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>> CHAIR: Interpreters, English channel?

>> INTERPRETER: Good evening, Chairman. This is the English booth. Can you hear me? Thank you. Good evening.

>> CHAIR: French? Good evening. French?

Spanish?

Russian? Thank you.

Chinese? Hello?

Arabic?

Good evening. Can you take your seats, please? And wear your headset as well. Thank you. We will start in a minute.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. If you can, take your seats.

If you can look at ADM/23, the pink document, or you can look at the agenda online.

I'll give you a minute to locate it. Take a look at it, because we are going to go through the approval now.

Okay.

The agenda is in front of you for approval. I don't see anyone asking for the floor. The agenda is approved.

And now I will go directly to the ad hoc group, that deals with Article 8, dissemination of information, energy efficiency and accessibility for presentation. And I give the floor to Dr. Sherif. Dr. Sherif is not here.

Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. Could you please delay the item for a few minutes where the good doctor will be available?

>> CHAIR: Okay. The meeting -- if we don't have any objection, then let's go to the report of the other group that deals with the issue of ROA/OA, ICT/telecommunications, and I want you to refer to document DT/30 rev 3.

We have met -- the last meeting we had was today at 8:00. And on the issue of recognized operating agency, or operating agency, and the application of these two definitions, and the results of the discussions that happened in the meeting, and I just wanted to say that we had initially groups of countries who preferred to use the words "Operating agency" and another group of countries who preferred to use the words "Recognized operating agency." And after very lengthy negotiations and discussions, there is a proposal. And you can find it as a compromise, that you can find it on page 2, we call it option 2. And we intentionally did not change the option, we kept it option 2, so that people are not confused.

And the option basically has an asterisk or a footnote, and some even suggested to have a reference and a provision, and we refer to it. But it basically refers to one option, which reads "Authorized" or -- the footnote would read "Authorized" when it sees the word "Operating agency." It would read "authorized or recognized by a Member State to establish, operate, and engage in International telecommunication services to the public." That was a compromised text that was agreed by a number of regional groups, plus some Administrations.

But also to reflect on the meeting, there are other regional groups and some Administrations who still prefer to use the word or the definition "Recognized operating agency."

So here we are. The group asked me to delay the discussion on this issue until tomorrow, to give them some time to go back to their regional groups and have discussions and come back to the plenary. I will not open the floor for any debate on this, because the group asked me to delay the discussions on this item until tomorrow, plenary.

So with that, I conclude my presentation. And anybody or any Administration wanted to add or comment? I'm not opening the floor for an Administration to say I prefer that or I prefer the others. We had a lengthy discussion on this issue. And I just wanted to present it, and I will go through it hopefully at length tomorrow once I have feedback from the regional groups and also the Member States who have wished to look at it, think about it, and come back to me. (applause in room next door)

>> CHAIR: There is good news in the other room, so hopefully we will have something here.

Okay. Now we can go back to agenda item 2. Dr. Sherif, you can present the document and we can take it for approval, hopefully, Dr. Sherif.

>> EGYPT: This document is related to energy efficiency and eWaste. And after several consultations and ad hocs, we came into concise text. However, the only item that after discussion with several delegations we found that the word "Inter alia" is very broad and can reference to items that are not well-known --

>> CHAIRPERSON: Which document? Inter Alia? Is it DT/29 or... just for the meeting to follow.

>> EGYPT: Give me a second, Mr. Chairman. I'll...

Yes, 33 rev 1.

"Member States are encouraged to adopt energy efficiency and eWaste best practices taking into account, inter alia, relevant ITU-T recommendations." And the request is to delete "inter alia" in the form of discussion, because it refers to -- up to the scope of the ITU and and related -- or can take us to unrelated areas. So it's suggested to delete "inter alia," and I think some regions can already accept that.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Do you want us to take the first, the energy efficiency and eWaste provision?

>> EGYPT: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay.

>> EGYPT: Article 8A.

>> CHAIR: So the proposal here, DT/33 rev 1 as you see it, it's clear. But to delete the words "Inter alia," from the text. And there is of course the famous ITU recommendation, which we will leave it at a later stage once we decide on ITU and ITU-T, as we have agreed in the -- at a later stage.

