suggestion. I will hold that thought and give the floor to UAE for a second. You have the floor.

 >> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. As regards this issue, in particular the proposal from Canada, in addition to the results that you have shared with us, we support your proposal, Madam Chair. This needs to be included in the report of the meeting. If this is approved, we will not need the Working Group which is supposed to meet.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you for that. I have two very wise Councillors giving me the Council. I would like to put the text on the screen as it was developed so that everybody can see. If we could agree ‑‑ if the ADM committee can agree to this text going in to our report regarding the SME pilot project I would propose that we proceed in this manner. So the text is on the screen for everyone to have ‑‑ if you have views please take the floor.

So let's start with the first run. Develop a framework for a pilot project for SME participation and interested Study Groups of the three sectors. Secretariat ‑‑ I am ‑‑ I have a suggestion to improve the text. So it would read develop a framework for a pilot project for open to SME participation. So you delete for and you add open. You ready? Okay. Develop a framework for a pilot project open for SME participation.

So that ‑‑ yes. Deputy Secretary‑General Malcolm, you have the floor.

 >> MALCOLM JOHNSON: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. If we are not having an Ad Hoc Group, the first bullet I would suggest could be amended to say a pilot project open for SME participation in ‑‑ will be available to any interested Study Group of the three sectors. Because it is not the terms of reference for the Ad Hoc Group. So we can delete develop a framework.

 >> CHAIR: That makes sense. Thank you. Okay. No. 2, any concerns with No. 2? United States, you have the floor.

 >> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. It is not clear to us now who is developing the pilot project. Is this going to the Council Working Group on financial and human resources? Or how ‑‑ what is the mechanism for developing the pilot project that we were going to discuss here? Thank you, Madam Chair.

 >> CHAIR: Yeah. So I'm concerned that we are turning the ADM Committee in to a drafting group because there is still ‑‑ while everyone agrees with ‑‑ the ADM committee agrees with this approach we still need to work out some of the details. And I have checked with the Secretariat. There is no other time for this group to meet except from 1:30 to 2:30. I completely understand that it is cutting in to folks' lunch hour. I just do not have any other options at this point. So if I can request that Tunisia has gracefully accepted to Chair this group. If they could meet from 1:30 to 2:30 and bring the results back to our afternoon session of the ADM Committee. And thank you very much for that taking in to account these terms of reference that are on the screen, all right? Thank you.

(Gavel).

 >> CHAIR: The next issue is item 33, and Mr. Jefferson, you have the floor to introduce DT6.

 >> Mr. Jefferson: Thank you, Madam Chair. In fact, we presented this DT6 yesterday. And I ask if we should present it again. But at least the first presentation I made yesterday was a complete report of the results of the Ad Hoc Group. Shall I present it again, Madam Chair?

 >> CHAIR: Nope. And I think you presented it yesterday but I just wanted to give you the floor in case there was any other information to provide. Thank you. So I put to you if you recall we had a summary of DT ‑‑ of the Ad Hoc Group on INRs and they ‑‑ their output of their work is in DT6. I put DT6 for your consideration.

U.S., you have the floor.

 >> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. And we thank the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group for the report in DT6 and recognize his contributions to the progress made during the discussions. We would also like to thank our colleague from Ghana for his quiet wisdom and gentle leadership throughout our deliberations.

Chair, throughout the final INR ad hoc reference was made to the fact that the revised rates in DT6 were those proposed by the ITU in document 43. More importantly it was noted that the cost justification for those rates was also included in document 43. And on that basis the revised text in the annex to DT6 was agreed by the ad hoc. Unfortunately, it has come to light that contrary to document 43 the new proposed annual fee for UIFNs and IINs was not intended to apply to members and that's the basis for the cost justification in document 43.

