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>> CHAIR: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, please begin to take your seats. We will start in a minute. Thank you.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to welcome you to the afternoon plenary meeting. Just for everyone to plan, we will finish at 5:30 sharp, where we will have our sitting committee meeting and then we'll reconvene plenary at 6:30. That's for housekeeping.

And let me start briefly and cautiously. When we have ended the discussion on moving to start with, moving the footnote, and to our provision in 1.1, I had this little group on stage, with all regional presentations here. And to start with, there was a consensus to move the provision from a footnote to a provision. And capitalizing on Panama's proposal and I will call it Panama proposal now, to have a sentence after the end of little "a." And the second sentence will read as follows: These regulations also set rules applicable to those Operating Agencies, authorized or recognized by a Member State to establish, operate, and engage in International Telecommunication Services to the public referred to here after as authorized Operating Agencies.

I will read it again. These regulations also set rules applicable to those Operating Agencies authorized or recognized by a Member State to establish, operate, and engage in international telecommunication services to the public, referred to hereafter as authorized Operating Agencies.

Now, if we have agreement on this text to be put after the first sentence of little a of 1.1, we will then ‑‑ and we will take it offline, replace Operating Agencies or agencies everywhere in the text, and replace it with authorized Operating Agencies. So that's the proposal and I'm putting it to the plenary. Is there any objection to this proposal?

United States and then Iran.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon all colleagues. Mr. Chairman, first of all, we wish to express our appreciation to you for conducting this group and for finding a compromise on this issue. Mr. Chairman, we must indicate, however, that while we are extremely close and your efforts have brought a great deal forward for us to welcome, there is one word that has become required for us in this document, and that is correspondence. Public correspondence is ‑‑ as our colleague from Botswana pointed out, is very clearly defined in the constitution, and it's a term that would have broad acceptability within our regulatory system and with other, we believe, regulatory systems. Let me be very specific, Mr. Chairman, because I think it's clear what the difference is. If you simply use public, public as defined in the ITRs is the following, in these regulations, the public is used in the sense of the population, including governmental and legal bodies. Mr. Chairman, that is very clearly a difficulty for this delegation and we believe for a number of delegations. Government entities providing services cannot be included in the definitions as we would use them in the ITRs.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, private networks cannot be included and we do not have confidence that by simply using public we have also given them exemption from these ITRs. We are being very frank with colleagues. We are being frank, because, Mr. Chairman, this is a fundamental issue for this delegation. So one word is required, and that is correspondence. And we would, again, express our appreciation to you, and to others and we believe that in indicating that, as we looked at the whole document, great progress has been made as well as the fact that great compromises have been made, but, Mr. Chairman, sometimes we have to be honest with our colleagues, and that is a term that's required. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We agree to the consensus which has emerged. We have discussed in the committee coordination meeting and there's a very, very small, I call them improvement. We suggest in the first line instead of set rules, because we don't find any rules in the ITR, we suggest to replace it by contain provisions. These regulations also contain provisions an continues after that. This first small improvement and the second improvement in the last line currently says referred after, we suggest that we read the text as is the preamble of constitution, here in after, one word referred to as. Hereinafter referred to as we borrowed from the preamble of the constitution.

With respect to the proposal by the delegation of the United States adding the word correspondence, that entirely changes the essence and the objectives. We go back to the definition of 1.0.0.8 and it a major departure of the agreement. We are not opposed to that and not in favor, but I just want to explain that it is a total departure from what was the text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I have three countries and then we will try that. Canada, Lebanon, Bahrain.

>> CANADA: Yes, thank you very much, Chairman. We would like to join others in expressing our appreciation to you personally for your great efforts in trying to reach a consensus on this extremely important point. Chairman, like has previously been indicated, the term "public" to us means application to the general public. And like the United States, it specifically should include private networks, business and government ‑‑ should not ‑‑ should not include private networks, business and government.

So Chairman, we have difficulty in making sure that we completely understand the meaning of the term public. So I do believe that we need to consider this a little further, but we do believe that we are very close to reaching a consensus on the matter. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I have five. I'm going to close the list, please. Lebanon.