So with that, are there any objections to approve the text as it is without the words "inter alia," and keep the square bracket between "ITU?"

Good? I don't see anyone asking for the floor. The text is approved with the change. And with this square bracket mentioned.

Dr. Sherif?

>> EGYPT: Just refer me which document?

>> CHAIR: 29 rev 1.

>> EGYPT: Regarding which topic, Mr. Chairman?

>> CHAIR: Accessibility for Persons with Disabilities to international telecommunication services.

>> EGYPT: This document has been discussed and agreed by, I think, everybody. And there is no problem with this document, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

The document DT/29 rev 1 is now for approval. There are square brackets which will be dealt with later on. But the text without the square brackets is submitted for approval.

I see no objection. Thank you.

And last, the last document is 32, United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and good evening to all colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, we would ask that you clarify with respect to the brackets in document 29 rev 1. We would, of course, wish to retain the brackets, and we were unclear as to your ruling. But we would wish to retain the brackets.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Yes, we will keep the bracket. So the approval was with the retention of the brackets. Thank you.

Okay. Document 32. Dr. Sherif, if you can present it.

>> EGYPT: The topic, Mr. Chairman, please? Because I've not copied so fast with the document.

>> CHAIR: 32 rev 1 and dissemination of information.

>> EGYPT: The document is not in front of myself. But it was two square brackets. One around -- excuse me just a second, Mr. Chairman. I'll just get this document.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think the remaining bracket was between -- I think there are no square brackets on this, Mr. Chairman. Just after the "ITU-T."

>> CHAIR: There is a big square bracket between the entire text and there are two square brackets which are, as I understand, the famous ROA and OA and the ITU-T. But there are big square brackets between the entire text.

>> EGYPT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Square brackets because some Member States have reservation about the whole text. So we managed to refine the text as much as possible, and waited for decision of the plenary about the big square brackets, just as this Article be considered or not.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Now I will put this document and I'll ask to remove the big square brackets, but leaving the smaller square brackets between the "Operating agency" and "Recognized operating agency" and the "ITU-T," and I submit it for approval.

I see no one is asking for the floor. United States? We would retain the "Operating agency" and the "ROA" and the "ITU-T."

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. You're on document 32 rev 1. Mr. Chairman, we had intervened earlier on this point and perhaps we need to add a bit of clarification. And that is where there is a reference to "Administrative and operational information" the difficulty, Mr. Chairman, and we believe that we're not alone in this, the difficulty, Mr. Chairman, is that in an increasingly competitive environment, such information is not provided by the carriers or others to the Member State. What we can provide, and what we have done with a number of International organisations including the ITU, is to provide aggregated statistical information that is useful, of course, to a variety of matrices that the ITU maintains. But, Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult for us, and we would wish to retain the brackets around "Administrative and operational information" which we do not collect, as a general matter.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Before I give the floor to Burundi, I think one of the most useful documents that the ITU publishes is the operational bulletin. When I used to be an engineer looking at numbers, I used to follow very carefully, because it's a very, very important document.

And I think with changes of numbers that the ITU is issuing, I think it's very, very important to have it. I will note this, but I'll give the floor to Burundi. And Canada was asking for the floor. And I'll come back to this issue.

>> BURUNDI: I think it's a mistake, Chairman. We didn't seek the floor. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Canada?

>> CANADA: Yes, thank you very much, Chairman.

Chairman, I would like to refer to the previous intervention. We have a similar situation in our Administration. And we, too, have difficulty with the words "Administrative and operational." We would prefer just a general reference to information of a statistical nature, which would be a lot more appropriate to our particular circumstances.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Algeria?

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Chairman, for having given me the floor.

I don't wish to open a debate. I have no intention of doing that. But in reading this provision, I see that the only obligation is actually placed upon the Secretary-General. It's the Secretary-General who shall do something. Disseminate information provided by Member States. But there is no obligation on any Member State Administration to provide a specific type of information.

The Secretary-General shall disseminate only the information which Member State Administrations feel like giving him. That's how I read the text.

And because of that, I have no difficulty in accepting it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Algeria.