In the annex to DT6 this is not the case. Under the current formulation of the draft resolution the new annual fee will apply to members and nonmembers. We would therefore propose a revision to the further decides in each of the draft new resolutions. So the first further decides reads to establish the registration fee at 300 Swiss francs per number issued and implement, we would add for nonmembers set off in commas an annual maintenance fee at 20 Swiss francs per member.

And the second further decides would read to establish the registration fee at 150 Swiss francs per number issued and, for nonmembers, implement an annual maintenance fee at 100 Swiss francs per member. Thank you, Madam Chair.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, U.S. Japan, you have the floor.

 >> JAPAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you and we would like to express my thanks to Mr. Jefferson, Chair of the Ad Hoc Group of ‑‑ for his grateful leadership. But I recognize that discussing this on C17/43. So only nonmembers would pay an annual fee of ‑‑ for INRs and there is no additional cost to Member States, sector members. And also I also believe that new fees would not be retroactive. Assignees will not pay the annual registration fee for the past years. So I support the U.S. proposal. Thank you, Madam Chair.

 >> CHAIR: Australia, you have the floor.

 >> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Australia would also like to thank Brazil for the very patient chairing of this Ad Hoc Group and achieving what was then a Consensus. Like the U.S. our acceptance of the final proposal was based on an understanding that the annual fee would apply to nonmembers only. So on that basis we would also support the intervention from the United States. Thank you, Chair.

 >> CHAIR: So I have Saudi Arabia asking for the floor.

 >> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning, everyone. Firstly we would like to thank Mr. Jefferson from Brazil for chairing this drafting group. Madam Chair, we are concerned by what we are discussing at the moment. We spent a long time in the group chaired by Mr. Jefferson and during our work we made a number of concessions. We did not insist on the inclusion of proposals from the Saudi document despite the approval of that document on the part of members of the Council.

We did not submit these concessions or make these concessions, just in the spirit of compromise but also in order to ensure there was harmony amongst during our decision making. During the meetings which were held in this drafting group we came to a Consensus and this is reflected in document DT6.

After having come to a Consensus on this matter we are not opening up the discussion again. If we continue along this path, Madam Chair, we will come back to our starting point where we started with discussing these additional INR resources. We believe that we should adopt DT6 without any further amendment. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: So Mr. Jefferson, can I ask you to clarify, it appears that there is the ‑‑ there was general Consensus on adopting DT6 with the understanding that this was based on document 43 and that this was ‑‑ would not impact members of the ITU but nonmembers. Could you please clarify that? Thank you.

 >> Mr. Jefferson: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Actually as reported the discussion has started based on both documents from the Secretariat and also from Saudi Arabia. We started by the proposals and the discussions were basically trying to establish principles that could guide us in the discussions. We found that basic principles for establishing a new decision on INRs would be ‑‑ if ITU could discharge for the numbers sent directly to ITU to the operators. And that's why we found that just IIN and UIFN would be the numbers to be charged. And also that the reference price should be based on cost recovery. Those were actually the principle ‑‑ the strong principles for the development of the decisions. We discussed quite extensively the possibility of having compensation for companies from ‑‑ for companies operating numbers requested or requesting the numbers if they are members of ITU already.

And in case they are not members of ITU, they should be exempted from the annual fee. Then we discuss this paragraph and actually we were almost reaching agreement but then the group decided that there should be no exemption at all for companies that are already members of ITU, and not for companies that could be members of ITU depending on their desire to be part of ITU when they request for the numbers.

That's why we ‑‑ that's when we presented these two decisions with no more exemptions for any companies. But then, Madam Chair, all the analyses showed that maybe the basic principle of cost recovery could be ‑‑ could be harmed, could be different in case we charge for all members, for all sector members and associate members for all companies requesting the numbers. Charging everyone for the annual fee would be by some calculations much more than the cost recovery for ITU in this regard. So ‑‑ but Madam Chair, this is calculations we think that this may happen. And maybe the solution that is provided can be a good solution. We ‑‑ and personally I think that by exempting members of ITU the charge of 20 Swiss francs in the case of UIFN would still give us the cost recovery that ITU needs for the assignments and management and maintainers of those members.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you for that ‑‑ thank you, Mr. Jefferson. That was great. So I have quite a long list of speakers to take the floor. And based on further information from the Chair of that group I understand these were very difficult discussions and you all reached some principles on how to come to a decision on your work. And I would not as Chair of ADM, I would not want to come in and give different principles.

