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(Gavel)

>> CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. May I welcome you to Committee 5. I'm sorry that you should be hurried in here, because we were going to be meeting this afternoon. But we brought it forward and it meant that the meeting is now this morning, to be sure to have one.

As you know, at 2:30 there are elections for the Deputy Secretary-General. If that election is completed, then we will be electing the directors of the bureaus. So we were running the risk of not being able to meet as Committee 5 at all today. So as you can see, it was necessary to bring the meeting forward.

So this morning we're going to be talking about ITRs. You'll find in ADM/18 our agenda. Does anybody have any comments on this agenda, ADM/18? I have the impression no one has any comments. In that case, I declare document ADM/18 adopted.

So item 3. Resolution 146. Review of ITRs. We have several documents tabled for our consideration. They are proposals from various regions. I'll start with the first of these documents, which is one of the InterAmerican documents, and its document 34R1-A1/23.

So I would request the InterAmerican region to present this document.

Brazil has the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, everyone.

It's a pleasure, it's an honor for Brazil to present on behalf of CITEL, Member States, IAP 23 regarding revision of WCIT.

The aim of this proposal is to establish a future timeframe for the periodic review of the ITRs, and of acting upon Resolution 4 of WCIT 12. The proposal is that the revision, the reviews should be carried out every eight years, in order to assess the need to convene a WCIT to revise the ITRs.

Council and the three sectors of ITU should take the necessary actions and carry out studies in preparing for the future reviewing of the ITRs.

This is just an introduction, but I would like, Mr. Chairman, to pass through the basic modifications in this Resolution on behalf of CITEL.

Going back -- going directly to the "Resolves" parts of the proposal, on "resolves" 2, we express our interest of the review process of the ITRs, commencing in 2017, two years after they are entering into force, at Council and at the sector advisory groups, which will then establish the methodology and procedures for the review.

The "resolves" 3, "that consideration of the review of the ITRs be taken in 2020, eight years after the ITRs were adopted at the 2012 WCIT in Dubai."

"Resolves" 4, "that the review process be carried out within the existing budgetary resources of the Union," and this is very important to stress.

And then we go to the "Instructs the directors of the bureau" so that the bureaus could include in their agenda the discussions and discuss the further review of the ITRs.

"Instructs to the sector" as well, number 2, so that it can "present reports to the 2020 session of the Council with an assessment on the procedures for revision of the ITRs and on the need to convene a WCIT to update the ITRs."

We would like to instruct the Council at its 2020 session to discuss the results of the review process carried out by the sectors, and to prepare a report in order to enable the next Plenipotentiary Conference in 2022 to decide whether WCIT is to be convened to update the ITRs or not.

And then we invite the Member States to contribute to the future review of the ITRs.

Mr. Chairman, we think that these are the main concerns that we have. We think that the ITRs should only be revised on an as needed basis, that's very important, so that the Council and the sectors made a very thorough assessment on the revision, on the necessity on the revision of the ITRs.

Our region would appreciate the ideas that are coming from other regions, and we look forward to working with the regions in this regard.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN: I thank the delegate of Brazil for presenting the CITEL document.

And I go now to the next document, which is from the Africa region. This is 69A1/9. Could I ask a representative of the Africa region to present this text?

Perhaps the Africa region isn't -- oh, Nigeria, you have the floor, Nigeria.

>> NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Actually, it's not Nigeria that is supposed to present this particular document. I think the change in the timing of this meeting might have resulted in the actual person to present this report to be absent here. But, however, for our document to be taken on board, I want to try to present this document which has to do with review of the International Telecommunication Regulation, and this has to do with review of Resolution 146 of Antalya 2006.

The document is as presented and you can see the various portions that Africa believes needs to be modified. I will not take much of your time. I believe delegates must have gone through this document.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN: I thank the delegate of Nigeria for having taken the floor on behalf of the Africa region.

I now move on to the next document, which is RCC/73A1/20. Kazakhstan, you have the floor to present it.

>> KAZAKHSTAN: The RCC region regularly reviews the Regulations at least once a year -- once every eight years. But having an interval of that long would be more efficient in terms of changes in Regulations and also for financial reasons, too.

In other words, after every other Plenipotentiary.

Also, we would suggest changes to 146 to have regular reviews, once every eight years, and also to have the next conference in 2020. The RCC administration would like these suggestions to be passed to the sectors and to the Secretary-General, so that they could organize this process.

And our next request would be to delete 171, because the work under that Resolution has already been completed.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: I thank the delegate of Kazakhstan for that presentation.

I now call upon the Arab States. This is 79A2/8. UAE, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, sir. Good morning to everybody.

Mr. Chairman, I have the honor on behalf of the Arab Group to present document 79 addendum 2/8. This is Resolution 146, about the ITRs. The Arab countries have proposed amendments to 146 given that the International telecommunications environment is evolving so fast, technically, politically and organizationally speaking, and the nature of these changes is rapid in itself, which requires reviewing the International Telecommunication Regulations on a regular basis. And for this reason, the Arab Group would propose amending -- reviewing the International Telecommunication Regulations regularly every eight years before the Plenipotentiary Conference. There would be a preparatory session which would establish the agenda for the world conference to follow.