>> LEBANON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As for Lebanon, we appreciate the agreement which has been reached, we will withhold our approval until we are done with Article 1. So basically, we will have a reservation until we are done with Article 1. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Bahrain.

>> BAHRAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, I'm actually slightly confused to be honest, because it was my understanding that the delegate from Botswana was actually strongly opposed to the term public correspondence because as he indicated on numerous occasions, including within the closed groups, that public correspondence has actually led to some confusion in certain regions and under certain administrations. In fact, I might take the opportunity to express this by reading out the actual definition, which is any telecommunication which the offices and stations must, by reason of their being at the disposal of the public, except for transmission. I'm not quite seeing how that addresses the issue of excluding government networks from the definition.

So in short, I cannot agree with the proposal from the United States on correspondence, because I don't see that it actually solves the issue. That is not to say, however, that we ‑‑ there's not room to address the concerns.

As has been discussed previously, I believe that we do have a common understanding of what it is. It's just a matter of reflecting it in the text, but I don't believe the phrase public correspondence adequately does that. So therefore I have some concerns about that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Russian federation, briefly.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Chairman, thank you very much. We are concerned by the fact that the compromise what was found, a compromise which we agreed to as a compromise over the lunch break and now appears to be brought into question again. We are very regretful about that and we think we do need to accept the compromise that we achieved over the lunch break and move forward. We have very, very little time before we are supposed to achieve something at the end of this conference. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Netherlands.

>> NETHERLANDS: As others have expressed, we don't want private networks and governments to be covered by the ITRs and I think the distinguished delegate from the US explained very clearly. If you read, the public is used in that sense. So it could include governmental networks. It maybe could also include private networks. I think that's the problem with the existing text or the text you proposed again. And we have to find a solution for that, I mean, I'm not so much into legal wordings, but it should be clear that those bodies, so private networks and governmental networks are excluded. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Botswana.

>> BOTSWANA: Thank you, Chair. I think we did explain our difficulties with public correspondence earlier on, and I think if you look at the sentence which we proposed, it is delivered to the public. The public, it may be the government buying a service from the operator. As far as I see there is no problem because the government is buying it from that operator, or a licensed operator because we are talking about an authorized operator, delivering the service to the public. Now, I thought this definition of public SCTs is broad enough. If the Member States when they get back home, they think to them, they are going to limit it only to the population, they can reduce it there, but rather to limit it at a high level, where you basically now tell other countries that when there are regulations, they only apply to a specific group. It is not to apply to a specific group. If they want to, they should have the ability to do that. I think with those remarks, we are not comfortable with the additional public correspondence. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: I will try quickly Saudi Arabia and Uruguay.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We agree with the delegate of Bahrain. We have the same concerns as to the use of public correspondence. Public is defined in this document. If we add correspondence to qualify, it doesn't change the meaning of public in any way. So adding the word "correspondence" to public will not change the meaning. That's my first point.

I also agree with Botswana that public can, indeed, cover government agencies since they use the services of operators, operators of the services, both to the private sector and to the government. Therefore, to my mind, the addition of the word correspondence serves no purpose and that the language before us now is compromised language, and I think that it is appropriate. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Okay. Let's ‑‑ first of all, let us ‑‑ let us focus on the compromised text. Now, we have a proposal from APT to change two things to start with, and I'm going to read it again. The first line, which reads, these regulations also set rules applicable to ‑‑ there is a proposal to strike out the word "set rules" and replace it with "contain provisions." So the first sentence will read these regulations also contain provisions. I just need to have a feel of the room if that's okay and that's acceptable. I see Lebanon and Nigeria. Can you take the request? Can you take the request, Nigeria? I'm trying to see if the meeting agrees to these small modifications to start with. Not to oppose the ‑‑ Nigeria.

>> NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Nigeria has listened to the discussion that is going on and as the conference progresses, it appears as if we are getting more confused. Why I think so is I do not know why we ‑‑ the Chairman had to call for a meeting of our regional groups to find a consensus. And after a consensus has been agreed upon, we come to the plenary and start opening discussions. That implies that, Mr. Chairman, your effort to get consensus throughout the night, having a sleepless night is fruitless.