I'll go to Egypt, Dr. Sherif, if you can clarify more and get back to this.

>> EGYPT: Yes. This text has been as a compromise text with reference to prices and suggested retail prices. But there are claims that there are too many operators, it's not practical, and there was reference to routes, and this is not so very relevant to the telecom environment. So we decided to keep "Administration and operational" and use this as a compromise text. We still find Member States should transmit such information, which is not mandatory but just like a request. So Member States as the previous intervention, Member States are not obliged to send such a remission. But if received by the Secretary-General, he will disseminate this information. So this was a compromise text achieved in a balanced way.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

I'll go back to the U.S. with these clarifications from the Chairman of the ad hoc group and the intervention from Algeria. I don't think you have a mandatory obligation to disseminate "administrative and operational," which I found it's very useful, but the obligations as a mandate is put on the shoulders of the Secretary-General.

U.S, can you go along with the compromise so we can move ahead?

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

And we appreciate the interventions of colleagues as they would interpret this language. We don't want to stand in your way, Mr. Chairman, but we offer -- and we are in your hands on this -- a simple editorial matter that we could say "that may be provided by Member States."

If that is acceptable to colleagues, we think that clarifies the intervention of our colleague from Algeria, Mr. Sherif. So if it may be "That may be provided by Member States."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay. If you can -- I have Saudi Arabia, Iran, Botswana. Can we try this, with the U.S. suggestions to add after "information" on the second line, after "Information,"  "That may be" and then to the end, that's a compromise. Is that acceptable?

If you can, Saudi Arabia, if you can remove your questions and let's try this, unless you insist. And Iran.

Saudi Arabia?

>> SAUDIA ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman.

As far as the text proposed as it stands at the moment is concerned, we managed to agree on this text after quite a considerable number of meetings. This is not the original version of the text. Some things have already been taken out of this text located in the form it is submitted now. Following what has been said by Algeria and by Egypt, I think it's clear that there is nothing mandatory placed on the shoulders of Administrations in this text. Administrations can provide the information or they cannot. It's up to them. There is nothing binding here, not on Member States.

As I say, we managed to get to this compromise after many meetings and after a lot of concessions made by the Arab States.

Thank you.

What has been proposed, as you rightly say, it contains nothing binding or mandatory on Member States. It's a question of "May be." So there is nothing binding. I agree with you.

Perhaps in a spirit of compromise we can adopt the proposal if Member States are prepared to agree?

>> CHAIR: Iran.

>> IRAN: Thank you.

Perhaps one quick solution for that. In the line "Provided by Member States" we delete "By Member States." "Provided on administrative, operational or a statistical nature." Because a Member State is referred to in the last part of that. "Member State should translate," which is not obligations. So you delete "Member States" to remove the concern of some distinguished colleagues, "information provided on administrative or relating to administrative operation or of a statistical nature." And the last paragraph, you have "Member States should" transmit, which is not obligations. "Should" is conditional, Chairman.

That may be a quick solution for that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran.

Can we go ahead with that, United States, without the use of "That may." We just strike "By Member States"? U.S.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you. We can accept the proposal by our distinguished colleague from Iran. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Is there any objection from the group, the meeting?

Thank you.

Now we have three approvals, and I would really thank Dr. Sherif from Egypt for the excellent job. I initially, when we started this, there was a lot of objections, but we sent it back to Dr. Sherif. I have attended many of his meetings, and I can see the level and competency of Dr. Sherif in order to reach what he reached. I wanted everybody to really thank Dr. Sherif by way of applause.

(Applause)

>> CHAIR: We have something to show to the world on energy efficiency and eWaste, something that we can show to the world as well on accessibility for Persons with Disabilities.

So thank you very much for your work.

Now, I -- we go to agenda item 4, the progress report by the Chairman of Committee 5. You have the floor to present your report.

And document 50, you can see it online. It's loaded. You can see it online.

Chairman of Committee 5, you have the floor.

>> JOSHUA PEPRAH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good evening to Distinguished Delegates.