Mr. Chairman, the text of this proposal firstly says that there should be a periodical review. The review should be carried out periodically.

Secondly, that ITU-T should act as the focal point for WCITs.

Thirdly, that the WCIT should be convened every eight years, starting from the WCIT which was held in Dubai in 2012.

Fourthly, "Resolves" that the ITU shall convene a CPP in preparation for the WCIT in 2017 to discuss the agenda of WCIT 20.

And the results of the CPP be submitted to the next Plenipotentiary Conference in 2018 for adoption.

Then fifthly, "Resolves" that the ITU in collaboration with the six principal regional organizations and within available financial resources shall organize six regional preparatory meetings, one for each region, to prepare for WCITs.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, we have another item and this is to study the need to hold these meetings. We don't want to find, as in the past, that there is a time lag in terms of taking decisions. If you look at past practice, there was a meeting in Melbourne and then there were 24 years between that Melbourne meeting and the next one. The ITRs weren't in any way amended for 24 years. So our fear is that if we adopt a text which requires us to hold conferences, we may find ourselves in the same problem as we found ourselves in in the past.

Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you to the United Arab Emirates for presenting this text.

So may I call your attention to document 43 as well. 43 is simply an information document. I think you probably all know it. It's Resolution 4. This is about the periodical review of the ITRs. I just wanted to draw your attention to the fact that this document exists. 43.

So now we have had the presentation of all the texts for this Resolution on review of ITRs. So I now open the discussion.

Russian Federation, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, sir. And good morning distinguished colleagues.

As you know, the Russian Federation also supports this RCC proposal, joint proposal, and we would like to offer an explanation of what the proposal is based on.

As several of the speakers have already said as they introduced their texts, telecommunications is developing at a breakneck speed. On the one hand, when we talk about International Regulation, we note that the rules and regulations must be stable. On the other hand, it is very important that that stability shouldn't mutate into stagnation, which is what happened with the previous version of the ITRs, which had to wait 24 years to be reviewed after the day that it was adopted. During a period when the situation for telecommunications changed completely in the world, over that period most state-owned operators became private companies and so many other huge changes that I won't even mention took place.

So you will probably find much that is common in all the texts that have been proposed. There is something of a difference in the different periodicities proposed for the review of the International Telecommunication Regulations, and we fully agree with what was said by the United Arab Emirates reflecting view of the Arab countries, and by several other regional organizations, too, who all said that we need regular reviews of the International Telecommunication Regulations once every eight years. And we would wish this Plenipotentiary to recommend that the next conference to review the ITRs should be in 2020.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: I thank the delegate of the Russian Federation.

Denmark has the floor and then Australia.

>> DENMARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to all colleagues.

Denmark would like to start off by thanking colleagues from other regions for the very good introductions to proposals made on this important issue.

This morning I would like to share the CPT position. As you note, the CPT has not made a formal proposal to revise the Resolution 146. But I would like to share with you our position, our views from the CPT side, as agreed, in terms of the ITR review.

I will read them out.

The CPTs have the view that since the ITRs will not enter into force until the first of January 2015, it is premature for this Plenipotentiary to determine the need for a revision of the ITRs.

We are also of the view that the ITRs should only be revised on a needs basis.

At this point, there has been no systematic assessment of any possible problems on the coexistence of the 1988 ITRs and the 2012 ITRs. The functioning of these two control systems should be reviewed when sufficient time has been allowed to pass, to adequately assess any potential consequences. So a review to assess the need to convene a WCIT to update the ITRs should be carried out not more often than every eight years.

Furthermore, the CPT notes that recurring world conferences, such as the World Conference on International Telecommunications, will have significant budgetary implications for the ITU. From the CPT side, we're happy to work with colleagues on these proposals and engage in the discussions.

And that's all. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Denmark.

Now Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Australia is certainly aware that a significant amount of time has passed since the 1988 ITRs were adopted, up until the 2012 ITRs were adopted. And we certainly understand the desire of some countries to regularly review the ITRs in light of that timeframe.

However, Australia does also note that it has only been two years since the WCIT 12 was held and the revised ITRs have not yet entered into force. We do consider that at the present time we have had insufficient amount of time to fully understand the outcomes of WCIT 12 and to make a fully informed decision about whether they should be reviewed.

On a separate but related note, Australia is also concerned about the financial implications of the ITU of a periodic scheduling of WCIT. There are currently eight of the largest conferences in the eight year period and the ITU has restrictions in its budget. To add a ninth conference of this magnitude every eight years may require additional sources of funding or to sacrifice other work that the ITU is currently undertaking. So we would consider delegates to consider that when we are discussing this issue.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN: I thank Australia.

Argentina you have the floor.

