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>> CHAIR: Good evening. If you can, take your seat. We did not start because I'm waiting for a document number that will be uploaded very soon to the Web Page of the conference. So if you can bear with us for a few minutes, it will come at any time.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. And welcome to the evening session of the plenary meeting.

In front of you you have ADM/27 rev 1. I hope you locate this document. I wanted to say a few things here.

On agenda number 2, report of the Chairman of Committee 5, and you'll see document 57. That is the Chairman report of Committee 5. We will take that, we will take note of it. We don't need to get into discussion.

I want -- I have the floor from Korea, Mexico. Is the system okay on your side?

>> INTERPRETER: Good evening, sir.

>> CHAIR: Korea?

I think we have a problem in the Korean delegation headset. ITU, please, can you assist?

We will pause the meeting for a minute.

>> REPUBLIC OF KOREA: It's okay, the Korean side. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Okay.

So let's go back to what I said. If you can pull ADM/27, the draft agenda of today's plenary. And if you go to agenda item number 2, document number 57, that is Chairman report of Committee 5. I want to add the DT/51.

Before I take number 2, I'll listen to the ad hoc group on Article 10 and ad hoc group on nondiscriminatory access and also the ad hoc group on Article 6.

Is there any comment on the agenda? I see none.

Thank you very much.

I wanted also to mention --

(Audio cut out)

>> INTERPRETER: Microphone, please.

>> CHAIR: Is this okay? Yes.

I wanted also to mention that if you could not find DT/51, you can please bear with us, because once I report --

(No audio)

>> INTERPRETER: Microphone, please.

>> CHAIR: I have an issue with this mic here.

Once we finished today, the afternoon meeting, we had to go with the Secretariat and look at the text, the consolidated document. It took us some time. I left them and we are just about to finish and they are working on it as we speak right now and they will upload it at any time. As soon as it's uploaded, I will tell you it's been uploaded. So just in case that you do not see it on the website, it means that there is a lot of consolidations that have been taking place, and the group needed some time.

So before I go to report of the Chairman of Committee 5, I wanted to go to the report from the ad hoc group on Article 10. And I give the floor to UAE to give me the status report of Article 10.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And good evening to all colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, the ad hoc group on Article 10 met twice today in order to agree on a common position between the various proposals on Article 10.

>> INTERPRETER: A microphone problem again, sir.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: I would repeat, Mr. Chairman. Sorry for that.

Thank you so much from the ad hoc group. Article 10 met twice today in order to come up with a position on the various proposals for Article 10. The following text, Mr. Chairman, which is before us in here, is sent to the plenary for approval and consideration. It has been agreed in consensus by all the delegates that have been attending the meeting, without any square brackets, Mr. Chairman.

So I would like to propose this text, Mr. Chairman, which has no square brackets and has reached a consensus --

>> CHAIR: If you can hold. There is a point of order and I think it's again the mic. Sorry, the system.

Do we have a problem? You can raise your flag again. I just lost it. It was somewhere here.

Zimbabwe and Palestine? The IT, I think if you can check. Zimbabwe, yes, we have seen the flag.

>> INTERPRETER: The mics appear to be flashing, Mr. Chairman, says the interpreter.

>> CHAIR: IT, can you verify, is everything okay? Sorry UAE. If you can give us a minute.

Zimbabwe, is it okay now, and Palestine? Zimbabwe? Can you take the floor? I think they still have a problem. No. They don't -- they don't have -- I think somebody stepped on the cable and they have been disconnected, that group there. Zimbabwe? Is it okay now?

>> ZIMBABWE: It is okay, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Palestine? Palestine?

>> PALESTINE: Yes, yes, it's okay now. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So let's go back. And please, when you take the floor, please, guide us to which document number that you're talking about on Article 10.

UAE?

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Yes, thank you so much, Mr. Chairman, and good evening to all colleagues again.

We are addressing DT/49, Mr. Chairman. That is the ad hoc report on Article 10, the final provisions.

And very briefly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my thankful appreciation to all the delegations that attended the meeting today. There were two meetings held today in the morning and the afternoon. And I could report to you, Mr. Chairman, with a message of appreciation to all these delegates, we have accomplished our assignment. We don't have any square brackets in the text which is before us in here. We have reached our consensus altogether in Article 10, addressing Article 10.

So therefore, Mr. Chairman, the document DT/49 with the text that is before us is submitted for your consideration and the approval of the meeting.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE, for that. And the document in its entirety is submitted for approval.

There is a modification, and let's start with 10.1. I see no one is asking for the floor. Thank you. Agreed.

The suppression of 10.2. Thank you. Agreed.

10.3 or the new 10.2. It's a modification. Thank you.

Suppression of 10.4. Thank you.

Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon or good evening to everybody.

Just this approval, this document, is an important issue, at least for the first decision. You have decided that the new Regulations will apply as 1st of January 2015. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

And the last Mod on page 2, which starts "In witness whereof," well then we have "Member States will sign." Togo?

>> TOGO: Thank you, Chair.

I would like to remind you that we are in plenary and we are trying to adopt an important text. Unfortunately, DT/49 is only in the English version, and obviously there are some subtleties between that version and the French version. This Article 10 is what we're trying to adopt and it's really important for us to have it in all of the languages in order to discuss things properly.

>> CHAIR: Yes. Thank you very much. And we took a note of it. The only problem that we had is the quick translation, and we are sorry for that. We are so much squeezed from the outcome from the meetings and the translation, but we will bring that to you in six languages. But hopefully you can go along with the approval.

I see the floor from Telecom Egypt. Okay. Thank you.

So with that, I would like to thank UAE and his group who participated in the work of finalizing Article 10.

I'll go now to the second ad hoc group and I'll take Article 6. Australia? And document 45, and if you can tell us if there is a revision to it.

>> AUSTRALIA: Yes, it's actually revision 2. So DT/45 rev 2. So just give people a short while to get rev 2 and not rev 1, which was on the agenda.

Okay. Chairman, I'll proceed now, I assume that people have got that.

We had our meeting this afternoon to discuss the issue, which was brought to our attention by Russia, which apparently seemed to be just an inadvertent omission of text and some repositioning of text. Thus, there was quite a bit more subtlety that went with this whole matter.

But I would say that we had a very fruitful meeting, Chairman. In fact, before the meeting, I found that Russia, the United States, Germany on behalf of the CEPT, Trinidad and Tobago, and the United Arab Emirates had already met and come up with compromise text to solve the problems for us. So I must say that I was very impressed by the emerging spirit of compromise which appears to me to be taking place.

And, indeed, in the meeting we also had Uganda on behalf of the African countries who also agreed to this, and China as well. So there is a substantial amount of agreement to what I'm about to take you through, Chair.

Now, as we scroll through the document you have there, the first change that we made was to 42C. And I don't know why the text is not underlined, it should be. But I'll tell you what the change is there. Under 6.1.1., that should read "Member States shall endeavor to encourage." I thought that was the decision we made. And at the end of that provision, should be "Comma, provided through commercial agreements." And that's the text which has been added. So that was agreed to.

Now, the next thing we come down to, you can see a title of "Terms and conditions." Sorry, above that, 6.1.-- 6.2 is "The following provisions may apply where the terms and conditions of International telecommunication service arrangements." The word "Telecommunication" has been inserted and agreed to by the meeting. Again, it should be underlined because it's a modification. I don't know why that didn't occur, but I'm bringing that to your attention.

Under the "Terms and conditions" that was the first change, under that title.

Now, if we go down to what was the old 6.3.2, it has been moved down to --

>> CHAIR: Can I pause here and can we take it one by one?

>> AUSTRALIA: Of course. So the first change, Chairman, to bring to your attention was at the end of 6.1.1, to put "Provided through commercial agreements." The words that have been added.

>> CHAIR: And of course --

>> AUSTRALIA: And "Shall endeavor to" but we had already agreed to that.

>> CHAIR: Yes. I'll put that for approval, and I want to thank the United States and Russia and the group who worked on this.

I see the floor -- I see Macedonia is asking for the floor. And then we will take the text. Macedonia?

>> LEBANON: Sorry, this is Lebanon speaking.

I'd like to come back to Article 10, in 10.1, there are still brackets, squared brackets, which are the appendices 1 and 2, 3 still remaining between brackets. Could you please clarify this?

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Square brackets will be removed once we approve appendices 1, 2, and 3. So it will just be an editorial removal of brackets.

Okay? Zimbabwe and Australia.

>> ZIMBABWE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Going back to 42C, this is just an issue of clarification. When we read the last part of that sentence, "promote competitive wholesale pricing for traffic carried on such telecommunication networks provided through commercial agreements," we are failing to comprehend the words. Perhaps it could be "telecommunication services." We just need clarification there, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: We will come to it. And I just want to focus on 6.1.1. Australia, do you want to add anything?