It appears as if some administrations want to frustrate the efforts of this conference so that the conference will not achieve results. I want to, again, appeal if we have agreed on some text by means of consensus, compromises, when you have a compromise or a consensus, there's bound to be give and take. Everybody is equally happy, and equally unhappy.

So if we have agreed on some text, and we come to the plenary, please let us not reopen discussions because it is taking us nowhere. At the end of the day, it will appear as if we are not going to achieve results. That is my appeal. Please, let us see how to move this conference forward. And try to limit opening discussions on issues that have been agreed upon. That is my contribution, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Nigeria. I think we are very close and this is what I'm trying to do. We are trying to agree on the text and we are really close. So I will read out the text as modified by APT and I will leave the word public for the time being as it is and please be patient with me for just five minutes. And I think we will ‑‑ we will ‑‑ we might reach an agreement. So I will read it to start with fairly in a normal speed so you can sense the changes, the modifications that was proposed by APT.

Now, these regulations also contain provisions applicable to those Operating Agencies, authorized or recognized by a Member State, to establish, operate, and engage in international telecommunication services to the public and this is a famous alignment with the constitution, hereinafter referred to as authorized Operating Agencies. The changes as follows remove said rules, because as APT said, there's no rules in the ITRs, there are provisions. I think they are right. So we will replace it with contain provisions. And there is an addition of operate and operate before and engage. I will read it one more time so that everybody is comfortable with it.

These regulations also contain provisions applicable to those operating Agencies, authorized or recognized by a Member State to establish, operate, and engage in international telecommunication services to the public, hereinafter referred as Authorized Operating Agencies.

Now we have one issue which is the word "public." Now, some administrations wanted to qualify public. So what I would suggest, if there is ‑‑ I see you wave UAE, and I see you ask for the floor and I will give it to you in a minute, if you can let me finish.

So if we can agree at least to start with, on the proposed changes by APT, can you remove, first of all, the request? I will give you the request, UAE, Uruguay, and Lebanon. Just take out the request. Can we agree first to the APT proposed small changes? UAE.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you. Exactly my intervention is on that part. I really appreciate the work and the proposal given by APT, however, I think the current draft of the text, which was also drafted in 1988 is well drafted. One side, it does not say, shall be applied and other side it does not say it's ‑‑ it is maybe applied but it says said rules and here the word rules is that we are not using the capital R of rules. We don't define rules. But these provisions, they include rules within them. So that's why in here, when we say the word applicable and rules, it balances exactly what we are trying to get at the end of the day, when it comes to applying these provisions. If we just make it provisions applicable. It doesn't really say that they must do it or they shall do it or they would do it. So it's well drafted, carefully drafted, since 1988, and it gives really a good balance in that text.

Therefore, I would appeal to my leagues from APT if they can keep the original text from 1988 as it is. If there is still an assessment, we can provide another way forward, but I hope that we can keep the same text as it is. If not, we can propose something else. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I don't want additional proposals. We have enough with additional proposals. Portugal, I hope you have a solution for me as well. Portugal.

>> PORTUGAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We support APT text. Just wanted to introduce a statement here. Europe, when interpreted these revisions to the ITRs and the particular revision on provision 1.1, Europe acknowledged that service ‑‑ telecommunication services includes, for example, content providers, private networks, operators and government agencies. And I would like this statement to be included in the meeting ‑‑ in the minutes of the meeting. And I also would like to say that a number of European Member States will be clean to include the final acts to clarify this position. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So are we okay with the changes of APT again?

Okay. UAE again.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman. Again, I'm asking to keep the previous text as it is. If there is insistence, I will give you a proposal. I ask that the APT, but first I'm asking for the distinguished delegate of APT to speak on this. I'm asking if we can keep the original text and I have another proposal.

>> CHAIR: I said it is going to waste more of our time. We are in a pingpong situation. We had more than one hour of lunchtime. We have agreed. APT as a group wanted to do small modifications to the text, and we have a support now for APT proposal, and let us try to finish with this text.