>> ARGENTINA: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. Did you give the floor to Canada or to Argentina?

We don't have...

>> CHAIRMAN: Could I ask the interpreters to make sure their mics are on?

>> INTERPRETER: The interpreters think it was the Chairman's microphone that wasn't switched on. But everything is fine now.

>> CHAIRMAN: I give the floor to Argentina. Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a technical issue. When you give the floor to Argentina, it's asking Canada to speak. We would be glad to do so, but I believe Argentina is able to talk.

>> CHAIRMAN: I'm so sorry. Is it Argentina or Canada who is asking for the floor? It's the system which is leading us astray. On my screen it says Argentina is asking for the floor. My colleague from Argentina is saying it's not them asking for the floor. So I guess it's Canada. So let's ask Canada, masquerading as Argentina. There is clearly a microphone mix up.

So Canada, you have the floor. And I'll ask the technicians if they could debug the system.

Thank you, Canada. So if I give the floor to Argentina -- I know it's Canada which will take the floor.

>> CANADA: There we are. I'm so sorry about the technical hitches.

Finally, I would like to also thank our colleagues from Argentina. Hopefully we will resolve the technical issues. As much as we would like to speak on behalf of Argentina, I think we will do so only on behalf of Canada.

Quickly, Mr. Chairman, having listened to the previous interventions and in particular to the InterAmerican Proposal that came from CITEL, there is an issue that I believe we all have to carefully evaluate, which basically stems from the distinction between a review and a revision. The ITRs have not yet entered into force. They will enter into force January 1, 2015. So there is no way in which we could right now evaluate what has been the result of the revised ITRs that came out of the WCIT in Dubai.

Consequently, Mr. Chairman, Canada fully supports the spirit and the text of the InterAmerican Proposal, and we believe that Council and the three sectors are better placed after 2017 to decide how and if we move forward in the process of reviewing the ITRs for their further revision if necessary.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN: I thank Canada.

Now I have the United Arab Emirates and then the United States of America. UAE, you have the floor.

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

I would like to make different comments concerning what has been said by the previous speakers, but in fact I'll leave it for the next discussion. But I do have one comment concerning the document prepared by the Arab Group and I would like to indicate that in that document 79/4/7, Resolution 171 is proposed to be eliminated for 2012. And then I would have other comments that I would like to make later.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, delegate of the United Arab Emirates. And concerning item 4, we would deal with that later.

The United States of America has the floor now, and after that, Russia.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to all colleagues here today. I wanted to speak in support of the CITEL IAP and also to make a few comments about some of the interventions that have been made on this topic.

We have heard from many speakers today that we are all living in an environment where the ICT Sector is changing rapidly. All we need to do is walk across the street to the trade show to see that that is absolutely true.

But that is exactly why we should not try to keep pace with the industry in the ITRs. The ITRs are and should be a high level instrument that does not try to provide a detailed regulatory structure for the Telecom Sector. There is simply no way that with an International Treaty we could have Regulations that keep pace with this fast moving Sector.

And that's okay. We don't need a detailed International regulatory Treaty for this Sector. The ITRs are not like the Radio Regulations, where it is absolutely necessary to regularly update the Treaty.

The United States does agree, though, that it is very important that we continue to review the Treaty to make sure that no updating is necessary, to ensure that those high level principles are -- continue to be relevant and consistent with where the industry is, and that is why we support the CITEL proposal to have a regular review of the ITRs.

With respect to the proposal to adopt a CPM-like structure for review of the ITRs, in advance of the WCIT, we are concerned that this sort of structure would end up being too prescriptive for the Treaty at hand. Again, we are not talking about a Treaty like the Radio Regulations, where there are several volumes. We're talking about a very small Treaty that is high level. And by having a conference preparatory structure, it would put too much structure around the preparatory process, and we are concerned it would actually change the nature of the Treaty itself by making it more prescriptive for Member States' markets.

Having been said, I hear a lot of commonality among the proposals in this room this morning. There seems to be general agreement that we should not let so much time pass again before we take a look at this Treaty. And I think that's a very good place to start and I think that we can all work together to move forward on revising this Resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you to the delegate of the United States.

Russian Federation has the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, sir.

I would like to note that we agree with the whole series of the points made by the United States of America. And as I understand it, in our proposal and in the proposal of other groups, there is no suggestion that we try to go into the detail and try and prepare Regulations like the Radio Regulations. I think we fully agree that we don't need to be doing that.

At the same time, however, I'd like to note another issue which hasn't been raised in any of these texts, but I think we need to mention it openly here. As we are all aware, many countries never signed the final act in Dubai in 2012. And since then, the last couple years, a very good spirit of compromise has emerged in taking decisions in various ITU fora, be they Government forums or be they multistakeholder platforms. And for that reason, as we see it, holding a conference in 2020 would be possible without any very important changes to the International Telecommunication Regulations. And if we do this, it would allow those countries which haven't signed the final act in Dubai to sign a new version of the final act. And that would mean that their legal dilemmas, the legal dilemma facing many of the countries, would be settled. And the earlier we do this, the better for the ITU, which of course is particularly important for the whole world community.