>> AUSTRALIA: It's me, Chair. No, I don't want to add anything to that. But I would point out that the square brackets in Article 10 for appendices 1, 2, and 3, I'll have something to say about that before the end of my intervention.

>> CHAIR: Okay.

But can we take 6.1.1 now?

>> AUSTRALIA: Yes, Chair, that was where we add the words "Provided through commercial agreements."

>> CHAIR: I'm trying to take approval from the plenary.

>> AUSTRALIA: Okay. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Nobody is asking for the floor. It's agreed, Mr. Horton, next.

And we have a question from Zimbabwe on 6.2. And you can take 6.2 as well.

>> ZIMBABWE: Mr. Chairman, I think this one has been changed to 6.1.1, from the presentation that has been given by the Chairperson of the ad hoc Committee, if we are not mistaken.

>> CHAIR: The document that I see here, no, it's 6.2. The terms and conditionz, and 6.1.1 is the one which starts -- which talks about the -- which ends with "Through commercial agreements." That is what I see.

So I take it back to Sir Horton.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Yes, it used to be 6.2. And as I said, the markups have not been actually marked up as they should have been. But where it reads 6.1.1, there should be a stroke through the number 2. Because it was 6.2. So Botswana was quite correct there. And I think the comment from Botswana is that it's not explaining the context of commercial agreements. But the whole essence of 42B and 42C is the focus on International agreements through commercial means.

And then we get into accounting rates principles in the next section.

I hope that explains...

>> CHAIR: I'll go back to you again, and sorry for that.

We have Togo and then I'll come back to you. Togo.

>> TOGO: Thank you, Chairman.

I would like to look at 42C, now 6.1.1. The phrase "Through commercial agreement" it seems to be out of place here. And we would like to see that phrase deleted.

>> CHAIR: I think we have just agreed to it. And we had taken that and U.S. and Russia and some others have discussed it and it was discussed in the ad hoc group that deals with Article 6.

Burkina Faso, and I'll go back to the Chairman of the other group. Burkina Faso.

>> BURKINA FASO: Thank you, Chairman.

We are concerned about the same issue, because this final phrase was added at the request of one delegation, and I feel that it rather restricts the initial intent, particularly for traffic carried on the basis of commercial agreements, rather than restricting this to only this type of traffic.

>> CHAIR:  Chairman of Article 6 ad hoc group, and I'll comment on it.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chairman.

Well, let me add that rider at the end. But if the plenary wants to strike out the words "Provided through commercial agreements," then I don't think it makes a terrible lot of difference, personally. So, Chairman, it's up to what the plenary decides.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. The last plenary there was a discussion on this specific issue, and the proposal was to add the words "Through commercial agreements." And we had a bit of a discussion and we decided to push it back to the Committee, because we had yet to bring the -- or we moved text from the body, and that's why we went through this. And we used the words "Shall endeavor." So if you can go along with that, Burkina Faso, and agree to it, I think it does not restrict; it does not harm.

Thank you. Burkina Faso?

>> BURKINA FASO: Thank you, Chairman.

We feel that we could accept it, but in the French version I would have preferred "Particularly" to be added, the word “notamment”, because it is phrased in that way, we're not limiting it only to commercial agreements.

>> INTERPRETER: I don't know what English word we could use instead of “notamment”, particularly, suggests the interpreter.

>> CHAIR: I'll take you.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. If there is difficulty here, that should not be limited, perhaps we could add after "provided, comma, inter alia to commercial agreements." So you don't close it to only commercial agreements, it could be for other types of arrangements. That is my way of suggestion if you have difficulty approving that. But if people are happy with that, no problem.

>> CHAIR: I always try to avoid opening the text for additions, major additions that might have -- that open discussion at plenary. But I'll go for Senegal, Togo, and I'll consult with the Chairman of Article 6.

Senegal?

>> SENEGAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We, too, would support the proposal by Burkina Faso. There are not only commercial agreements. There are other circumstances and we would like that addition.

>> CHAIR: Togo?

>> TOGO: Thank you, Chairman.

Togo certainly supports Burkina Faso and Senegal. But aside from that, I think it may be a language problem. In reading this it seems that it is only those networks which are provided through commercial agreements. And the French reading is not clear. It seems to restrict the provision only to those telecommunications networks provided through commercial agreements.

>> CHAIR: Let me try that, and the proposal coming from Iran and to add the word "Inter alia." Is there any objection to adding these two words? Panama?

>> PANAMA: There is no objection to adding those two words. But perhaps the issue might be resolved by "wholesale pricing of commercial agreements for traffic."

>> CHAIR: So we move "Commercial agreements" to after the word "Pricing." I'll go back to the United States, they are the custodians of that text. And a proposal from them as well will help.

United States.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are concerned at this stage, after much deliberation on this section, that we may be drafting in plenary and possibly losing the meaning that was associated with that phrase and shared -- that meaning was shared by a number of delegations involved in Mr. Horton's ad hoc.

Mr. Chairman, to avoid further drafting, which could confuse what we believe to be excellent text, and of course we wish to express our appreciation to Mr. Horton, in order to move along your plenary we would simply suggest to delete "Through commercial agreement." There is already a title to international telecommunication arrangements, and it may be that this is beginning to be more of a difficulty than it deserves.

So, Mr. Chairman, we would propose simply to delete "Through commercial agreement."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(Applause)

>> CHAIR: Okay. So that is the proposal and I don't think that there will be any objection to that.

Mexico?

>> MEXICO: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would simply like to point out that the word "Provided" should also be deleted. "Provided through commercial agreements."

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mexico. We will do that.

Mr. Horton, let's move on to the next provision.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chairman. The next change is an intermediate title, which is "Terms and conditions." This is provision 42DA, and this is to assist in the clarity of the text, to divide it up.

So if you'd like to put that to the plenary, Chairman, that is the next change.

>> CHAIR: Any objection to the change of the title? I see no objection. Thank you.

Sir Horton, next provision.

>> AUSTRALIA: Provision 6.2, 42E that is. In the second line, you see "International telecommunication service arrangements." Telecommunication was not in the previous version. It should be underlined, but it's not. And that was I think an oversight of previous drafting. So, Chairman, I put that to you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

So with the addition of the word "Telecommunication" in the second line, provision 6.2. It's here for approval. And I see no objection. Thank you.

Next, Mr. Horton.

>> AUSTRALIA: We go down, lower down, scroll down to a new heading "Collection charges." Provision 42HA. That is to give us some guidance of what comes next, and I put that to you, Chairman, for approval.

>> CHAIR: So the title?

>> AUSTRALIA: Yes, "Collection charges."

>> CHAIR: Okay. It's for plenary approval. And I see no objection.

>> AUSTRALIA: Now, Chairman, what you see at 42I, which is Article 6.2.4, all this is text which has been assembled. The first sentence comes from what was earlier in the text. It has been moved down. It says "The charges levied on customers for a particular communication should in principle be the same in a given relation, regardless of the International route used for that communication." That was originally in the text under 42G, but higher up in the text.

Now at this point this is where Russia made the comment that there was some text missing. So we now have grafted back that text, which went missing for some reason. I don't know why, which says "In establishing these charges, Member States should try to avoid too great a dissymmetry between the charges applicable in each direction of the same relation."

That is text from the original ITR, and Russia has brought this to our attention, because it is still useful in rates and accounting regime.

So, Chairman, I put that assembly of text to you. It's not new text. It's been relocated and brought back from the dead.

(Laughter)

>> CHAIR: Okay. So the dead is alive now. 6.2.4. It's for approval. Thank you.

>> AUSTRALIA: This next part is a very elegant solution. I must say, I was very pleased that the group came with this.

What they have done is brought text forward under the new heading of "Service telecommunications" from appendix 3. I'll provide you with the new title, 6.4. "Service Telecommunications." If you could accept that, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: I see the floor from Trinidad and Tobago. Please go ahead.

>> TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: Thank you, Chairman.

Just before we leave this section on "collection charges," the two paragraphs currently numbered 6.2.4 and 6.3, both relate to collection charges. I'm proposing that the numbering of 6.2.4 be changed to 6.3, and the current 6.3 be changed to 6.3.1.

To leave the paragraph currently numbered 6.2.4 suggests that it relates to the previous provisions under 6.2. The previous sections under 6.2 relate to accounting. And these two paragraph, 6.2.4, and 6.3, relate to collection charges, which is not accounting.

So I'm saying that these two paragraphs here, right under "Collection charges," should be numbered together in a corresponding fashion.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Sorry, we were not able to attend the meeting. But the third line of 6.2.4, if it is read carefully, "Member States should try to avoid too great a dissymmetry?" What does it mean "Too great a?" That means they can do great dissymmetry but not too great? And what is "A?" Doing what? "Too great a dissymmetry." It is old text but now after 24 years do we need to have a look at it? It seems to be, Chairman, a little bit awkward language. "Should try to avoid too great." That could avoid great, but not too great, and a, is it, is it a correct language use here?