Mr. Chairman, not too long ago Committee 5 met for the fourth time to discuss the work that has been submitted by the various Working Groups, Working Groups 1 and 2. And, Mr. Chairman, the conclusion at that time was that the output coming from both Working Groups have so many square brackets and reservations and issues that the best way of going forward was to bring them all to plenary, and perhaps that's why we're here, starting this evening.

The compilation of all those works that came out to be found in the document 50E, starting from -- yes, on Article 3, 4, 5 and so on and so forth, and various appendices.

Mr. Chairman, we had some ad hoc Committees also set up to look at a couple of issues, whose reports will be submitted to the plenary beginning this evening by the head -- the Chairman of the ad hoc Committee on Article 6, and then from tomorrow we will have the report on Article 10. And so we can begin to look at the details of what was submitted in document 50-E.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, and thanks for your work and thanks to also the chairmen of Working Group 1 and 2 for their work.

And I wanted to say something here at this junction, and it's very important that DT/50 -- sorry, document 50 as you see is a consolidation of all work that was assigned to Committee 5. I see that Article 10 is -- is in this document, so I just wanted to mention that Article 10 is going to be discussed tomorrow at a meeting at 7:30, headed by the UAE. So document 50 as I see it right now has got a lot of square brackets. I'm not planning to open this document for discussion at this stage. And I wanted to explain something which is important, and I wanted to mention it to the plenary.

The course of action for -- to deal with this document or to deal with the different Articles, since we have many issues, some going to the easy side and some going to the -- to be very difficult matters, that we need to deal with. And I wanted to have a meeting that will be attended by the Vice Chairmen of the chairman of the conference, plus a number of the regional representatives. And for regions where there is no single representative, we will invite some Administrations. Today after plenary, at 10:30, to look at main items that the conference can agree and reach to a compromise.

We then translate these main items into -- reflected on a text, and this text will be presented by the Chairman. And I wanted to say here that this text is going to be based on much of the work that has come from the different Working Groups as well as Committee 5. And I will be waiting also for the ad hoc groups that have been established by Committee 5. And also, again, discussed by the same group tomorrow morning at 9.

And we start the plenary at 11 for the consideration of a complete ITR document starting from definitions and ending with the Article 10 and, of course, the appendices and resolutions.

With that, I wanted to not open the document for discussion. As you might be aware, this document is very -- has got a lot of square brackets. I don't see a point in opening the discussion.

And we will move in this manner. We will meet. I will repeat again and summarize, we will meet with the regional group representatives for regions. I see Australia is asking for the floor. We will invite them, like APT, where there is no common coordinator for this group, to meet with us, to reach to compromise on all issues; hopefully tonight. I will not leave the group unless we finalize that, even if they need to stay awake all night.

Because tomorrow I have to produce a text to plenary where plenary will consider and hopefully start approving and have -- on the spirit of compromise, and basically have some text that will be signed by all Member States available in this room.

Australia, you have the floor.

>> AUSTRALIA: Chairman, this is the Chairman of the ad hoc group on Article 6.

Just to report briefly back to you, we have completed our work in the main body of Article 6. Got rid of quite a number of provisions and a lot of square brackets. There are some global square brackets which are still in there, which we can do nothing about until the interconnections with other issues are sorted out at plenary level. But the text is now available for you and ready to be synthesized into your composite document.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And I will take it from you. Thank you.

With that, I will move on this course of action and I will be looking forward for meeting the group at 10:30. It's going to be in room Edcom. And hopefully we will reach to a conclusion that will be resulting and to producing a complete document hopefully tomorrow on the basis, again, I want to emphasize, on the basis of the document that has been discussed in the working group and Committees. And hopefully we will be able to remove many, many, many square brackets, hopefully all the square brackets, and reach to an agreement.

With that, I will move to agenda item 5, and looking at the blue document 43. And I wanted to start with the preamble, and I wanted to look into document 44 -- before we fetch document 44, I wanted to give the floor to the Chairman of the Editorial Committee for any presentation. Chairman of the Editorial Committee, you have the floor.

>> MARIE-THERESE ALAJOUANINE: Thank you, Chairman.

The Editorial Committee is submitting to this plenary three documents. First of all, blue document, 43, as you indicated, this only concerns the preamble today, since the other sections have already been examined.