As I see it, this, too, needs to be taken into account as we decide things here, as we take decisions here.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIRMAN: I thank the Russian Federation.

United Arab Emirates has the floor.

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

Concerning the preparatory platform for conferences regarding ITRs, we think that the concerns of the USA administration are perfectly understandable. However, it is important that we not necessarily get into details concerning the ITRs because the purpose is to approve the Conference agenda, always remembering that previously it has been difficult to fully examine how such a conference was organized, and that there in fact should be a special Council group perhaps responsible for conference preparations for such an International conference. Therefore, everything that has to be taken into account can be dealt with adequately.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you for what you have added now to your presentation.

So for the moment, what we have done is we have listened to different perspectives concerning this item. Everybody does want to review this Resolution, that is the great majority, but the issue is regarding the periodicity. When should this revision of ITRs take place? And concerning that, there are different opinions.

Also what has been discussed are the preparations necessary for the Conference for WCIT, and there have been observations concerning the possible financial consequences of such preparations. I think that sums up the different important elements of the comments just made.

What I would like to say for the moment is that perhaps the groups or a specific group should be created in order to be able to have a common approach. It is important to find a solution that would express the various opinions. I think there is good will to do that, and as has been indicated, we shouldn't wait 24 years to revise, to go over the Regulations. We should have a system that is appropriate.

And some have indicated that it has been difficult to keep up with the ICT innovations. And therefore in the documents of different regions submitted we have -- it is indicated that we need to do something. And I would suggest, therefore, that there should be a small group -- and I would suggest as Chair of the group our colleague from Cameroon, Mr. Zourmba, who has Chaired the Council to date.

He could perhaps then Chair this group, which could meet in order to have a revised Resolution 146 based on the different submissions made.

And we should have a first report from this group by Tuesday. They could already start meeting tomorrow during the day, because as we have decided it could be indicated in our schedules that there would be such a meeting.

United Arab Emirates, you have asked for the floor?

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chair.

We fully support your proposal, Mr. Aboubakar Zourmba has been able to lead the meetings of the Council. We know him well and we trust that he will be able to make our efforts be successful.

There are specialized groups, in particular in Committee 5, and we should avoid any overlap between the different groups that meet.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, delegate of UAE. I am in total agreement, because it is correct that we should not have overlapping meetings in Committee 5. And I would suggest that we be able to rest adequately for next week, and therefore that we shouldn't work on Sunday. Perhaps what I would say is that this small group, this small Working Group, could perhaps then make a presentation on Wednesday. So they wouldn't have to meet tomorrow, because tomorrow we are probably already going to have two groups of Committee 5 that are going to be meeting. And then if they could perhaps make a report on Wednesday, they could avoid meeting tomorrow.

Is that agreeable to everybody? Thank you very much. Thank you for your cooperation. Thanks to all. And good luck in finding a solution and to everybody in this group who will participate in it.

I suggest that we move on to the next item, which is item 4, already mentioned by our colleague from the Emirates. Resolution 171. We have document 78 A1/21. And then 79A4/7. Before giving you the floor, and probably to the Emirates, Nigeria has asked for the floor. Therefore, I'll give it to you right now.

Thank you.

>> NIGERIA: Thank you for the floor at this point in time. I just wanted to take us back to yesterday's decision of this Committee, which was not conclusive. Mr. Chairman, I'm aware that we agreed to set up a drafting group yesterday, and the issue of the Chairmanship of the drafting group was not resolved. I expected that at the end of the meeting you as the Chair were supposed to call the regional representatives and all parties involved to agree on the Chairmanship so that the group could go ahead and commence work. But up to now I'm not aware of any Resolution made in order to get a substantive Chairman for this Working Group.

I might be corrected, maybe an agreement has been reached with respect to who is going to Chair the group. And if that is not the case, Mr. Chairman, I think it's better that issue be resolved so that we know who the Chairman is and then so that the group can go into operation immediately so that we do not have any problems at the end of the day.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, delegate of Nigeria. I have not forgotten that item. We will deal with that this morning before we complete our meeting.

So as indicated, I would like now to move on to item 4, and I give the floor to the Emirates.

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

In the name of the Arab Group, it is my pleasure to submit this proposal to suppress the Resolution, given that we have already implemented it and dealt with the issue of International meetings and conferences.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. We take due note of your proposal that we suppress Resolution 171 from Guadalajara.

And I would now like to give the floor to Kazakhstan, who will I think present document 73.

>> KAZAKHSTAN: Thank you, sir.

The RCC administration also proposes that we suppress Resolution 171 because it has been implemented.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: So according to what I see in the document, you are in agreement concerning the suppression of this Resolution 171.

Are there any objections?

Kazakhstan, you have the floor.