If you come up with a new proposal, this is going to open up again. You know what, I think we should just move on.

APT, Iran, can you reply to what the UAE is saying. I really think we need to move on. We need to stop at 5:30. We have already past 45 minutes of the plenary time and don't forget, we have lots to come. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Speaking as a representative of APT but not as government of Iran, Chairman, there is no rule or rules in the entire ITR. If you kindly identify anything a rule, then we agree with that. You don't find any rules, Chairman. It is not insistent, Chairman. APT is among other regional organisations who is trying to help that this conference advances. Please kindly consider that. You are not putting obstacle at all. This is the APT position but there's no rules, Chairman. Where are the rules? Which rules establish applicable provisions or applicable so on and so forth? Can you identify one of the rules? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Text in square bracket and we will move on. Thank you.

But before we leave, as I said, in 1.5, when we refer to Operating Agencies, now we have agreed that we will not have a footnote. We will have a provision, and this provision is going to be at the beginning of the Article 1.1. It's going to be after first sentence of little a. Now, whatever this text is going to look like, this is where it's going to appear and we will have an editorial change to all Operating Agencies once we get into this.

So now with that, can we approve 1.5? Thank you.

Now, 1.6. Sorry, 1.6 has already been agreed before.

1.7, and I will start with a and there is an Operating Agency here. So 1.7a. I see no objection. Thank you.

1.7b and this is a change to ITU‑T now. I see no objection. Thank you.

1.7c. Jamaica and then Cuba.

>> JAMAICA: Thank you, Chair.

In keeping with the preamble which refers to the international telecommunication regulations as hereinafter referred to to regulations, Jamaica would like to delete the international telecommunication regulations and replace with these regulations. So the Article c would now read or paragraph c would read the Member States where appropriate shall cooperate in implementing these regulations.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jamaica. I will take Cuba and then take your proposal. Cuba?

>> CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. It may be a translation problem, though it does occur in the previous regulations. The words where appropriate, en su caso in the Spanish, it's not a clear expression in Spanish. We don't really know what en su caso in Spanish. It could be to simply shall cooperate in implementing. We really do not see the need for en su caso, the English version of being where appropriate.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We will align it with the English text.

Now, can we try the proposed modifications by Jamaica to strike out the international telecommunication regulations and replace it with these regulations. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Simply, it is a reference to resolution number 2. Do we have resolution number 2. Or do we see we have deleted it.

It's just a housekeeping.

>> CHAIR: We don't. Thank you.

So is there an agreement on these replacing the international telecommunication regulations with these regulations? Thank you.

1.8.

I see no objection. Thank you.

Now we go to definitions. So we went through the approval of the title definitions before, and as well as 13 and 14 in previous readings. So I want to go straight to 2.2, International Telecommunication Service. Iran?

>> IRAN: Chairman, just to fully understand your decision, in 1.8, in number c, Chairman, the text in round bracket has totally deleted that bracket, am I correct for interpretation also see resolution number 2. You said that there is no resolution number 2. The whole text in round bracket is deleted? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Which document you are referring to? Are we at 51 rev 1.

>> IRAN: The document that was given to me by the Secretariat, if it is not right, I'm sorry about that.

>> CHAIR: C reads Member States, where appropriate, shall cooperate in implementing and we have changed the words, the international communication regulations to these regulations full stop. So there's no resolution 2 here. Thank you.

So 2.2 of definitions, Algeria.

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, are you referring to the .1.8, it reads ‑‑ it states by the regulations. So maybe we could apply the same wording in every ‑‑ in all the provisions saying these regulations instead of having these given provisions and the regulation in others. So let's align the wording. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Algeria. Good catch. These. So if there's no objection to replace "the" with "these," I don't see any objection to that. Thank you, Algeria, for this.

And a note to the Secretariat to take a note of it, so we can have global change to the relevant parts, to align the text.

So 2.2, the definition of international telecommunication service. Is there any objection? I see none.

2.3, government telecommunication definition. Is there any objection? Thank you. Agreed.