We also have another series of blue documents, document 49, which contains the draft resolution on special measures for landlocked developing countries, et cetera.

And then a third document which is at its second reading, that is pink, document 46, which contains the first series of texts which had already been looked at in blue at the previous plenary.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Can we take document 43 now? And I wanted to start with the preamble and I want you to refer to document 44, which is submitted by any number of countries, and then another -- many countries supported it. I don't want to go through the list. But I just wanted to be brief and to the point.

And, basically, there is a proposal first of all to leave the preamble, first paragraph, as it is, but to add one sentence, which says: "While implementing these regulations, Member States shall take into account their International obligations in relation to universal human rights."

And I wanted to put this for approval.

Argentina?

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chairman.

I simply wish to add our support to this document.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Is there any objection to include this sentence, after the first paragraph of the preamble?

Australia?

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Unfortunately, we are not in a position to agree to this at this stage. We will have to consult with our capital overnight on this question. Australia is a signatory on a number of documents on human rights, and we have to take advice as to whether we can agree to this.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Okay. I started to fear that. And I don't want the -- the list is growing. So I'll give the floor to Sweden and the United States, but I will then summarize. Sweden?

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Sweden has come to this conference in the spirit of compromise, and it's ready to continue engaging in constructive negotiations. However, there are some areas in which we are not prepared to compromise. Universal human rights is one of them.

We welcome the broad consensus reached last Tuesday on not including content in the ITR, as well as the strong support from across the room for the Freedom of Expression and human rights, which you also can see in document 44. We support from many of the regions around the world.

The ITR is a technical treaty and should stay that way. The scope of the ITR should not be expanded at the -- I have to be clear on that, the scope of the ITR should not be expanded and the Internet should not be included. However, we recognize that even a technical treaty on telecommunication may have human rights implications.

We also are concerned that some of the proposals at this table at this conference may have unintentional consequences for the United States and human rights obligations. Some of the proposals may be based on genuine and legitimate concern. However, Sweden believes that there are other documents and forum that better deals with these issues.

To highlight the consensus on the importance of human rights, we would like to introduce a general reference to the human rights in the ITR preamble, emphasizing that Member States should take their human rights obligations into account while implementing these Regulations.

Furthermore, as you know from other fora, Sweden is supporting openness and transparencies. And we believe that there is a need to ensure that any debate on these issues, human rights, Internet, Freedom of Expression, are carried out in an open fora with the public and media present.

We reluctantly go along with your idea to have consultations tonight on some of the issues. But any detailed discussions have to be made in public in order to support transparency and openness.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Sweden, I'm completely lost.

(Laughter)

When you -- I mean, this has been discussed. Initially, I don't know, Sweden was opposing it -- are you opposing it now? I -- believe me, I was completely lost. Are you in support now or are you in agreement? I'm sorry to -- it was too long for me to follow. I'll give you the mic again just to summarize. You are in support to this text or you are against this text?

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As we are a co-signer of the document, we fully support the inclusion of this text in the preamble and we think the decision should be taken at this moment. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

United States?

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

Mr. Chairman, we of course have intervened earlier on this issue. And we have stated, of course, that we have an historical and well recorded commitment to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as all colleagues who have committed to the United Nations.

And we have further committed to similar expressions of human rights during the World Summit on the Information Society. The record is very clear as to the views of the United States of America on this subject.

We would also note, Mr. Chairman, that today is human rights day to honor the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and we wish to acknowledge that important day.

However, Mr. Chairman, and we wish to move forward constructively. Mr. Chairman, at least in the English version, this current formulation raises some difficulties. And we wish to be clear with colleagues, it is our understanding as a matter of practice that preambles should not be operational in nature. And the current sentence includes the word "Shall" as it would suggest then an operational implication.

However, Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to work with colleagues to find appropriate wording to appropriately place such a sentiment in the preamble, but we would ask through you, Mr. Chairman, to form an ad hoc that can bring into alignment at least the English version with well-established practices governing preambles to treaties.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: I think I'll take it today at the 10:30 meeting.