>> KAZAKHSTAN: As I said, we propose that we suppress Resolution 171 as implemented.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Nobody seems to be asking for the floor. Therefore, we can proceed with the suppression of Resolution 171. Thank you.

Now, I would like to move on to item 5. It's a proposal for a draft new Resolution and it's being made by Colombia, so I would like to give the floor to Colombia, document 87/1. You have the floor, Colombia.

>> COLOMBIA: I would like to take advantage of the fact that it's the first time I take the floor in this room to express our pleasure at the fact that you have been elected as Chair.

Now, moving on to document 87 that is presented by Colombia, essentially the reason that we have submitted it is that we need to have the adequate technical means to be able to bring into operation broadband. And we have a very diverse geographical situation in Colombia and therefore we need to resort to a satellite system.

For 20 years already, in a permanent fashion, we have tried to have a satellite system in order to be able to proceed with economic development, and there have been more recent activities carried out by the Government in agreement with International norms. We have done what is necessary in order to be able to exploit 70.9 West and 131 West orbital positions. And we have tried to acquire a satellite. This was achieved. In order to have connectivity, we also used installation of national fibre optic network and broadband. However, despite having this national network, because of our geographic location, there are certain areas that don't have connectivity. And the solution continues to be only possible via satellite.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, via you, we would like to submit to this conference a request that a study be made in order to be able to have a satellite system SATCOL at orbital positions 79.9 West, 38 West and 131 West so that in the Conference 2016 measures could be approved in order to authorize the Colombian Government to utilize these satellite orbits.

We also want to request that this decision at the Plenipot be transmitted so that there be no difficulty between now and when the Conference makes a decision. This is something that I would like to submit via you, Mr. Chair, and I submit it to the consideration of all present in this room. We hope that the response is going to be positive.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

United States, I give you the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have been discussing this Resolution with Colombia since we arrived here in the beautiful City of Busan. And we have been looking with great interest at things that happened in past Plenipots. And we don't really think that a Resolution is necessary for this. It's traditional to take requests for actions on satellite locations and procedures to the World Radio Communications Conference, and there is one that will be convened next year in 2015.

We think given what happened in the past, that a way to handle this would be for you, Mr. Chairman, to put some text in your report to the plenary so that this issue could be contained in the minutes of the plenary.

Colombia does face a very real problem in that one of these three satellites expires in December of this year. And certainly when you're trying to procure satellites, it's not a good thing to have your assignment expire. So we would hopefully be able to recommend to the Radio Communications Bureau that they take the right action -- or the appropriate action so that this orbital location won't expire until Colombia is able to take its issue to the World Radio Communications Conference, where all the satellite experts will be gathered next year.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Madam delegate of the United States, for your proposal, which I think is very wise.

perhaps we shouldn't have a Resolution but rather we are going to -- I will make reference in my report to what Colombia has indicated, so that in the Radio Communications Bureau it can be taken into account for the Conference.

Sweden has asked for the floor.

>> SWEDEN: I think that was a technical error with the microphone. It's now switched on to red.

We also note that this is a sensitive problem for Colombia and we understand that maybe they need to take certain actions regarding the -- one of the satellites that will expire before the 2015 conference, one of the filings.

As indicated by the United States, where the BR may take positions to instruct the Radio Communications Bureau, it would be good to get instructions from the RRB from this meeting to explain the procedures that were taken in the past in order to ensure that we do follow the existing principles. We do not think that the Plenipotentiary Conference should take a decision on the issue as such. But there are procedures and it would be useful if the RRB could explain the procedures as have been applied and we could take the same action this time.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Iran has asked for the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Chairman, thank you. Good morning to all of you.

Just a bit of experience that we gained. In 2006, when I chaired Committee 5, we had not identical but similar issues, as mentioned by colleagues. But the exact date was 2006, Antalya. And there were some course of actions taken.

The point made by Colombia is a legitimate point. It's very important. Colombia is a developing country and faces problems, difficulties that many other Developing Countries may face.

Nevertheless, in that 2006 conference there was some course of action taken by the Chairman of Committee 5 at that time, consulting the BR and the RRB when drafting the text to come back to Committee 5 and the plenary. Perhaps, if you wish, you may consult those documents that may guide you to a better text and course of action to respond to, on the one hand, the legitimate right of Colombia and on the other hand to keep the calls of action taken in line with the previous Plenipotentiary Conference that will help you.

Thank you

>> CHAIRMAN: I gave the floor to the Radio Communications Bureau for clarification. Would they like to take the floor?

>> RADIO REGULATION BOARD: In our capacity as adviser, according to 141 A of the Convention, I just advise that we have cases, like Vietnam, WRC decided due to delay of the corpus, that the case come to RRB. And in the case of the RRB, they are authorized to post -- to extend the filings of the Vietnam.

But as in this case, when I see three filings, two of them will expire in 2016, so the administration of Colombia, they have a right to bring it to the WRC 15 for those two filings. But for the filing of 70.9 west, I believe finish by the end of this year, that filing expires, but there are provisions set up by WRC 12. One was a delay due to the launch. The other one was a force majeure. So RRB has the authority to look at force majeure. In the case of force majeure, we can bring the matter to the board. And if there is a case, RRB has authorization to instruct BR to extend the deadline.