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Sir Horton, can we live without "Too great a"?

>> AUSTRALIA: Chairman, I can live with anything.

(Laughter)

But this is what Russia has brought to our attention. They have used this for 24 years without any problems apparently and brought the text back to continue the use of it.

But, if there is a better way of expressing this, the English reads fairly well to me, and I'm sure that Russia might entertain a change to the words, but it is something that they -- it's tried and true in practice.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Can we delete the three words "Too great a"? I don't think that is going to harm the text. And we will move on for sake of time. Thank you.

Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Now we're making good progress.

>> CHAIR: Sorry, before that, also, the change of the numbering, and I think it's good and it's good that we change that.

>> AUSTRALIA: Yes, Chair. I think in the Americas that is what they would say is a good catch. So congratulations, Trinidad and Tobago, sharp eyes.

Now, Chair, we move down to the next heading, "Service telecommunications." I'm not sure, did we agree to that heading, 6.4?

>> CHAIR: Not yet.

>> AUSTRALIA: I'll present that to you for approval, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: So is there any objection for the heading "Service telecommunications?"

And I see none. Mr. Horton, approved. Thank you.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Now we move to provision 42KB, and Article 6.4.1. And this says that the entities in square brackets "may in principle forego inclusion of service telecommunications in international accounting, under the relevant provisions of the Constitution and Convention of the ITU and the present Regulations, having due regard for the need for reciprocal arrangements. Administrations/Member States, in square brackets, may provide that service telecommunications be free of charge."

Now, those two statements come from the existing, with a slight improvement in the wordage I believe of appendix 3. So that has been brought into the body of the text from that source. And I -- and the wording and the intent is precisely the same as in appendix 3.

A slight change of wording, sorry, "may provide that service telecommunication be free of charge." It used to be "May provide that service telecommunications be provided free of charge." And it was a little bit clumsy. So we felt that "may provide service telecommunications" would be a simple expression of the same thing. So we put that for approval, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Existing 6.4.1, of course the numbering might change now, but 6.4.1 is for the plenary approval. Russian Federation?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Mr. Chairman, we would like to propose a single common denominator and we refer to Administrations, Member States, in square brackets. In other words, what we meant was in the first line there was a reference to "Member States" and we would like that reference to Member States.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Russian Federation, I think we will do that at the end, all these issues. Administration/operating agencies. And we will deal with it at a later stage, editorially, hopefully after having global acceptance to what is going to come next in the Chairman's report.

Okay. Germany?

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Unfortunately, I have to come back to the point of collection charges. Just for clarification, the number of collection charges, is it still 6.2.X or is it 6.3? Because I think in the ad hoc group it was consensus that collection charges should be within 6.2, for structural reasons, to make clear that collection charges belong to the accounting system, accounting rate system, and not on the principle level.

So just to put this to your intention, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: I'll go back to the Chairman of the ad hoc group. Sir Horton?

>> AUSTRALIA: Chairman, that is a valid observation. And we could accept that, that it becomes numerically part of the family above it. But we would like to keep the title in there, so that it stands out that that is what that particular provision is all about. But numbering, I would tend to expect that the Editorial Committee might help us out with this, if we give them this comment.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Trinidad and Tobago again? Please. I think we will go back to the same, maybe the old proposal has to be 6.3, but anyway, let's go and see. Continue Trinidad and Tobago?

>> TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: Yes, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

I would like to repropose the numbering that I proposed earlier. Collection charges is not accounting. And there is a definition that applies to collection charges in the ITRs, an existing definition, which is separate from accounting.

So while I understand the thinking that this is part of the old accounting rate system, it really is not. Because in both commercial agreements and under the accounting rate system, there will be charges applied or levied on customers by operating agencies. So it should not be mixed with accounting. It is traditional that the term "Accounting" relates to the relationships and settlements between carriers, and collection relates to the collection of usage fees from customers.

So it is appropriate that the two provisions that relate to collection charges be grouped together and that they not be mixed with accounting.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I will suggest one thing. Germany, Trinidad and Tobago, on coffee break, you get together and solve this issue, and I think with numbering we can be within that.

So we go back to the text, 6.4.1. I see the floor from Uganda, Japan, Mexico. If it's on numbering, we will take it off line. So if you can please take the request.

Uganda.

>> UGANDA: Thank you, Chair. Chair, we are proposing a minor modification in the text. We don't see the need for the word "Be" before "Free." In other words, Chair, we are proposing it should be "Administrations may provide that service telecommunications free of charge." I don't think we need the word "Be" there.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Japan and then Mexico.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I need some clarification with regard to 6.2.4. The Distinguished Delegate from Iran has proposed some dubious on the word "Too great a", And I wonder if we have agreed to delete or if we maintained -- retained it as it is. Which one is it?

>> CHAIR: The meeting agreed to delete it. Okay. Thank you, Japan. Do you have a problem with that?

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think that sentence allows us a certain sort of dissymmetry, but it didn't allow the excessive dissymmetry. In that way I think the words "too great" still need to be here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I'll take Mexico.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. Please excuse me if my comment isn't on the English version on 6.4.1. It's stated that one can forego the inclusion of service telecommunications, whereas in the -- on the last line, one says that one may provide that service telecommunications and this word "That" means that it might be certain types of services. And I'm wondering if this particular "That" means certain telecommunications services or if that is not the case perhaps it might be a good idea to just eliminate the word "That" so that we can have a sentence that has a general meaning.

Now, obviously, we have read that in the English version. And obviously if we have the Spanish version we can more easily determine what this word "That" in this particular context means.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Let me go back to Japan and I think Japan we have closed the discussion on this subject and are reopening it again.

I know that you have some reason to open it. But the meeting agreed to it. Can you go along with deleting these three words, to start with, Japan? So that we could go back to 6.4.1.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We thought that the Distinguished Delegate from Iran proposed the deletion of the word "a" not "Too great." Is my understanding incorrect?

>> CHAIR: No, it was to delete "Too great a." And is that correct, Iran? I think I was correct. Iran?

>> IRAN: Yes, Chairman. The first important is "a" does not have any clear meaning there.

Now, the second issue, whether it's too great or great is another issue. It's very, very subjective. What does it mean "too great?" Who decides that this is too great or not too great, little too great, medium too great. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So we have dealt with it in the Australian way and we struck it. So, Japan, can we go along with that and move on?

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Okay. It's fine with us.

>> CHAIR: Okay.

Going now to 6.4.1, we have two proposals. One to delete the word "That" in the last sentence. And also to delete "Be" but the sentence will look very odd. And I'll turn to the Chairman of Article 6 for help to see if we can do quickly the change and move on. Chairman?

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chairman. I thank Mexico and Uganda for those two comments. Neither is right, Chairman, but together they are correct. So it should read "May provide service telecommunications free of charge." So we get rid of both "That" and "Be." Thank you for the two contributions. Without the two of you, we would be helpless.

(Laughter)

>> CHAIR: "May provide service telecommunication free of charge"?

>> AUSTRALIA: Yes.

>> CHAIR: It does not sound good to me, but anyway I'll go along with the meeting.

Is there any objection to remove these two words and approve the text? I see no one is asking for the floor. It's agreed.

Next, Mr. Horton?

>> AUSTRALIA: Now, Chairman. We come to 6.4.3, which is a new text here, which is it reads "The general operational, charging and accounting principles applicable to service telecommunications should take into account the relevant recommendations of the" -- and we have the usual square brackets.

This was brought forward from appendix 3 as well.

So I put that to you, Chairman, for acceptance.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. 6.4.2. And it's for the meeting for approval. I see no one is asking for the floor. Thank you. And thank you, Mr. Horton, for all of your work.

Australia?

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chairman. I've not finished yet, Chairman.

This story gets better. Now, what this means is that we can now suppress appendix 3, because we have brought forward what is necessary into the body of the text on the service telecommunications. And the other part of appendix 3 which was privileged telecommunications is no longer required. So we can now suppress appendix 3.

In turn, that has two effects. The other one is that we, in the definition, we can remove the definition of "Privileged telecommunication" in Article 2. And also as I mentioned before, in Article 10, where we had in brackets appendix 1, 2, and 3, we can cross off 3.

That is my proposal, Chairman, that we suppress appendix 3 and we suppress the Article on privileged telecommunication. I put that to the meeting through you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Let's start with the text itself. Is it approved or not? Is there objection to deleting the text, 6.4.2. Agreed. Is there approval to suppress appendix 3 now?

Okay. Approved.