I really just want to move on. And if there is no objection, at least on principle, that we have -- there is acceptance to put some language in the preamble. We will get back to it. So at least we have something that we agree on with regard to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the number of attempts that this issue has been discussed. And we will send it back to today's meeting to discuss it further.

I never thought that this would have such a debate, but I respect the positions. And we shall discuss it further.

I have the floor now. Brazil and Turkey, do you still insist? I'm not going to take floors from Administrations who support or go against, because we will discuss it further later on.

Brazil? Thank you.

Turkey.

>> TURKEY: Mr. Secretary-General, I asked the importance of having such a statement in the preamble in a very explanatory way several times. And at the moment, we fully support the idea of having such a statement in the preamble that will give a good message to the people against ITRs even to negotiate it and to be concluded. We support the statements in the document 44 at the moment. Even though, you know, Turkey is not among such countries, but we fully support the statement that has been -- that has been set forth in document 44.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Turkey, for being brief.

Let's skip the preamble and let's go to Article 1 and Article 2 and the start of the definitions.

Is there any objection to that? Seeing none, thank you.

Next page, page 2, which starts from "telecommunication" all the way to Article 7, "special services." Thank you.

3? Page 3? In its entirety? Thank you.

Page 4? Thank you.

Page 5? Thank you.

We go now to the second series of document 49. And that is the resolution for landlocked developing countries and small island developing states for access to international optical fiber networks. And that is up for approval. And I'm going to take -- the resolution is in its entirety for approval.

Is there any objection? Thank you.

I want to thank Paraguay, again, for their work.

Now we go to document 46. Page 1.

Chile?

>> CHILE: We would like to go back to document 49.

We are concerned by the scope that this proposal may have, political scope.

>> CHAIR: Chile, I'm not clear. Can you explain?

>> CHILE: Obviously we support the interconnection for these countries, but nevertheless we believe that we should review the language in this resolution since some of the provisions are not of a technical nature, but rather seem to be a political statement.

So if the language could be reviewed in that light.

>> CHAIR: Tell us the specific text? This has been agreed in a previous plenary meeting. And this is the first reading, although I did not send a cake to Paraguay. I promised them. But we went through this.

Is there any specific text that Chile is -- wanted to highlight, so that we can help and move forward on approving this document? Chile?

>> CHILE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We just wanted to review it in general to see what -- if there are any political implications, and to ensure that the language expresses the technical needs of countries in this situation, but should not go beyond that technical expression and enter into the realms of politics.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I'll come back to you. I have the floor from China. China? And then I'll come back to this resolution.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Regarding this resolution, we do not have any problem with that. However, Mr. Chairman, we would like through you to ask the Editorial Committee that in the Chinese version, and recognizing -- sorry, "considering E," the E in "Considering" has some problem.

There is new global framework for transport cooperation. There is a mistake in the Chinese version. We would like to see it corrected.

And also, instruct the -- invite the counsel, there are also two mistakes in the Chinese versions. We would like to draw it to the attention of the Editorial Committee.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We will take note and the Secretariat will do it. Is there approval to open the discussion on this resolution to revise it, to revise the language in it?

Iran?

>> IRAN: Chairman, the answer is no.

But we are jumping from one document to another Chairman. Please indicate which document we are discussing. We were 49 then 46 then 43. Please kindly, if possible, allow us electronically to open the document and please indicate which document we are discussing at any time.

I really appreciate your kindness. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I finished document 49. I thought it was -- I thought it was approved. And then I jumped to document 46. But then Chile asked for the floor and they wanted to open discussion on document 49, so we are on document 49.

I'm asking the meeting if there is any support to open the discussion on the proposed resolution.

Nigeria, Botswana, do you support opening the discussion on the resolution? If yes, you will take the floor. If it's not, please don't ask for the floor.

Nigeria is still insisting. So you support the opening of the discussions on this resolution? Nigeria?

>> NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It's not that I support the opening of the discussion, but I want to appeal to delegations at this conference to not reopen discussions on the issues that have already been agreed upon.

(Applause)

By reopening --

(Applause)

By reopening issues that have been agreed upon, it's going to draw us backward, and this conference will not achieve anything. It is our desire that we see this conference progress forward, so that at the end of the day we will have something to take home.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(Applause)

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Nigeria.