Saying that, another way is the way proposed by some administrations to bring the text for that slot to the plenary. But again, RRB will look at the case. There is no direct instruction. We have to look at the impact on other networks based on first come, first served, what will be the networks that will be affected as a result of that decision.

So at this stage, this is RRB's thinking.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: I thank the RRB. We have taken note of that information.

Cameroon, I have -- Eritrea, you have the floor.

>> SPAIN: Thank you, Chairman. This is Spain. And I think that the microphone is not well located.

But we simply wanted to take the floor to say that we are in agreement with the proposal that was initially made by the United States. As indicated by the ITU Secretariat concerning this satellite network, it would be SATCOL only.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Cameroon.

>> CAMEROON: Thank you, sir. Mr. Chairman, may I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your election to lead the work of this very important Committee 5.

If Colombia tabled this at the Plenipotentiary, I would assume that Colombia is taking into account the work of the RRB and the procedures involved, and the time scale is not being respected for this developing country. So perhaps the suggestion of Iran that we refer to a case which has already taken place, that that could be of help to Colombia.

Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIRMAN: Egypt has the floor.

Iran, would you like the floor?

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: In the light of what has been heard, first the right of Colombia to bring this issue to the highest organization of the Union, and the right to look into the past, perhaps I suggest that you task the Director of the RRB and with the two advisory capacity members here and direct consultations and agreement of the Delegation of Colombia to look into the issue of the past and prepare the text and bring it back to Committee 5. I think that was the past practice.

In the meantime, WRC 2012 made another possibility as the distinguished RRB member mentioned. Take all of them into account but do it in a systematic way. And they all three sit down together and prepare something. This is what has been done in 2006. That might help you, Chairman, unless you want to continue discussion at this meeting.

>> CHAIRMAN: I thank the delegate of Iran. No, I don't want to drag out the discussion. I think that is an elegant way of resolving this issue, that we prepare a text to pass this dossier to RRB and then we could present the text to the Committee.

Colombia, you have the floor.

>> COLOMBIA: Thank you, Chairman. I would like to thank all the administrations for their comments. And also to thank the RRB.

If you would allow me to do so, I, as indicated by or suggested by the Distinguished Delegate of Iran, I would like to perhaps have a meeting with RRB and others in order to be able to have or produce an adequate text and respond therefore to everything that has been suggested.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your good will concerning this item. We will therefore do as indicated and the delegate of Colombia will consult with the RRB and the Secretariat to submit then a text to our Committee. It has been decided and we will return to this item next week.

Now, if you would allow it, I would like to return to something that is very dear to you all, which has to do with Chairing this group concerning light tracking.

On my screen just now I had requests for the floor from Iran and Germany. Would Germany like to speak? I give the floor to Germany. You have the floor.

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

Mr. Chairman, representatives from different regions have been discussing the issue of Chairing the subgroup on the light tracking issue until the last second, the beginning of this meeting, and this gives us an indication how complicated the issue itself was.

I think that we could conclude, and I'm aware that it's not an easy task to do, but due to your wise guidance you have given to us in order to fulfill the work, in order to accomplish the work, I'm delighted and I'm appreciated to announce my name as a delegate from the German Delegation as the Chairman of this sub Working Group.

With regard on this, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask you whether you could mention in which timeframe we have to conclude this work, and which kind of report do you expect for us? Because we are still in favor to develop a Resolution which is tasking WRC to take the issue into consideration.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIRMAN: I thank the delegate of Germany. So following on from consultations which I know weren't easy ones for that proposal, I hope that everybody agrees with this Chairmanship.

I don't see anyone opposed. I know the delegate of Iran asked for the floor, but I'll give Iran the floor later.

I think it would be a good thing if we could all agree on that Chairmanship, so that the work can go forward smoothly and confidently. Again, I say I know it wasn't easy and it won't be easy. But I hope that the group will achieve results.

So I don't see anyone against that proposal to have the delegate of Germany.

Nigeria, are you asking for the floor? Nigeria?

>> NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Africa is not objecting to this proposal. However, I wanted to be on record that if similar consultations are going on, all regions should be carried on board. I'm not aware that Africa was consulted in this particular proposal. Because if Africa was contacted, Africa would have equally made its own input to this proposal.

I just want this meeting to take note that if similar coordinations are being carried out, all regions should be carried on board and no region should be side lined. Because in the future, if such a thing is done, the region that is sidelined might cause some difficulties in achieving results at the end of the day.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN: I thank the delegate of Nigeria. Absolutely I wouldn't want a region or a country to be left sitting on the sidelines. It certainly wouldn't be in the spirit of our work. So perhaps it's because we were moving so fast that Africa wasn't consulted as it should have been. But I don't see any opposition to the nomination which we announced, so I'm very grateful. So that group will be presided over by our colleague from Germany. We expect them to bring us back a first report on their work on Tuesday, that they will meet tomorrow, and the details will be communicated to you by the Secretariat. It is so decided, and thank you all for your cooperation.