So I'm going to ask the question, we all agreed on the principle of cost recovery before we went to the INR group. I guess my question the general disagreement comes, are we going to charge our Member States and sector members twice? They already pay a fee. So is it the intention of this decision to charge them an additional fee on top of their membership fee to the Union?

So that is one question. If that is not the case, then I believe that going with Mr. Nasion's suggestion to exclude sector members or Member States from paying that additional fee. So can we clear the list, please? Can everyone please clear the list?

I'm going to ‑‑ yes, can everyone please clear the list? If it is ‑‑ if you push your button again you should clear yourself out. I'm going to take that ‑‑ this one Councillor, is it ‑‑ if you push your button you should be cleared from the list. Burkina Faso, do you insist on taking the floor? No, you don't insist on taking the floor. Okay. Thank you.

Thank you very much. So we all agree on the principle of cost recovery. Then my next question if you agree ‑‑ if you do not agree with the principle of cost recovery, take the floor. If you do not agree with the principle of cost recovery, take the floor.

I have two administrations asking for the floor. Okay. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

 >> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. In fact, you have asked all of the Delegates to withdraw their requests for the floor and after that you have asked a question. It would have been preferable first to ask the question and then only after that to ask states to withdraw their requests for the floor depending on the question which was asked. Nevertheless, Madam Chair, on the principle of cost recovery, we'd like to recall that at a previous meeting of the Standing Committee on administration and management when this question was asked for the very first time you made a proposal, namely to set up a drafting group to study the two contributions and perhaps to modify them. There was no Consensus. Consensus was achieved after the setting up of an Ad Hoc Group which considered the content of the two contributions.

The contribution from the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia included this contribution, contained proposals not based only on the principle of cost recovery. We took part in the three meetings of the drafting group led by Mr. Jefferson. We made various concessions. We abandoned various proposals in order to achieve the latest solution which we see in document DT6. Consequently, Madam Chair, we ask that this session adopt document DT6 without introducing the slightest amendment to it.

 >> CHAIR: UAE, you have the floor.

 >> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. We'd like to thank Mr. Jefferson, the Chair of this Ad Hoc Group for his statement. He explained various points. As we see it he recalled that Consensus was achieved on the texts in document DT6. We have reservations as to the need to reopen discussions on this issue. As you know the United Arab Emirates submitted a contribution on the need to strengthen the budget of the standardization sector. There was another document proposed by Saudi Arabia making similar proposals. During our meetings we were able to achieve a Consensus. Consequently as stated just now by the Distinguished Delegate of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia we also ask that this document be adopted without any amendment whatsoever. We have some misgivings and concerns about the discussion on the content of this document. Yet another discussion. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Germany, you have the floor.

 >> GERMANY: Thank you, Madam Chair. So now irrespective of the right of Council to reopen the discussion I have to associate myself with the intervention of my colleague from Saudi Arabia. We both came from a long way. Germany, for example, doesn't want this fee for INRs at all. Saudi Arabia wanted revenue generation. We had three sessions. We had intense discussions and we came to a compromise. Thanks also to the kind understanding of Saudi Arabia and others. If you reopen the discussion here we will not come to a conclusion at this Council from my point of view. We also believe that either we accept the result of difficult discussions in the Ad Hoc Group or if it cannot be accepted by Council we have to find other mechanisms to revise this decision which will then probably not take place during this Council, because we are running out of time.

So again, Madam Chair, I confirm what the Distinguished Delegate of Saudi Arabia had explained previously. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. I have Egypt asking for the floor. Egypt, you have the floor.