I see no support to open the discussion on this floor. Sorry, Chile, and we hope that we move forward.

So we go back now to document 46, first page. Is there any objection? First page? I see none.

Page 2 of document 46? I see no objection. Thanks.

Page 3?

And page 4? Thank you.

Thank you very much. I would now -- now we come to the last agenda item of the fifth plenary meeting, and that is any other business.

I see no one is asking for the floor. Thank you very much. We will -- Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

There was an issue that Egypt wanted to address to the distinguished plenary meeting regarding an issue that happened a couple of days ago. And I'm just waiting to get the statement out.

And Egypt would like to clarify its position with regards to the unofficial multi-country draft proposal regarding the review of the ITRs. That was submitted -- that was circulated back last Saturday.

This document has spread unofficially, and we notice that it contains the name of Egypt among its proponents. Egypt would like to reiterate that we never supported this document. We believe that the ITRs are and should continue to be a high level Treaty discussing high level principles. The ITRs must be updated to fit our current times. We hereby confirm that Egypt's position remains as follows:

Egypt has always supported and will continue to support the concepts of free Internet and has exerted all efforts to develop the Internet and its wide spread among its citizens. Content Regulation and censorship are not within the scope of ITRs. The ITRs shall not prevent states or relevant stakeholders of having thei own bi-lateral or multi-lateral agreement that differ from the ITRs.

However, for parties that are not signatories of the agreement, the ITRs would prevail. The ITRs should not impede multi-stakeholder institutions such as ICANN or ISOC from continuing its functions effectively, and should promote the continued vibrancy of the Internet and its impact on individuals and the society.

Thank you.

(Applause)

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Algeria and then we will close the meeting. Algeria?

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Could you, in your final remarks, tell us what we will be doing for the remainder of the evening? What issues remain to be dealt with later? If we are so informed, we will be far more effective and efficient at our next meeting.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

The meeting is going to adjourn now, earlier than scheduled. The -- we will reconvene -- a lot of regional groups wanted to have their own meetings, so it's good that we have an earlier break, so that regional groups can have their time. And we will reconvene with the regional representations at Etcom -- in the Etcom room, which will be attended by the Vice Chairs and chairman of the conference, and the regional representatives plus some countries who do not have main focal points, like Asia.

And we will continue our discussion. And as I said, the basis will be to have an agreement to move the conference forward. And once we have this agreement, this will translate on the basis of document 50 plus other documents like the ones we have approved in plenary to consolidate one complete document, which has the entire ITRs, for submission tomorrow at 9 for the same group. And tomorrow at 11 a.m. we will have the plenary to discuss this document.

With that -- I have United Arab Emirates and I have Cuba. And if you can be very brief, UAE.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman.

I just wanted to invite the Arab Group to meet within the next 30 minutes at 9 o'clock in room D. The Arab Group.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Cuba and then Iran.

>> CUBA: Thank you, Chairman.

A question. Committee 5, I believe there was supposed to be an ad hoc group in order to discuss the proposal on nondiscriminatory access to the Internet. Now I don't think anything has been programmed. Or if it has, I don't know when or where it's going to take place. I'd like to have some information, if possible, please.

>> CHAIR: I'm going to consult with the Chairman of that ad hoc group from South Africa and we will inform you accordingly.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

As maybe of the APT perhaps it might be appropriate that we, APT countries, also have a meeting at 9 o'clock. And we request that a room be assigned to us, Chairman, because we need to come to your meeting at 10:30. We have some views. For the time being we have not consulted and we would very much appreciate if a room can be assigned to us. And I apologize to the Chairman of the APT if he is at the meeting or if he has raised this point. It's important for us to discuss this.

>> CHAIR: Philippines is asking for the floor, I believe, on the same subject.

>> PHILIPPINES: Thank you very much.

This is for the information of the APT countries. We will meet at room E after this plenary meeting. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And thank you everyone. The meeting is adjourned, and we will meet tomorrow as a plenary at 11 a.m. in this room.

Thank you.

(Applause)

(End of meeting, 20:30)
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