So you will have the details as soon as possible from the Secretariat about which room it will be in and so on. I invite all the regions to be represented in the group, because of the subject being a sensitive one. And we don't want, as the colleague from Nigeria was saying, for anybody to be left by the side of the road.

So we have another quarter of an hour. I think perhaps we could tackle another subject. Let's move on to item 6. We have a proposal, proposed amendments to the duties of the Deputy Secretary-General. We have proposals from Argentina, Brazil, Canada and Uruguay, altogether.

And then there is another proposal from the Asia Pacific region. So I would like to give the floor to one of the countries proposing document 29/1 and 29/2.

Iran, are you asking for the floor?

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yes, Chairman, on the previous subjects. Because tomorrow we have a group dealing with a stable Constitution, we have a group dealing with Resolution 130. And if you have another group at the same time, it will be very difficult for us. Therefore, we request the Secretariat to kindly organize the timing. It should not be simultaneous with these two groups. We already have a major problem for that. But I have no difficulty with the Chairmanship of Germany and I fully agree with you and the Chairman's decision. We most welcome them. And it's just a timing matter.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: So as I was saying, there won't be a group. The Secretariat was listening. There won't be a group working in parallel with Committee 5. We want everybody to be able to be represented there, which is essential. So your request has been heard.

Now, I will go back, if I may, to item 6. So which country will be presenting this text? I'm so sorry. My screen is saying "empty seat." "Empty seat" is asking for the floor. I don't know who that is.

So which country -- perhaps you could just raise your yellow label. It's Argentina. Argentina. So it's not Canada. Argentina. So Argentina, you have the floor.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I simply wanted to inform of the fact that this document and the one that follows it are multicountry proposals, Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, others, too, simply because this deals with the reform to the Constitution. And there has to be a given time period for making these proposals. Both of them are within the documents 20 and 21, by the Americas region, and specifically by CITEL.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The other proposal is from the Asia Pacific region. From the same region, 29/2. Brazil has the floor. You have the floor, Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Yes, it's a CITEL proposal. This is on the duties and functions of the Deputy Secretary-General, as mentioned by the colleague from Argentina. After the initial term, the term that we needed to provide amendments to the Constitution, then we could find more countries to support this proposal. So we turned it into an InterAmerican Proposal.

Let me explain the rationale. The duties and responsibilities of the elected officials are provided, as we all know, in Article 11 of the Constitution and Article 5 of the Convention for the Secretary-General. And Article 12 for the Director of the Radio Communication Bureau. The Convention Article 18 for the Director of BDT. And Convention Article 15 for the TSB.

The functions of the Deputy Secretary-General, although, are only specified in terms of acting on behalf of the Secretary-General in his absence. With the exception of a general description of this in Resolution 148, there is no specific reference of the management responsibilities of the Deputy Secretary-General, with the exception of a note that the Secretary-General should partially delegate management functions of the unit to his deputy.

It's resolved as well that in the interests of greater transparency and efficiency in the management of the Union, the tasks of the Deputy Secretary-General, consistent with the basic instruments, should be set out in order to create clear operational and management responsibilities.

So it's proposed that the duties and functions of the Deputy Secretary-General be outlined in general terms as they pertain to the management on the side of the General-Secretariat. The specific amendments to the Article 11 of the Constitution, and Article 5 of the Convention, we proposed to ensure that the duties of all elected officials are really effectively outlined in the basic instruments.

As you can see in our proposal, the text as follows reads: The Deputy Secretary-General shall provide effective management oversight over the functions and operations of the General Secretariat, providing advice and recommendations to the Secretary-General and the Coordination Committee on effective and efficient use of ITU resources. That would be the modification for Article 11 of the Constitution.

And with regard to the Convention, Article 5, we would add 2A, basically the same text. It's exactly the same text.

But, Mr. Chairman, based on the discussion held in our first session and the understanding that there is a spirit in this conference of not changing the Constitution and Convention unless extremely necessary, and only where the people cannot find an appropriate place, we request that the core elements of this proposal be embedded in Resolution 148 if this plenary agrees.

So thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN: So I open the discussion on these proposals. The tasks of the Secretary-General, the General-Secretariat. I think this is probably a recurrent problem: Do we revise or not revise the basic text during this Plenipotentiary?

Iran, you have the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I speak on behalf of APT, but not Iran.

Distinguished Colleagues recall the presentation of document 67 in which due to the intensive discussions that we have had or are having now in relation to the stability of the Constitution and Convention, the APT proposed that if there is such a need, we should try to avoid to modify the Constitution and Convention unless it is absolutely necessary and there is no other ways to do that.