And I just -- I'm jumping to the -- you said the definition. Privilege. Australia, Mr. Horton, I'll go back to you, of course. Article 10, that will be an editorial change.

>> AUSTRALIA: Yes, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: And what is the other editorial change?

>> AUSTRALIA: The other editorial change is to suppress the definition on privileged telecommunication, which appears in Article 2. It's no longer needed because there is no text on it.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. And that's for approval. Thank you.

Sir Horton?

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, this is where you get the steak knives with the free steak knives.

Under "provisions on roaming," I mentioned yesterday, I think it was yesterday -- it seems such a long time ago -- that we suggested that these provisions on roaming be moved to Article 4, and that is going to happen. But I hate to send text with square brackets unnecessarily, Chairman. So if I could indulge your attention on 42M, you see at the end of that provision in square brackets are the words "And the associated conditions."

Now, this means that when we roam into another country, we get information on the tariffs or -- which are free of charge, maybe. But we would also get the associated conditions associated with that. And, Chairman, it's been brought to my attention in between that this could be an awful lot of information on your mobile phone screen if you had pages and pages of conditions which were brought to your attention when you -- when really all you need is the tariff.

So the suggestion, it's my assessment, Chairman, of the information and the advice I received from people, is to recommend to you that "and the associated conditions" be struck out. I'll put that to the meeting through you for -- to sense the mood of the meeting.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: It seems the mood is not... is not -- it's not good. I mean, I have so many requests now coming from the floor. Start with Brazil.

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

We think that the associated conditions are very important information for the user. The user may have the prices and he can decide on the prices. But what about the kinds of calls that he can make when roaming? And what about the limit of download after the -- after that limit, the operator may reduce his download speed? Or what is the limit of megabytes that he can download? And that is very basic information. It doesn't need lots of texts and lots of SMSs to inform the user of this fundamental information. Thank you.

>> IRAN: This issue was discussed at least 45 minutes, and agreed as such. May I suggest that we keep it as it is? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Mexico?

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mexico, too, had understood that it was going to be kept for the reasons already stated by the Distinguished Delegate of Brazil.

We had understood that that was the compromise reached and accepted, and Mexico would like it to be retained. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm not speaking on behalf of the Japanese Government but on behalf of the Chairman on the ad hoc group on roaming. My understanding is that this wording and the associated conditions is the conclusion of the compromise. So I would like you to delete the square brackets.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Can we remove the square brackets and retain "And associated conditions." And I have four requests from the floor. If you can remove the requests.

Canada? Do you still want the floor? Canada?

>> CANADA: Yes, thank you, Chairman.

In our estimation, if you keep that text "And associated conditions" we believe that you need to modify the beginning of the sentence to read "Member States shall endeavor to foster measures." As Dr. Horton has noted, there could be many, many conditions associated with this particular aspect and therefore we think that "Shall endeavor to foster" would be a more appropriate formulation.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And this will be remain -- be aligned with the remaining of the text.

Brazil.

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

We think that the transparency provisions and transparency actions regarding roaming have been put forward by several operators, but they are not symmetric. Meaning that some operators from some countries, they provide information and some operators from other countries don't provide. And we think that there is -- there is a pretty good consensus here that the user needs more information regarding roaming.

And we feel that these are very easily implementable solutions. And we think that the Member States should foster the increase of transparency for the benefit of the users.

And this was pretty consensual text. I don't think it's productive have to change it right now.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. UAE?

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you. We support totally the proposal by Canada and I think it's a good way forward. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Burkina Faso.

>> BURKINA FASO: Thank you, Chair.

We just want to be sure of one thing, that the price mentioned here will be the retail price. There was a concern that some of the prices might be tax free prices or pretax prices, and here we want to be sure that the information being given to the consumer is the retail price. Perhaps we should add, in fact, a specific reference to "Retail price" just to be sure.

>> CHAIR: Luckily, I attended one of these discussions and I saw what happened when we dealt with these words. And it was "Rates" and it was "Tariffs" and now "Prices." I think it's a compromise, Mr. Horton. And I have really -- I would be very nervous to change that now.

Again, I will put the proposal if we can strike out between square brackets, Canada proposed something, Brazil, I don't think that they accepted it. So can we just remove the text -- sorry, can we just remove the square bracket and retain the text? I have Iran, Chile, Republic of Korea. I'll go back to Canada. Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, I do believe that UAE supported the addition that we suggested to added words "Shall endeavor to foster measures." I don't think that should cause too much difficulty. So I would suggest that that be added to this text. And of course we would accept removing the square brackets and keep the text that was formerly in the square brackets. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I'll look at also the comment from other countries. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. With all due respect to Canada and United Arab Emirates, we believe that this text was the subject of serious and in-depth discussions and negotiations. Please, apart from removing the square brackets, please can we retain the text as it was. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Mr. Horton, I'll go back to you, and I need your advice, because I really don't want to have an open to this. I attended one of the sessions, and for one word it was almost two hours. So Mr. Horton?

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, I appreciate your predicament there.

Look, I think it's a very good suggestion. From the mood of the meeting, I sense that we just need to get rid of those square brackets and proceed. Because the object of the exercise is to get rid of square brackets, and I think that the mood of the meeting seems to be to do that, with no other changes.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I have dozens of countries who wanted the floor. And if you don't mind, remove the requests, I'll just put it again.

Can we retain the text as it is, and just remove the square brackets between "Associated conditions?" I know Canada spoke. It was supported by UAE. But I don't see that so far a majority to open the discussion for this text again.

Can you remove your requests?

I still have Chile, Germany, Japan. Chile?

>> CHILE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I believe that we have debated this quite long enough. It was consensus language. And if we add "Should endeavor" I think it weakens it. And I think we're all aware that this is an important issue. And in order to maintain transparency for users.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Germany.

>> GERMANY: I'd like to associate with Canada and indicate that Dr. Horton mentioned that this provision has the potential to overload, especially the SMS message, with all associated conditions. So we had, as pointed out, intensive discussion, reconsiderations with especially mobile network operators, and they told us that this would really be -- goes into maybe disproportionality. So I would ask you to maybe follow the proposal or to give to the floor "Shall endeavor." Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I don't mind. But it has no support. It has support by some. But I have a lot of countries who are opposing that.

Japan? Sorry, Republic of Korea.

>> REPUBLIC OF KOREA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We have some concerns about the associate condition. Because roaming price already covers most of the things, like SMAS price, voice call price, also conditions included within the one SMS. So I think Canada's proposal should endeavor to foster and keep the words between the square brackets could be a compromise solution.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I will tend to do only one thing right now. To agree that we move this to Article 4. And I will have informal discussions with some of the constituents here to try to reach a conclusion. It seems that this issue will take a much longer time than expected, despite the fact that it was discussed at length in the Working Groups, and the Committee, and the ad hoc groups.

Is there any objection to move it to Article 4, as proposed, with the square bracket, between the words "And associated conditions" for the time being, and we take it off line.

Can you take the requests from the system, please?

If you don't mind, we will come back to this issue.

Please.

Brazil?

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

I'm honestly very happy for the countries that have all the information when they travel. But most of us don't get the information that we need. Some of us do but some of us don't. We have the delegates that come from Geneva and they get the information for the price of roaming here. But for the Brazilian delegates, they don't get it. That's why we're proposing this provision, to solve this problem. We don't have any problem with moving to Article 4. But we also think that reopening discussions that were held on four different occasions in the ad hoc group will create a big problem for us.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Is there any objection to move it to Article 4? I have Algeria and United Arab Emirates and others. We don't need to repeat the discussions. I'll just move the text with the square bracket. And I'm not opening the discussion for support or opposition to retaining or deletion, until we take it off line.

Algeria and then Saudi Arabia.

>> ALGERIA: Sir, thank you for giving us the floor. We have appreciated the way that you began this meeting. Each time you reminded us of the difficulties of the debates, and when a compromise was found you have yourself made appeals for us to accept these compromises. And I must testify to the fact that I think it started with Mr.  Seiichi Tsugawa, he was very wise and patient. He let all the delegations speak, including the Canadian delegation and the Canadian delegation has taken part in the discussions. Obviously Canada has the right to open the discussion up again until the text has been agreed. Now it didn't do so during the discussion of the Article, but we're very concerned now that we add brackets as if we didn't have enough brackets already, sir.

We can accept you transferring this to another Article, but you've made proposals to eliminate the brackets, and maintaining the text as is.

So, sir, what we would ask you is to maintain the text as is, while just eliminating the brackets.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. This is exactly what I said. I said that we are just going to move the text and we will retain the text as it looks right now, so that we can have consultation to be able to move forward.

I see that there is an opposition from Canada, UAE, Republic of Korea and some other countries on maintaining this text.

So Saudi Arabia?

>> SAUDIA ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman.

I will make an attempt to try and help the group that will be in charge of the discussions and the consultations.