Now, 2.4, service telecommunication as a title to start with. Thank you, and the text and we have Operating Agency here. This is going to change at a later stage. It will be aligned. Thank you.

2.6, international route definition. I see no objection. Thank you.

2.7, relation. And we have Algeria.

>> ALGERIA: Chairman, there does seem to be some problem with linguistic alignment here. When I see the definition of international telecommunication service, in fact, it is telecommunication services and the qualifier is international. Whereas in French, it is the service, which is qualified as international. There is no such thing as an international service. There is an international telecommunication service on the other hand. So I believe that there is some work to be done in the aligning of the language versions. I know it is difficult for the Secretariat to do that in the heat of the moment, but it is something that should be looked at.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And we'll take a note of that, Secretariat, to make the alignment. Thank you.

So we are at 2.6, international route definition. Is there any objection to retain that definition?

I see none. Thank you.

Ah, Egypt and Lebanon.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. I don't recall any ad hoc discussions about those definitions and the international route was a proposal from at African region, considering attention for international route to include the in between the intermediate stations, like the fiber cable that does not call into any Member State but international borders. So there is a text for this definition that I hope ‑‑ text for this definition that I hope can be considered by the plenary. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: I will take Lebanon first. Lebanon?

>> LEBANON: Just an editorial note. I see 2.4 and 2.6. I do not see 2.5.

>> CHAIR: 2.5 was suppressed and we will align the numbers at a later stage. Thank you. Germany.

>> GERMANY: We have to reserve the right to reserve 2.6, the international route because it was new and was not introduced by now and we have to check. And we also would request we have to consider whether this question of international routing is in the further text. If it was not, it is not useful to have a definition on some things that is not used in the other text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Can we skip 2.6 for a moment? I'm trying to locate Mr. Horton to come back to us on this definition because he proposed to retain these definitions. So if we can skip it for the time being. I have the ITU staff for the floor, maybe for clarification.

>> Chairman, it's me, Mr. Horton. I have been relocated. I'm not trying to escape from you. So I'm over here. On your left.

>> CHAIR: Okay, Mr. Horton. Is this one of your definitions that was agreed not to change anything?

>> MR. HORTON: No, Mr. Chairman, I admit to a lot of things but not this one. We suppressed 2.5, but not this one. This is from another set of articles.

>> CHAIR: Okay. We will just skip this for a time being, Egypt, and we will go to the rest because I need to consult with the ‑‑ with the relevant parties here.

2.7.

>> IRAN: Iran? When 2.5 is suppressed, you could put supp 2.5. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: We will do that. Mexico?

>> MEXICO: Mr. Chairman, if we have understood right, I believe that the proposal was to delete the definition to international route since there's no reference to it in the text, that is wrong because under 3.3, international routes are referred to. So if we have understood the proposal to delete, we would object, because it does appear later in the text.

>> CHAIR: No, we did not discuss the deletion of it yet. Germany raised that if it's not ‑‑ if it's not mentioned in the document, then there is no need for it, but as you rightly said, it's in 3.3. But I was trying to locate the ‑‑ I'm trying to find the discussion that took place because opening up the definitions at this stage is also very risky and I'm trying to skip 2.6 to give me some time to come back to it. So can we take 2.7 now? Relation.

I see no objection. Thank you.

And 2.7a. No objection. Thank you.

B? Thank you.

2.8, accounting rate. No objection. Cote d'Ivoire.

>> COTE D'IVOIRE: We do not think that the definition in 2.6 has been discussed in committee or group. I don't know whether this is the right place to make this point but there is the African states group that has a proposal to make. So do you want us to do it now because we have some suggested amendments to this definition?

>> CHAIR: I just wanted to ‑‑ if we can hold on it for the time being, I will come back to it, just need to consult with the Secretariat on this issue. Thank you.

So 2.7b. Sorry, accounting rate. Is there any objection to the definition? Thank you.

Collection charge. Thank you.

Instructions. Algeria.

>> ALGERIA: Chairman, I'm afraid I have slightly lost the thread here. I don't understand what's happening any longer. We made several contributions supported by a lot of countries to ensure that in the French language version, we are not referring to (Speaking French).