 >> EGYPT: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning, everyone. First I'd like to thank Mr. Jefferson from the Brazilian administration for leading all the meetings of this Ad Hoc Group which was so important. I agree with all those Delegates who are asking the document be adopted as it currently stands, because it reflects a Consensus solution achieved following various concessions. So I invite you to adopt this document as it currently stands. I think we are now trying to modify these two decisions. Enterprises submitting requests for these numbers, they pay currently whether they are members or nonmembers. This is the provision which was previously in force. What we are introducing in terms of modification is that the costs are today on the basis of cost recovery. So the question today is clear and Council is in a position to take a decision on this.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. I have Algeria asking for the floor.

 >> ALGERIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. We in our turn thank the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group for presenting this report. The Algerian administration supports the Consensus solution reflected in this document which is the outcome of several meetings. We also support the comments from the Distinguished Delegate of Saudi Arabia who is calling on us to adopt this document with no help whatsoever.

 >> CHAIR: Burkina Faso, you have the floor.

 >> BURKINA FASO: Thank you, Madam Chair. Madam Chair, we in turn would like to associate ourselves with the words of the Delegation of Saudi Arabia. As we have always done, we in Burkina Faso are always in favor of new sources of income for our Union. Therefore we are in favor of the adoption in that spirit of the new report from the Delegation of Brazil DT6. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Burkina Faso. I have Bulgaria.

 >> BULGARIA: Thank you. There were many meetings on this subject and finally the wisdom did prevail in that whole group. So we have agreed to a text. As every text which is agreed by a group with conflicting positions at the beginning it is not ideal for everyone. And therefore attacking this on the levels of this one is not the very constructive approach. Madam Chair, let us tell you the following, we have reached a Consensus of the group. And this is a document which is proposed by you to be adopted but I would like to invite everyone of this meeting to read the instructs Secretary‑General paragraph 2 which there is a report from the Secretary‑General about the implications of this decision at the next meetings of the Council. If something does not correspond to the reality of their deliberations they may be rectified and corrected once we have the experience. Thank you very much.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Bulgaria. Russia, you have the floor.

 >> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Madam Chair. We would like to associate ourselves with the view of administrations which have spoken. We do not support opening this document. We think that would put the discussion right back to Council Day One. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Morocco, you have the floor.

 >> MOROCCO: Thank you, Madam Chair.

 >> INTERPRETER: Sorry. Not audible.

 >> MOROCCO: Annex 1 and annex 2 of the report of the Ad Hoc Group. Thank you, Madam Chair.

 >> INTERPRETER: Sorry, there was too much feedback.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Morocco. Tunisia, you have the floor.

 >> TUNISIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. In my ‑‑ I associate myself with all those who support this document and call for its adoption because this document reflects Consensus which we achieved after strenuous effort. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Rwanda, you have the floor.

 >> RWANDA: Thank you, Madam Chair. The document C17/DT6 is a Consensus document. And when you reach a Consensus it means everyone has done compromise. So we should adopt it without again opening it. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Canada, you have the floor.

 >> CANADA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Very briefly, to associate ourselves with the interventions of Australia, Japan and the United States. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. I'm going to confer with the secretary for one minute.

Okay. Thank you. What I can gather from this discussion is that the drafting group under the able Chairmanship of Mr. Nasion agreed two principles based on the two contributions. Document 43 and ‑‑ sorry. And the Saudi Arabian document, document 92 and document 106 as well as the two decisions that were made by previous Councils 92 and 95. Based on that, the drafting group agreed to look at the numbers that the ITU were directly responsible for, UIFN and IIN.

And here is where I gather there is a departure in the conversation. Some members of that group walked away from with a Consensus with the understanding throughout the discussions that this new annual maintenance fee of 100 Swiss francs would not have an impact only on new members. That's my understanding based on this discussion because on this annual maintenance fee in both documents is new revenue.