The paragraph does not stipulate that all details should be sent to the telephone of the subscriber. Can we say that a link should be sent to the phone of the user and through that link the customer, the consumer, will be able to obtain the necessary information? I do not think that the issue is so contentious and I think with the use of such a link then we can solve the problem easily.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And that's a good suggestion. But we will take it off line as well, so that we don't start a debate.

Iraq, Nigeria and Spain. Briefly. Because we will just move to the next issue. Iraq? Iraq?

>> IRAQ: Our apologies, Chairman, we did not ask for the floor.

>> CHAIR: Nigeria?

>> NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We have listened to this discussion with keen interest. There is one thing I want to let this meeting understand. Any time a user gets into another country, he is loaded with so many advertisements, promotions, and all kinds of text messages that he does not require.

This particular request is of great importance for a user to be able to know the kind of charges that he will be paying.

So Nigeria feels that the text as it is, Mr. Chairman, should not be modified. Instead, we should just remove the square brackets and leave it the way it is.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Spain, do you have any objection to, rather than getting into the discussion, just move the text and we will take it off line if you don't mind for the sake of the meeting?

I think every time I give the floor to Administration, we go through the same debate.

Spain, I see UK, Brazil, I'll give the floor to Spain and then... try to move on. Spain?

>> SPAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We wish to thank the interest expressed in this issue and the debate. We do agree with Brazil that transparency is vital for each user. And we believe that the conditions are an integral part of the information that the user should receive.

We also share the view of Germany. The prudence as to an excess of information, which could confuse the user.

So we would suggest that we add the relevant conditions, relevant which would be the amount of traffic beyond which the speed would be limited, and so on.

As to other proposals, what is the cost is what concerns the user. What is the final cost? Detailed pricing I think would be wise, but not essential. It is an additional thing. But we also believe that a link is not a good idea because it could lead to additional roaming costs. It wouldn't work for everybody.

I think that a brief SMS information is the best way to deal with it.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. It's time for us to take a coffee break. I have UK and Brazil. And if you don't mind, we will go to this corner and quickly talk about it. Hopefully it will lead to a solution. But we will take a coffee break right now and come back in 15 minutes.

Thank you very much.

(Break)

(Return at 20:15)

>> Ladies and gentlemen, please take your seats. We're about to begin. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Good evening. And let's start where we have ended before the break.

I'll give the floor to Japan, who I saw leading the discussion on the same issue which was dealt with between square brackets, and I hope Japan you have reached a conclusion.

>> JAPAN: Thank you. As the Chairman of the ad hoc group on roaming issues, I'm very pleased to report back to you the conclusion of this informal gathering.

We have agreed to put -- insert the word "Relevant" between "Associated" and "Conditions" and we have agreed to delete the square bracket.

Thank you very much for your patience, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Great.

So as you might have heard, the small informal gathering that was on the corner agreed to put the word "Relevant" between "Associated" and "Conditions" and remove the square bracket. So is there any objection to doing that? Thank you.

And thank you, Japan, for all the work you saved us from entering into a discussion. And this discussion has ended --

(Applause)

Yes.

-- has finally ended, after hours and hours of discussion on the same subject.

Sir Horton, can you advise us now which provisions should move to Article 4?

>> AUSTRALIA: Yes, Chairman. And thank you for your attention to that small item. It's good to get rid of square brackets any time.

There are four provisions which now can be moved to Article 4, that is 42M, N, O, and P. So that is what I would suggest, Chairman.

And while I've got the floor, I may bring to your attention that we had a re-discussion on the numbering of provisions. And my colleagues, who were part of the group which brought these solutions to us, together with the Secretariat, confirmed that the numbering of these Articles is correct the way it is in this document.

So we don't need to worry you any further on numbering, I believe, Chairman. And they discussed that with Trinidad and Tobago, who now agree.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Can we take 42N, 42O, and 42P, to start with, as approval and then we will take the entire four provisions to Article 4. Is there any objection? There are no square brackets. It's clean text.

Thank you.

And can we move them now to Article 4. Thank you.

And thanks, Sir Chairman of the ad hoc group that deals with Article 6.

Now we move to the report coming from the ad hoc group that deals with nondiscriminatory access to telecommunication services. And I give the floor now to South Africa to report.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, Chair.

We met this afternoon as an ad hoc group. We looked at proposed text for the Regulations, and we also gave brief consideration to a resolution. Colleagues decided that they did not want to pursue the resolution. There was no agreement, either, about the proposed text for the Regulations. So we do have some text. We did discuss it. But it is entirely in square brackets, in total and in parts, Chairperson.

The text is available DT/51, Article 3.7.

Thank you, Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. United Arab Emirates is asking for the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman, and good evening everyone.

I had a question about document 45 revision 2. I don't know if it was intentionally or unintentionally, but I think you skipped the part about other provisions, and I just wanted to know when are you planning to discuss this? And in here I'm speaking about page 5, page 5 of the document 45 revision 2. We had a number of at least from three regions there has been proposals on some important provisions in this regard, and we just wanted to know are you planning to discuss this and when are you going to open the discussions on this?

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We are taking these provisions in document 51, the consolidated document, where we will discuss them when we reach them, in order to try to minimize the square brackets or remove the square brackets or remove provisions and reach to an agreement.

Going back to South Africa. I just wanted to sense the feel of the meeting if there is any hope to talk about it, or you entirely left it to a seconded text between square brackets in document 51. South Africa?

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Chairperson, yes, we are bringing the text to plenary. We did not resolve any consensus, so it's really in your hands, Chairperson. The brackets cover the whole of the text and parts of the text.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you.

If there is no objection, can we take this issue when we deal with document DT/51? I see no objection. Thank you.

Now we are on agenda item 2 of plenary. I want you to go to document 50. There is one draft new resolution that we can agree, and that is draft new resolution on global harmonized national number for access to emergency services. And that is on page 17 of document 50. There is no square brackets on this and we can proceed with it and proceed with the approval.

I'll give you a few seconds to locate document 50 and go to the last page for consideration. The title of the new resolution is "global harmonized national number for access to emergency services."

Okay. So the new resolution is put forward for approval. United Arab Emirates?

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman. I'm actually trying to get to the documents. I'm so sorry, opening a lot of documents, but I just -- could you just repeat which document is this resolution? I'm sorry. It's -- it was not clear to me that you're going to move to that document, so I was trying to upload this real quick. If you can give me a minute. Just repeat which document?

>> CHAIR: Document 50. Last page.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman.

We only had one comment about that "recognizing B," and it says that I think either we try to improve the language or just strike out "Recognizing B," which says that it's not currently possible. So I'm not sure if this is actually a language that should be in that. Maybe we can find better language, more positive language.

>> CHAIR: Can you live with "Considering B?" Because there is a lot of work put into this, and we don't want to come to the plenary with a few -- changing a few words. And since it's written "recognizing" -- can you live with it?

UAE?

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Can we live without it? That is probably the better question. Can we just delete that?

>> CHAIR: Can we live with it? Because I see the draft new resolution. One of the reasons I pull it is because it has the clean text, no square brackets, and can proceed for approval and to Editorial Committee to produce a text.

And it's... so. Is there any objection on this draft new resolution? Iran?

>> IRAN: I thank you, Chairman. Perhaps I'm too slow or you're too fast. Document 50, contribution 50, right? And which page, please, kindly? If possible.

>> CHAIR: The last page. Page 17. Draft new resolution on global harmonized national number for access to emergency services. This document came from the Chairman of Committee 5.

There is one element of this document that we really need to take and that's the approval of this resolution. Cameroon?

>> CAMEROON: Thank you, Chair. There is a problem, an editorial problem here. The title says "global harmonized national number for access to emergency services," but later we're talking more about a unique emergency number. So I think it might be a good idea to harmonize the language in the title with the text.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Do you have a proposal? Sorry, I was trying to move the channels and I could not catch half of what you said.

I know that you want to harmonize the title with the text. But can you propose the title, so that I can take it?

I'll move to Iran and then to Algeria and then come back.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

I opened document 50 and page 18. Not 17. The draft resolution, global harmonization, harmonized national number for access to emergency service. Where is the "considering" that the Distinguished Delegate of the United Arab Emirates referred to? There is no "Considering" here.

>> CHAIR: He was talking about "Recognizing B"

Algeria?

>> ALGERIA: Mr. Chairman, thank you for giving me the floor. I've been reading with a great deal of attention and concentrating on the "recognizing" under b). Now, if we assume that in four years we re-read this resolution and we realize that maybe eight years will go by before we come back to the ITRs. Now in four years, it may be possible to put in place this number. And the problem is that in the resolution we will still have this language saying that it's not possible currently to put in place this kind of number.