We are grateful to the Distinguished Delegation of Brazil with their very humble proposals that they kindly agree, at least as far as I have heard, that such a proposal would not end up to modify any provision of the Constitution and Convention. However, it could be properly reflected in Resolution 148, which is quite a good proposal.

And therefore, Chairman, in our view, APT, not the Iran view, APT view, any such proposals for amending the Constitution and Convention we have to answer two questions. Do we need the changes? Number one. Question two, and when do we know that we need the changes?

Fortunately, Brazil has given us good guidance. Therefore, we propose modification of Resolution 148. In that case, perhaps we should engage in some discussion in one way or another to see how we could import the proposals of Brazil in that Resolution, which seems to be very reasonable, from the course of action point of view.

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you to the delegate of Iran.

I have the Russian Federation and then Uganda. Russian Federation you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, sir. And thank you for these interesting proposals which we have had tabled.

The Telecommunications Administration of Russia considers that these proposals give the Deputy Secretary-General a certain amount of autonomy on the one hand. On the other hand, the main tasks of the Deputy Secretary-General must be decided by the Secretary-General, depending on the situation.

In 84/5 of the Convention and Resolution 148, it says that the Secretary General can pass the management of some of these resources to the Bureau Directors and the Deputy Secretary-General after consultation with the Coordination committee. We all understand that these resources refer to the ITU's resources. In this way, the powers of the Secretary-General are already fully defined.

We consider that the proposed changes to some degree do limit the powers both of the Secretary-General and of his or her deputy, and as a result this may lead to a lack of balance and a lack of flexibility for the management and the leadership of the Union.

Therefore, it certainly would be a good idea for us all to put our heads together once again and decide is it worth making changes to the Constitution, especially with the issue of its stability still under discussion.

But before we make changes to Resolution 148, either, we need to see an actual text and be able to study it carefully and analyze that text, and decide is it a sensible approach?

Thank you very much, sir.

>> CHAIRMAN: I thank the Russian Federation and I give the floor to Uganda.

>> UGANDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I'd also like to thank the colleagues from Brazil for this submission. I think possibly most of my concerns have been expressed by the previous speakers from Russia and from Iran.

One of my current concerns would be the use of the term "Assist" in terms of what would this consist of, in terms of -- as pointed out by Brazil. It is important for us to not relegate the Deputy Secretary-General to only be active or to perform tasks when the Secretary-General is around.

However, in terms of being able to clearly define this, we would need to use appropriate terms, and I would have some concerns about using the term "Assist." And in terms of, as already has been discussed in terms of whether we should modify the Convention and the Constitution or look at Resolution 148, I think I would support the proposals both by Brazil and Iran that we should first consider whether this is absolutely necessary or it's just an option or an alternative way to achieve the same.

I hope the changes reduce the reference to this office only being held by a "he" and look at a more neutral language that doesn't put out the "He" or "She."

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Uganda.

China has the floor.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We support the intervention of Uganda and Russia. We think it's not necessary to make amendments to the Constitution 77 and Convention 105, because we are thinking the basic documents know the assignments and delegation of powers are very clear to mention the balance of the management and resource.

Secondly, we want to reiterate the APT common ground of making amendments to the Constitution and Convention, those amendments should only be made when it's absolutely necessary, based on the above mentioned two points. We want to make our stand very clear.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDIA ARABIA: (No English translation)

After studying this proposal, I can't help wondering the following: What is the use of adding the wording proposed to the Convention? What is the use of adding this wording to the Convention?

Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Taking into account the points which have been made, and I think Brazil, too, made proposals, I would ask Brazil whether it would be possible, taking into account what has been said, for you to offer a draft Resolution, I think it's 148, and ask you to present it in order to avoid changing the Convention and the Constitution, and then we would have a text before us, a written text. And then we could decide would we change it, adapt it or adopt it. So could I ask Brazil to offer a text of a draft Resolution?

Brazil, you have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Of course Brazil can try to find a solution based on Resolution 148. And we would be willing to work with the colleagues from Uganda, China, Saudi Arabia, Russia and others that are willing to participate in this exercise with me.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So I leave you to come back to us at the beginning of next week with a Resolution.

Now it's time for us to adjourn. So we have dealt with item 6 today. And I'll give the floor to the Secretariat, which has some information. Antoine, you have the floor.

>> SECRETARIAT: Yes. Thank you, sir. I just wanted to make three announcements. The first is that the group on a stable Constitution and Convention will meet tomorrow, Saturday, in room C at 9:30.

The second announcement is that the group on flight tracking will also meet on Saturday at 2:30, also in room C.

And the third announcement is that there is a reception at 12 o'clock in room 3 B1.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you for this information, especially the last piece of information. That is very enjoyable to hear.

I wish you a very good weekend. I hope that you avoid having to work on Saturday or Sunday.

The Swiss tradition is that an official has to spend the weekend resting in order to be efficient on Monday morning. I don't know if we can hold to this 100 percent, but we will try to do our best.

So I wish you a good weekend and I'll see you on Monday.

(End of session, 12:03)
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