I think that ‑‑ and is that where ‑‑ am I ‑‑ is this the general discussion of the group? Yep. Okay.

So if there are no objections I would propose the following, that the ADM Committee adopt DT6 with a statement in the summary record that this fee will not impact current sector members or members of the ITU. It will only impact nonmembers.

That is ‑‑ that will clarify the situation. And that would ‑‑ we are maintaining Consensus of the drafting group but we are also going to clarify in the summary record that this fee is only intended to impact nonmembers of the ITU. So I have Saudi Arabia asking for the floor.

 >> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. What you have just explained is a modification to document DT6. And we do not support this proposal because it does not reflect the Consensus we achieved in the drafting group Chaired by Mr. Jefferson. We held lengthy discussions to achieve the draft of this document which we now see and we think it is necessary to adopt this document without adding any additional paragraphs to the summary record of this session. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Brazil, you have the floor.

 >> BRAZIL: Thank you, Madam Chair. After listening to all the contributions and suggestions we think that maybe a way forward would be to maintain the document as we did after the Consensus we had in the Ad Hoc Group. As we listened many administrations made huge concessions so this agreement could be reached in the Ad Hoc Group. And I would like to reiterate this is a Council decision to be implemented starting from January 2018.

So my proposal would be to approve this document. And then during the year of 2018 we will have the impacts of this decision. And if we may find different positions from companies or even from ITU or other members we shouldn't revise the decision. It can be revised in the Council 2019.

We would have a better assessment of the impacts of this decision after its implementation and then we could have from the Secretariat a better perspective on the financial impacts that we have for ITU in case we decide to ‑‑ decide to revise it and we would also have an opportunity to get information from ‑‑ to have information from companies that will be impacted. And if this impact causes some burdens for their financial we will be advised from then. And then we can revise the decision.

That would be my proposal, Madam Chair, for the deliberation. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. Thank you, Brazil. UAE, you have the floor.

 >> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. We would like to support the very wise proposal presented by Mr. Jefferson about this topic. And we would like to see any amendments on the Consensus text that we have reached. If there are any reservations to be made, it could be done. But nothing is to be added to the document. We do not support an addition as you said, Madam, concerning a statement. We would like to support Mr. Jefferson. We think the proposal by Mr. Jefferson is very wise. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. I have Senegal asking for the floor.

 >> SENEGAL: Thank you, Madam Chair. We would like to thank Brazil for having chaired this Ad Hoc Group. I think this was a question which has, in fact, been brought up at various points over the past few years and now we have a Consensus document. I think we can adopt this document as it stands. And over the next few years see how this situation plays out. I think that as Brazil said it is a good idea. We think it is very wise. We don't think there is any need to have any notes or clarification to this document. And over the next few years we will see what happens with regard to this issue. Thank you, Madam Chair.

 >> CHAIR: Nigeria, you have the floor. Thank you, Senegal.

 >> NIGERIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Once we have Consensus normally you don't expect everyone to be happy. The issue is that we are all happy and equally unhappy. And so as a way forward which I want to propose for you as a Chair, is that you take the bull by the horns. And what I mean is the proposal made by Brazil is a straightforward proposal. And if there is any administrations that have reservation with respect to this particular Consensus document, the administration is free to include its own reservation in the minutes of this meeting. But where a Consensus is reached and we come here and open up debate on the way that we add or subtract, Madam Chair, I think you are not doing justice to what we mean by Consensus at this point in time.

Because a Consensus is an issue that administrations have made compromise. Every administration have given and have taken. So I want to suggest that as Chair of this meeting that you just rule and adopt this document and any administrations that have reservation could put forward its own reservation which could be included in the minutes of this meeting. Thank you, Madam Chair.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you.