And yet we need a resolution that can pass the test of time. At least it needs to be valid for a few years moving forward. So if you -- if we read b) item, all I'm asking myself is that the -- if the delegate from the UAE is not right and we do support him, sir. If we don't have any objections, sir, what we would suggest is also too delete b). Maybe it's a bit presumptuous on our part right now to propose language, but I think that it might be a good idea to deal with this issue and this will help us to better understand the resolution.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: I just wanted to follow up on the suggestion of Cameroon. If we remove "National" from the title, that might address the issue that I was raising about the discrepancy between the title and the text.

Thank you, Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. South Africa.

UK?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: I speak not as the UK but as Vice Chair of the Study Group 2 in the ITU-T sector. I will address two issues, if I may. First the title and then "Is not currently possible" under "Recognizing that."

The reason the title is there is because you have the concept of global numbers. These are assigned and managed by the ITU. One such example is the free phone service number behind country code 800. That is a global number. We are not talking global numbers here. We're trying to globally harmonize a national number for access to emergency services.

So if there is a discrepancy between the title and the next, I would suggest that you copy the title into the text. It does make sense for numbering experts.

With regards to "Recognizing that B" specifically is not currently possible."

In the discussions that we had in both the ad hoc group and in the Working Group and that we have had in Study Group 2, it is not currently possible to harmonize national numbers globally for access to emergency services. With 193 Member States, each managing their own numbering space in their own way, these emergency access numbers have been allocated in different ways in the countries. And it is not currently possible and it probably will take, if it can be done at all, many, many years to identify one such number.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Perhaps there were two ways to deal with this issue. The first one is simple. We put the full stop after "service" and delete everything. "Due to technical" and so on and so forth is not available now, as the reason given by Algeria. This is one option.

The other option is to take advantage of what was said in Study Group 2 and put that content in the footnote, that at the time -- whatever, November, December, December -- I forgot all the dates, December 2012, there is no single number available, as a footnote. That we will refer to this state. Otherwise after two years it has no meaning.

These are two solutions that I suggest. Simply delete the portion relating the "due to the" -- and so on. And second put that one in the footnote.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Lebanon?

>> LEBANON: We support what has been proposed by --

(No English interpretation) (?) -- to delete B under "recognizing." Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Sudan?

>> SUDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to go along the same lines as said by the Honorable delegate from Iran, but instead of just stopping at "Services," because we need the third spot to be there, and then we may say "When technically feasible or possible."

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Armenia?

>> ARMENIA: Thank you, sir.

We support what was said with regard to the deletion of "recognizing B."

The construction here in this resolution is a bit strange. We have a de facto "recognizing A," which should be -- it should be "Considering" in reality. And in resolutions of this high level, I have never had a "recognizing" recommendation. (?)

So what I would propose is this. A should be "Considering" and C should be "Noting." "Considering," and then "noting," and then finally after that, the resolved section. This would be a logical progression.

Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. If we can make quick suggestions. But to start with, is there any objection to aligning the title with the text inside, as suggested by the Vice Chair of Study Group 2? I think he has got a good suggestion here.

Thank you.

On "Recognizing that" and if you can follow me, there is a proposal to delete the word "Although." So the sentence will start "It is desirable to have a global telephone" and of course we have to align it "national number for emergency services." We need to delete "Due to current" and we say "When technically feasible." And we stop at that. So the entire sentence would read: "It is desirable to have a global telephone national number for emergency services when technically feasible."

Is that acceptable?

UAE.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: As we heard, we will take the title and put it there. "Global harmonized national number for access to emergency services." So we will just take the title and put it in there, rather than saying technology number like telephone or other things. So we just mention the title and we put it there.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: So we will copy the title. And then we will end it with "When technically feasible."

Okay? I see no objection. Can we go along with now approving the draft new resolution?

Thank you. It's approved.

I want you now to go to DT/50. And that is the famous resolution which came from Ghana.

So Saudi Arabia you have the floor.

>> SAUDIA ARABIA: Please allow me, Mr. Chairperson, to come back once again to "recognizing B." We did state "When technically feasible" but this is not quite delineated and not quite clear.

We know, for example, in Europe there is a number in each country and it is used at the level of Europe. From a technical point of view, this is feasible. But there are maybe problems at the level of national numbers, because such numbers cannot be used as the ones that are used either in Europe or in the United States. And this is not related to technical matters.

But if we left the sentence by saying "When technically feasible" it might not be quite appropriate.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Basically, you're suggesting to remove -- okay. Let me try that again.

And please, Panama and Iran can remove the requests. Is there any objection to recognizing that and -- sorry. And little b)?

United Kingdom, Vice Chair of Study Group 2, please.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. The Distinguished Delegate from UAE is quite correct. There is a harmonized number within Europe. This is a harmonized national number. It is taken from each of the national numbering plans of the countries concerned. It took some years to identify and to implement, and initially when implemented it was not available in all countries. It required a number change.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I'll take it as you have no objection to remove "Recognizing that b)."

Okay.

So that's agreed to remove the b) and the resolution is approved.

Thank you.

Before we get into document DT/50, I just wanted to do some housekeeping. We will try -- we will finish the meeting at 9:30, so that we will allow Administrations to have rest today. And we will start tomorrow plenary from 9:30, after a very long night yesterday.

So I'll give the floor now to Ghana, to give us a presentation about the progress on DT/50. Hopefully we will have an agreement on that resolution.

>> GHANA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good evening to Distinguished Delegates. Mr. Chairman, this draft resolution seeks to bring to the attention of this conference the need to review the ITRs on a more regular basis than almost a quarter of a century, since it was first published. And basically it says it gives a range of a timeline to be considered by the 2014 plenipotentiary for the ITRs to be renewed every 8 to 12 years. It's just a suggestion. And we have made references to the relevant Articles of the ITU Constitution and provisions of the ITU Convention. That seeks to follow the regular -- the way documents or things are reviewed in the ITU Committee, taking into consideration the financial considerations.

However, when you come to the resolved section, where we really wanted to make our point, we had two options. Now, option 1 indicates that resolves 1, to revise the ITRs regularly. For example, every eight to twelve years in parentheses. This is only -- we're not instructing plenipotentiary or anything, just to give them a guide of a timeframe that we are looking for. And to invite the 2014 plenipotentiary conference to consider this resolution and to take necessary actions as appropriate, taking into account proposals from Member States in this regard. So option 1 gives a time range and gives the plenipotentiary freehand to do what is necessary.

Now, option 2 says that "To invite 2014 plenipotentiary to review and consider this resolution and to take action as appropriate, if necessary, to convene on a regular basis a conference to revise ITRs, taking into account the financial implications for the union."

Mr. Chairman, there were a little bit of arguments back and forth on these two options. Those of us in Ghana believe that option 1 actually brings forward the intent of this resolution. We believe that option 2 continues to maintain this activity in a rather vague timeframe, which we're not too happy. But we decided that we will bring it to the conference for others to look at it and help us make a decision. That is why the "resolved" section is in square brackets.

If you come to the "instruct" section, we have "instruct the Secretary-General to bring this resolution to the attention of plenipotentiary. "

Instruct 2, "to provide information to enable the plenipotentiary conference to consider the cost implications of convening WCIT."

So I believe that we can easily get rid of option 2 and thereby remove the square brackets in that resolved section.

But when you look at "Instructs", there is another instructs we can put in there for the Secretary-General and directors of the bureau to identify relevant and present telecommunication issues which should be discussed with a view towards incorporation in the ITRs, and report to the plenipotentiary conference on that matter.

Mr. Chairman, we had a list of items that were suggested to be looked at, but upon wise counsel from Members who participated we decided that we would put this phrase in there to allow plenipotentiary to decide what items need to be considered when they are looking at the consideration of the ITRs. So that is why it is in square brackets.

Now, if it is acceptable, then it can move to become -- "Instruct the Secretary-General 3," so that the Secretary-General does everything. So we don't have to instruct the Secretary-General and the directors of bureau to do this activity.

And here we invite Member States also to contribute to the work outlined in this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that some of the difficulties and anxieties we are facing during this conference is the fact that the ITRs have been left for too long to be reviewed. And we believe if we can put some language coming out of this conference to plenipot, at least the issue of regular review will become something that has to be considered. So we don't get -- find ourselves in this situation.

I believe that -- we believe that if we look at the ITRs every eight to twelve years, it would have been stable enough. And with the pace of telecoms and technology, a range of eight to twelve years is a long time to be called "Stable."

So we believe we shouldn't leave everything vague. We should put some timeframe and invite plenipot to consider this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I submit this for your kind consideration, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Ghana.

Ghana, I just wanted to ask you a question. Have you seen any synergy between option 1 and option 2, or there were very polarized positions whether to even recommend? Because it says here to revise the ITRs regularly. And, for example, you are saying that. And to recommend to plenipotentiary to revise, it's basically what you recommend. And then marry the two options, and of course the second option has got cost implications, financial implications in it, but I think I don't see the big issue.