 >> CHINA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I also like to thank the efforts made by the Ad Hoc Group. We support Saudi Arabia and UAE's comments. We don't want any additions to the DT6. We should adopt this document. We believe that we have already reached the Consensus at the Ad Hoc Working Group. Also based upon the comments from the Councillors it has also got the consent from most of the countries. So if there are any reservations it should be put in the minutes of the meeting. We should adopt this document without any amendments.

 >> CHAIR: Lithuania, you have the floor.

 >> LITHUANIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I will be brief. Lithuania supports your statement that we can adopt document DT6 with a note proposed by USA and supported by Australia, Japan and Canada. And we agree with the principle of cost recovery and we are against double taxation. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Sweden ‑‑ situate. Sorry. I'm sorry. Morocco, you have the floor.

 >> MOROCCO: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to ask the legal counsellor of the ITU what ‑‑ what the impact would be of the implementation of your new proposals. I would like to support the proposal made by Senegal. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Japan, you have the floor. And ‑‑

 >> JAPAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. So I think there is no Consensus. So I recognize we agree the principle is cost recovery in this Plenary. So I think there is no additional cost to members. So I support proposal of Madam Chair. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Tunisia, you have the floor.

 >> TUNISIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Very shortly, very briefly, I would like to support what has been presented by Mr. Jefferson. He gave us a very wise proposal. Thank you, Madam.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Kenya, you have the floor.

 >> KENYA: Thank you very much. Madam Chair, I have taken the floor with a lot of hesitation. Because for me this sounds like one of those classic cases where, you know, when you reopen a document that has been negotiated in several, several meetings, and a Consensus reached, the petals that we have to go through in opening, because we seem to meet the positions that were there made last week and as said by previous speakers, Madam Chair, when you negotiate you don't come out necessarily with what you set out to do. It is a give and take.

I would urge, Chair, that the Consensus document does provide for (inaudible) approach. And this decision will be reviewed in terms of its impact. We are hardly a year or so away as the Chair of the group, Mr. Jefferson, has ably said when we will abbreviate. So that in that regard let's ‑‑ let this Committee accept the work of the Ad Hoc Group, the Consensus work that has been agreed on as agreed and if there are Delegations and they are not few, I probably sympathize with those positions but for the fact that it is already a Consensus document in which a group whose deliberations I participated I would not want to have it open. And so my plea, Chair, is that we move on, accept it as is, if there are lessons to be learned from it, if there are reports to be drawn from it, we have time. The document itself recognizes that we have that opportunity and we take it in that regard. If there are Delegations with reservations, of course, those can be recorded in your minutes. Thank you very much.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Uganda, you have the floor.

 >> UGANDA: Thank you, Chair. I support what Kenya has said and I also recognize we have a way out in a way of looking at the impact when this is implemented. Madam Chair, we support what Kenya has said. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. France, you have the floor.

 >> FRANCE: Thank you, Madam Chair. And good morning, everyone. Our Delegation would like to align itself with other Delegations to express their support for the exemption of annual fees for members and associate members. We think this would be double taxation. We also would like to acknowledge document 43 submitted by the Secretariat. Therefore, Madam Chair, we would like to support your proposal of adding in to DT6 and a note about the impact of these fees on sector members of the ITU. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, France. Ghana, you have the floor.

 >> GHANA: Thank you, Madam Chair. From the beginning of this meeting we all assured you of supporting your authority. You Delegated your authority to Brazil to take us in to an Ad Hoc Group. And for meetings that were held with the various positions for which it came to the point of a certain text which is before you. At that meeting we had a conclusion with a clap with five minutes to spare to the close of the meeting. As much as I understand the ‑‑ the concerns of U.S., Japan, Australia and Lithuania who are present in the meeting on the consequence of how the test stands. I also want us to be guided from now and in the future, that we will really take on your authority and report with such ad hoc sessions so that when we are coming back to you it is really the Consensus as the Consensus and not to have that deviations as we could have resolved in five minutes, but we have taken almost an hour's time. With the full understanding of the debate on both sides and we don't have happiness as other countries may have said, I want us to respect your authority through the advice from the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group, that you take full consideration what has been reported and advised for us to proceed on this for now and in the future. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Ghana. I have the Russian Federation. Russia, you have the floor.

 >> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Madam Chair. We would like to support the proposal of the administration of Brazil to adopt the Consensus document and all of the comments reproduced separately. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Spain, you have the floor.

 >> SPAIN: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. We would like to thank Mr. Jefferson for his excellent work. Spain already indicated in the Council meeting in 2014 that we had a preference for there to be an exemption for sector members from these fees given that we believe that it is an incentive for sector members to continue to participate. And that it does have a benefit for the ITU's budget. However we can accept these two proposals in the interest of Consensus both as indicated by Mr. Jefferson and by you. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Now I will give the floor to Sweden. You have the floor.

 >> SWEDEN: Thank you, Madam Chair. As an observer with limited possibilities to participate in the debate but we would like to take this opportunity to make a few remarks at the debate. We are concerned about the proposal to add new additional cost for sector members for ‑‑ today is already included in the membership fee. We note that there are options for sector members that are not satisfied with the decisions. One option is to cancel members and therefore not paying the fee and the option is to cancel the membership in the ITU. This decision by sector members may have financial consequences for ITU and especially ITU‑T. Our question to the director of the TSB is therefore if there has been a complete analysis of the possible consequences of this what is called the double taxation by some of the previous speakers, and if the possible loss of income that this may result in for that T sector can be balanced by additional savings in the T sector to avoid a negative result. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Sweden. UK, you have the floor.

 >> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I wish to be associated with the reservation in the records proposed by the U.S., Japan, France and others about the application of annual charges to sector members. In particular I want to note that it is national administrations who authorize and issue IINs. It is not ITU. What ITU does is to register the number and maintain the register and the proposed cost for this is 100 Swiss francs per number. We do not agree a double charge for numbers as it can be assumed that national administrations would also raise a charge. So for that reason we do not support the proposal to make charges to sector members and associates. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. I have Belarus. You have the floor.

 >> BELARUS: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to thank the administration of Brazil who over the course of various meetings of the Ad Hoc Group managed to find a Consensus in the group amongst its participants with some concessions. But the path to this Consensus took six years. One of the main tasks of the Chair was to preserve the important achievements. Countries also noted that the countries that did not wish to align themselves with this document were accepted by Consensus with those which are in the most favorable position financially. We support this document DT6. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. And the last speaker on my list is Romania. And I am closing the list. Or if you would like to take the floor, please push your button now. Otherwise I am closing the list. Okay. I see no one else taking the floor. The last two, Poland ‑‑ Iran will be my last speaker. Romania, you have the floor.

 >> ROMANIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. First of all, we would like to thank Brazil for chairing the Ad Hoc Group. Romania is also concerned with double taxation. We think that the membership fee to the ITU should cover this issue also. And we would like to support the comment made by Sweden. Thank you, Madam Chair.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Poland. Thank you, Romania. Poland, you have the floor.

 >> POLAND: Thank you, Madam Chair. This is the sixth meeting of the Standing Committee on administration and management but I am having the floor for the first time. And I would like to take the advantage of the opportunity to congratulate you on your nomination of Chair of this Committee. You have done an excellent job so far, Madam. I will be very brief. We would like to support the opinion presented by the United States in the matter of INR fees. And we also share the ideas and concerns of our Distinguished Colleagues from the U.S., Australia, Japan, Lithuania, France and others. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Iran, you have the floor.

 >> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. May we seek a clarification from the legal advisor to the Secretary‑General to the text that if DT6 is approved and some member makes reservation, how the issue will be dealt with in regard to their reservation within the context of the reservation as contained in the constitution? Should be a simple statement that their views are recorded or whether they could say that the document or the issue will not be implemented in their regard because they have made reservation. Just to the very context of the reservation as contained in the constitution. We need this clarification. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. So I have had two requests for the legal advisor to weigh in. Mr. Arnaud, if you would take the floor, please and provide clarification?