Couldn't you marry the two together?

>> GHANA: Mr. Chairman, if you look at the document that we have made references to, and also "Instructs Secretary-General," the issue of costs is there. So we thought that option 2 was really not necessary, because we have already covered the issue of the cost implications to ITU when doing such a review.

But it was insisted that we put specific language in option 2 for this. But we thought maybe the conference can look at it. And further deliberation with one, the Administration who suggested this option, seemed to me that they probably would look at it, could look at it again, the time, instead of leaving it without any time range, could look at it again. But where the time range appears perhaps could be somewhere else. And we thought we should bring it for further consideration.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

I think we can -- I think this resolution needs some work. And let me -- I mean, adding the financial implications is something that I don't see of a major issue. I think the main element out of option 1 is the time. And to start with -- to revise the ITRs regularly, I think we need to hold the World Conference on International Telecommunication and then that conference can decide whether to revise or not to revise. I think that's important and it's an important element.

But let's start with the notion if there is an acceptable way forward to have the notion of, and we need to work on the text later on, the notion of having -- or to recommend holding WCIT regularly and an example of eight to twelve years.

I see Republic of Korea and Jordan.

>> REPUBLIC OF KOREA: Thank you. We would like to indicate our support to have the resolution. The notion you put to us, we preferred the regular revision of ITR, because there are three -- there are two main reasons. Republic of Korea has difficulties to find competent experts who were involved in ITR back in 1988. Some of them already passed away, and some of them are already retired. So it's very hard for the person who really, really memorizes all of these discussions. That's a simple reason, one of the simple reasons, Mr. Chairman. And then I do believe most of ITU Member States had similar difficulties. Another reason that we found is that national legislation requires a kind of milestone not only taking into account domestic and International technology, evolving environments, but also taking into account general principles and guidelines embedded by this ITR.So ITR needs to acknowledge the future development in terms of setting up high level principles.

Regarding the option 1 and 2, I think we can combine together. When I look at option 2, at the second line "To convene on a regular basis" and then put parentheses, "for example, 8 to 12 years," I do acknowledge there is some reference for the financial implication for the union, but it combines option 1 and 2 for both parties.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I have six, seven asking for the floor. I would limit the discussion to one minute each. And move forward on this. Jordan?

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Very briefly, we support the adoption of this draft resolution. We are for a periodic revision of these Regulations. And I think eight years is a very reasonable period for a periodic review of the Regulations.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. India?

>> INDIA: Mr. Chairman, we support these resolutions. And number two, in place of "Regularly" do you have an idea of "regularly?" We can put "periodically," and keeping in mind the fact that the technology basis is quite -- quite -- technology changes very frequently. And the half-life period of technology is about 4 years. From the beginning, the ITR and the WCIT, eight years seems to be logical and reasonable. Therefore, we propose it can be eight years. And we, in short, we support this proposal.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. The list is growing. South Africa.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: I don't have much to add, Chairperson, from the excellent inputs that have already been made. I would support the regular review of the ITRs, and Ghana's initiative in this regard.

24 years was much too long. It's difficult under the current procedures to hold this meeting, so I think this resolution will be of a lot of assistance. Thank you, Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Guyana, briefly, please.

>> GUYANA: Thank you, we believe that the ITRs should be reviewed periodically, so in line I think with Jordan and India, maybe replace "periodic" with "Regular review." That might be a little more acceptable. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Saudi Arabia?

>> SAUDIA ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman.

We also support the draft resolution. We also support the view that we have a periodic review of the Regulations, and eight years seems to be reasonable enough for us.

We also support your views on a possible merger between both proposals or both options, and we have a view and I will read my proposal in English.

"And consider this resolution and to take necessary action to convene on a regular basis, between brackets eight years, a conference to revise ITR, taking into account the financial implications for the union."

>> CHAIR: I would like you to read the proposal, but with dictation speed, please.

>> SAUDIA ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. I will read the text in dictation speed.

The proposal to merge both options as follows, in English. "To invite the 2012 plenipotentiary conference to review and consider this resolution and to take action, to take necessary action to convene on a regular basis, between brackets eight years, a conference to revise ITR, taking into account the financial implications for the union."

2014. Sorry. "To invite the 2014 plenipotentiary conference."

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

I have almost ten countries asking for the floor. And I think I have a majority here saying that we are in support of this. And I'm sure you had a very lengthy discussion on how many years and what should be the case.

I'll take, if that is acceptable, I have ten, I'll take at least -- because I have 15 minutes to go. I'll take -- if there is a concrete suggestion from administrations that I have, they are asking for the floor, please stay. If not, because I want to send it back to Ghana to at least try to merge the text and come up with language that saves the time from plenary and rather than go into drafting. And we have seen also a proposal coming from Saudi Arabia. I think it was -- it's a nice proposal. It can bring a lot of this text together.

Iran and then United States. Iraq.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, we support the proposal. With respect to eight years or twelve years, that is an issue for the -- required for the decision by colleagues.

However, Chairman, you said or it was said that this resolution should not resolve that ITRs to be revised. In fact, it must have an operative part. If it does not have an operative part, it will be a statement, a statement that this is the matter and conference that for the 2014 plenipotentiary to consider. You have to resolve something. Perhaps the current wording may need to be changed. "Resolves that ITR should be regularly revised," and then take any of the two part, either "inviting" from option 1 or "invites" from option 2. But "invite" from option 1 was simpler, therefore it required some sort of editing.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United States?

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

Yes, we would also agree that there should be a "resolves." We agree with our colleague Mr. Arasteh that we should have a resolves that takes an action. And the "review periodically," we would prefer the term "Periodically" would be an approach that we would accept or we would support.

Mr. Chairman, we add only one caution, and that is that we're a bit concerned about adding an explicit number of years. It may very well be that the time appropriate for a conference may fall beyond eight years. It may fall beyond twelve years. We believe that there should be some opportunity for the plenipotentiary as it reviews the strategic plan of the union, as it reviews the operational plans of the union, of the sectors, to take that all into consideration to then to make a considered judgment as to when a next review of the ITRs should be undertaken.

So, Mr. Chairman, we agree with colleagues in perhaps taking option 1 is the simplest, and we would suggest "Periodically." But, Mr. Chairman, we would add caution that we don't give a specific number of years. Let the plenipotentiary decide that, in full consideration of all the elements that the plenipotentiary must consider.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Iraq. And I have a long list and I really need to move forward and suggest something. So I'll take Iraq.

>> IRAQ: Thank you, Chairman.

The Iraqi Administration is of the view that we need a predetermined period for holding a WCIT to review the Regulations, and we support the first option. And we also support the views expressed by my colleagues from Iran and the United States on this issue.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Ghana, I'll turn it back to you. And I think you have heard. There is some element of agreement for some of the wordings. I'll send it back if you can, according to the time. We have plenary tomorrow at 9:30. If you can meet earlier than that and try to reach to a consensus and redraft of the -- of -- merge the two options under one. I don't think that adding "Financial implications" is of a bigger issue. I think we need to get into the substance of the resolution and agree on the substance of the resolution on the best way forward.

So if you don't mind, I have close to ten Administrations asking for the floor. And if you don't mind, defer that to the meeting that will be held with the Chairman from Ghana, to review this resolution.

Can you take the requests from the floor? Or if you have an objection to my way forward... I still have Administrations asking for the floor.

China and then Oman. China?

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chinese delegation supports this proposal on "regular" or "periodic revision" or "review" of the ITR. We agree with your proposal combining the two options into a single text.

In the current option 1, we would like to make a change at the moment, for resolved 1. "Revise ITR regularly." We would like to add one word "to review and revise ITR regularly," to add another verb, "Review."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

So, Ghana, I have to ask if you can try to reach to consensus on this resolution and come back to us in the plenary.

Now we have agenda item number 3 and DT/51. I believe now it is published.

I just wanted to introduce this document. Before prejudging, I just wanted to say that the document requires further small editorial refine. What we have done is we have met yesterday night -- and I want to thank everybody who came to the meeting. We stayed, you know, until late hour in the morning, where we have made progress. And today in the morning we also met and we had a smaller group as well to look into the issue. And we came to the conclusions that you see in this document.

What has been done afterwards is we have taken all the elements of agreement in the meeting and put it in the first ITR draft, which you see in front of you. Of course, we need to capture the approvals that we have done today for Article 6. Of course there is -- there is a few pending, but we have captured a few things. We moved a few articles. Also, we have also the approval for Article 10, which we need to update this document.

And it has -- it captures somehow a compromise text. We intentionally kept the entire ITRs between square brackets, so you can see that, and we have left the text that we have agreement on within the ITRs without square brackets. And we kept the discussions -- we kept square brackets between the provisions that we have discussed and it has clean text. And we hope that we take that and start the approval process.