 >> ARNAUD GUILLOT: Thank you, Madam Chair. Something of a poison chalice. I am going to try to clarify the situation a little. As regards the question from Morocco, I must say that I wasn't quite clear on what the background was to that. So if it could be ‑‑ well, if it would be possible for the Delegation of Morocco to kindly repeat their question, I think I can try and give a more specific response than I can at this stage. Now turning to the question which was raised by the Delegate from Iran, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the provisions on reservations and the Constitution and Convention are not applicable. When we are talking about reservations we are not talking about reservations to the decision. At this current stage the reservations formulated in the ADM Committee only have the scope as pertains to the ability of the Chair to include these reservations in the report of the ADM Committee.

In the absence of clear Consensus within the ADM Committee divergent views expressed by Councillors have to be included and specifically mentioned in the report of the Committee. That is the ADM Committee. At this stage in the proceedings therefore that is the only value that reservations voiced within your Committee can have.

I hope that my response is sufficiently clear in order to cast some light on your debate. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

 >> CHAIR: Morocco, would you like to clarify your question before I give the floor to the director of the TSB to address the other question? Morocco, you have the floor.

 >> MOROCCO: The members at the end of the day do not take decisions. Is this not a contradiction? That's what I wanted to ask as a question to the legal advisor. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Mr. Arnu, does that provide more clarity? Does that provide more clarity? Thank you.

 >> Mr. Arnu: Thank you, Madam Chair. If you will allow me, I will talk to the Councillor during the lunch breaks so as to further clarify the issue and provide a more specific response given the amount of time that you have left. Thank you, Madam Chair.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Director, do you have a question that was required, asked by ‑‑ you have the floor.

 >> CHAESUB LEE: Thank you, Madam Chairman. At this stage it is quite difficult to say what is the impact because this depends on your members' decision. If this decision is heavily the impact that the company, they might be considered withdraw this memberships, but in any case if we can go with this current status given this document, whether they are members or not, they have to pay. This is the fact. So they ‑‑ each country ‑‑ each company may be examined of what is relevant ‑‑ impact of their business. That is the first comment to you.

And with a look at this current status of this ‑‑ some companies, having of this ‑‑ heavy impact of this decision as my list as around 20 or 25 companies on my list that there might be heavy impact of this decision. That is my comment at this moment. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Director. Germany, you have the floor.

 >> GERMANY: Thank you, Madam Chair. With all ‑‑ I apologize for taking the floor again. Madam Chair, we have your classical situation. I already explained and was supported by many other colleagues what happened in the Ad Hoc Group. We reopened the discussion here in the Plenary and the conclusion is there is no Consensus. There is not only absence of Consensus, there is opposition with regard to the document coming out of the Ad Hoc Group. As a consequence, Madam Chair, we cannot take a decision because whatever decision we will take there will be opposition. That means that the provisions in place for these two numbers stay as they are and will not be amended as opposed ‑‑ as proposed by the Ad Hoc Group as the first thing. And the second thing is, of course, that the discussion on how to deal with INRs within a cost recovery system or any other system will have to continue, Madam Chair. I don't think that it is a wise idea to take a decision here which will be opposed either by the one half or the other half of the room. Thank you very much.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. We have ‑‑ it is 12:30 and it is now time for me to close this meeting. In the next two hours I will consult informally with the Chair. And I will come back to this ‑‑ to the ADM Committee at 2:30. Enjoy your lunch. Yes. So Mr. Ba would like to provide some information. Thank you.

 >> ALASSANE BA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just to inform you that Council Working Group on strategies and the financial plan will be meeting at 12:30 in room A. The Ad Hoc Group just created on SMEs will be meeting at 1:30 in G1 in the Varembe building. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Enjoy your lunch.

(Gavel)

(Session concluded at 12:33 p.m. CET)
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