I will not take this document immediately, because I would love to take the second reading of document 59. We will update the document as it stands, because it has got a lot of editorial mistakes that we have captured after seeing the document, and we want to reflect exactly what happened in the group.

Iran and then I'll continue. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you mention, you want to discuss the document later. However, we found that there are some editorial corrections to be made with respect to those parts that you have not approved at plenary. Several editorial corrections, Chairman.

First of all, any changes to the text that currently is in ITR and you have not approved must be shown with the revision mark. I've seen some deletions without the mark and I've seen some revisions without the revision mark. So that should be quite clear.

And then also other revisions, for instance, paragraph 2.4, we have administrative council, IBRV, Director of the Committee, these are changes, Chairman, that need to be corrected. It has it in the proposal. So sorry at this late hour, but there is a need that somebody look at this document carefully and carry forward the material changes, in particular the revision marks, Chairman.

Any change which has been to the existing ITR and has not yet been approved by your plenary must be shown with the revision marks.

And I thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: We will do that. The only thing is that we have received it really, really late. And even the translators are -- have been working very, very hard to produce this document in six languages, and I really appreciate what the Secretariat did. And that's one of the reasons why it's better to defer the treatment of this document until tomorrow to make changes.

Now, there are a few things which we need also help on, Mr. Horton. Appendix 1 and 2, if you can stay, because there are a lot of square brackets that if we can clear and we need his help to, again, to help us in clearing square brackets in appendix 1 and 2.

I will give the floor now to the Secretary-General, please.

>> SECRETARY-GENERAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to thank all the participants for a very strong will of collaboration and compromise that has prevailed along this conference. And I would like just simply to ask you to please continue that.

We are close to the end, and it's looking good. I'm very much impressed with so many things.

Just a few minutes ago, we were sitting in this room and there was a delegate from Iraq take the floor and supporting both the United States and Iran.

This is ITU. This is the ITU that I know. And I would like really to thank all of you for that spirit of cooperation.

(Applause)

Yes.

Please, let's continue. Let's continue. We have a lot of things to do tomorrow. A lot of serious things that are important for our countries, for generations of people that we're dealing with, and we have to take them very seriously and to do it right. And I think we're all committed for that.

This little Working Group that I personally chaired today was a testimony of your commitment to compromises, and I would really like you to continue so. So please thank you very much. And have a very lovely evening.

Thank you.

(Applause)

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And I wanted to extend thanks to all the regional groups and their heads. They have stayed with us late and the delegations who came, and one thing we can get out of it is regardless of differences, I think we have a lot to share. That's very, very important. And I think we have a breakthrough and we have the first, we can say that we have the first draft of the ITRs, and that is something that we all should be proud of. And we should maintain this level of spirit in order to go through it for the first time tomorrow, and hopefully agree to remove the square brackets and have a document that we can go through first and second reading that will be approved by all of you and have something to be signed on Friday.

I have the floor from Saudi Arabia. And I need the interpreters to stay with me for five minutes, if possible.

>> INTERPRETER: Yes, Chairman. You can have ten minutes.

(Laughter)

(Applause)

>> CHAIR: You can see even interpreters... Saudi Arabia and then UK.

>> SAUDIA ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman.

At the outset I would like to thank you personally and of course the Secretary-General for your extensive efforts, efforts that have been recognized in order to achieve consensus amongst us all.

Before we bring this meeting to a close, I wanted to raise a question about document 51. Of course, this document is not going to be discussed tonight. However, I have noticed that item 3.8 had been placed between two brackets when we know that the whole document from the beginning to the end is between square brackets.

If I'm not mistaken, in our last meeting on this issue, we had agreed to remove the square brackets. And this has confused me a little bit. I hope that there is an error in the drafting of the document or in the production of the document. I believe that the whole document or the whole set of Regulations is between square brackets and not that item in particular.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

We need to modify all the brackets in any case, but we have to, since we have done it in a smaller group, we have to present it for plenary between square brackets. Plenary will approve it. We will remove square brackets and hopefully tomorrow we will agree to it.

But we cannot remove the square brackets immediately from that smaller group.

>> SAUDIA ARABIA: (No translation)

Thank you, sir.

If I've understood correctly, the entire text is in brackets. Most of the text was dealt with today in this evening's meeting, and we agreed to text under the direction of the Secretary-General. So I don't understand why this text in particular, this paragraph in particular, is in brackets when the text, the general text, is in brackets.

So today around 3.8, I don't really understand why these brackets are still around 3.8, since we have to come back to it tomorrow.

>> CHAIR: We have a lot of missing, as well, brackets that we need to deal with. So if you can bear with us until tomorrow and we will -- the Secretariat has tried very hard to reflect everything that we have been doing. It's not in particular about 3.8 or 3.7 or, you know, other text.

But since there has been an agreement on many of the texts here, or the majority of the texts, and we have modified that, but we require -- the Secretariat and myself require more time to come and filter this document to make sure that it has got exact reflection. Otherwise, I was prejudging and I was telling the Secretariat that we might get into the plenary and we will get into these questions and discussions on why the square bracket is here and why not, and so on and so forth. So I will kindly ask you to bear with us until we make the revision. There has been an overall compromise on major issues. And that was done. And that will be presented and I hope that the plenary will approve that compromise in its entirety.

UK, Canada, and then Algeria.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chairman.

My delegation has come to Dubai ready to work for a positive outcome. We have been very encouraged by the progress that has been made here in the last 24 hours. Through your tireless efforts and with dedicated assistants of the Secretary-General, and the Secretariat, we have made good progress towards ITRs that we can all work with.

I want to thank other Member States and regions for their efforts to come to compromise, and that's the positive spirit my delegation has approved of our collective work.

We now have this consolidated text. And having worked on this with you, there is much in this that we will be happy to support. We do, however, just need a little time to consider the document in its entirety and its full context. We're hopeful this text puts us in a good position to complete our work successfully. But if we could just beg you to allow us to sleep on it whilst our capitalists consider and possibly to just give us a little more time in the morning, we will come back to you fresh and ready to work tomorrow.

Thank you very much, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I'm not going to start the considerations of this document right away. I'm going to -- we will take it. We need to update it. We need to correct a lot of errors that are reflected in this document, and issue a new rev, where it will cover all the issues that we had and all the discussions that we had even in the smaller group.

Canada and then Algeria, Bulgaria.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, just one point with regard to the draft resolution that was presented by the Chairman of Committee 5 concerning the periodicity of the future WCIT. It was mentioned that there would be a meeting at some point. Exactly when will that meeting be held? There is a suggestion of perhaps tomorrow morning, but if you can confirm that, we would appreciate it.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: We can announce it's going to be 8:30 and we will find a room and display it to the -- on the screens.

Algeria?

>> ALGERIA: Yes, thank you, Chair.

Yes. Obviously we agree with all of the positive comments made to you, sir. And we also think -- well, we have faith in your ability to help us produce an acceptable document. But having said all of that, we think that the remark made by the delegate of Saudi Arabia is valid concerning 3.8. Just take note of that, so that this item is dealt with appropriately.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, I'll take note of it. Bulgaria?

>> BULGARIA: Thank you for the good spirit. I'm using my -- obviously my language skills in Arabic are not very good. But we also would like to ask you to consider giving us some more time. We are two hours ahead of Sophia. We need to talk to them, and hopefully we will do it tomorrow morning. We got feedback from them because of the time zone difference. But it's good to, as our colleague from the UK said, and they are four hours behind Dubai, to give us some time in the morning to go through the text, see whether they are responding to the Bulgarian legislation, and they are still in kind of a raw format. We hope that the next version will be better.

As for a lot of details which the distinguished colleagues from other countries mentioned, whether there are square brackets or not, we leave that up to you.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

So we will modify the document, we will reflect all the factual issues that happened. There has been, as I said before, in the room and thanks to everybody, a compromise. And that's what is reflecting right now in this document. And hopefully it will be presented for consideration tomorrow and we will reflect also -- we will amend all appendices of the resolutions. And we hope that we get all the elements in order to have, you know, a complete document I would say.

With that, we -- I wanted to consider document 59. It will take a minute for the second read. It's the pink document. Document 59. It's a resolution, special measures for landlocked developing countries. And I'll take the resolution in its entirety for approval by the plenary.

Is there any objection to approve the resolution?

I see none. Thank you very much.

And Mr. Horton's group will meet now on appendix 1 and 2, and it will take place in room C, to clear out the -- the square brackets in appendix 1 and 2.

Thank you very much.

And have a good evening. And we will see you tomorrow morning at 9:30.

The meeting is adjourned.

(Applause)

(End of meeting, 21:36)
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