We set it umpteen times and now here comes the other term again. I'm sorry, Chairman, but I know I'm taking the floor on this repeatedly, but I have no choice because of what is appearing in the French language text in front of me. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Algeria and my apology again for that. And I hope we ‑‑ I hope that we take care of it.

Ethiopia.

>> ETHIOPIA: Thank you, Chairman. No, this is not Ethiopia. This is the Chairman of the editorial committee. In other words, the French delegation. I'm very sorry, we do appear to have got trapped behind a different name plate. What I wanted to say to you, Chairman, was this, this problem of aligning the texts, particularly between the French and the English versions, and with respect to this word charge or charging, et cetera, is something that is going to be considered by the editorial committee when it next meets and when it has in front of it the text which you will have approved here in plenary.

For the time being, the editorial committee has not met to discuss these texts because the texts had not yet been approved. So Chairman, I am only too well aware as indeed is the entire editorial committee that there are certain problems with respect to the aligning of the language versions of the text, but we will look at them in due time. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Earlier on, we asked about the status of instruction. The distinguishes director of the TSB indicated that from 1993 or 1993 all instruction were suppressed. So there's no more instruction. You have two option, either delete this definition or include in the minute of the plenary that all instructions from ITU‑T recommendation were suppressed in 1993 and there is no more any instruction. Both of them is correct in order to let you to advance your vote. Otherwise, delete this definition. There is no instruction anymore. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Sudan.

>> SUDAN: On behalf of the African proposal, we have a lot of division here and not being discussed yet. And now we are going over them quickly without discussion. We need more discussion because we have amendment in some of these provisions. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: To start with, is there any objection to delete the instructions definition? As proposed.

I see no objection. Okay. We'll delete. Instructions definition. So there's no need to add anything to the summary record.

Thank you. Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you Mr. Chairman, and good afternoon. We note that you have completed Article 2 with one exception and we understand you will come back to this issue later on, however, we also believe that it's necessary not to send this text to the editorial committee in the final version before we have gone through the whole treaty text. We understand that if a definition is not included in the treaty text, it should be removed from the definition part or if new definitions are added to the treaty text, they should go into Article 2. And that's the reason why we would ask you not to close this article until we have gone through the whole text of the treaty. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Jamaica.

>> JAMAICA: Clarification is being sought, if it is agreed to delete the definition of instructions, would the word also be removed from articles 1.4 and 1.6, where they appear?

>> CHAIR: I will take Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. Indeed in the working party, they were charged to look at the proper definitions when we consider the articles. Regretfully, this has not been done completely. The instruction definition has not been considered with associated articles, like the one you have raised about ‑‑ like Africa has raised about the international route and there are others also. So not to stop the work of the plenary, I think we can come back after we see the relevant provisions that contain these terms and to consider it again. So West Africa preserves its right for that.

>> CHAIR: That's my intension is to go through it and come back to it when we see the relevant part of it. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With respect to the question raised, since we have deleted definition of instruction in paragraph 2.10, any reference to instruction need to be deleted in the entire ITR, new ITR.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I was just going to say that and reply and we have located the two places. Thank you.

So we will come back to the international route definition.

Let's go to Article 3 now. So the title of the article was approved before. I will go to 3.1. Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Mr. Chairman, before going to my intervention, I just acknowledge the excellent work done by the working party Chairman and I regret saying that the load was too heavy for them.

There was a statement included in working party to find reports in the working party, then to the Com5 regarding statements by Egypt to be included in plenary minutes and come to the final acts. These can be found in documents 57 under working group 5‑2. I think no need to read it now, but can be ‑‑ if you can refer to it. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: No, thank you. You gave us the reference.

So provision 3.1. No objection.

Provision 3.2. No objection.

3.3? Compromise was to leave the old text as it is. Thank you.

3.4. No objection. Thank you. 3.5. Ghana?

>> GHANA: This is to draw the attention of the team to align the word "endeavor." We have used endeavor differently in the text 3.5 and we want to look at that.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Noted. 3.5.

Okay. Agreed.

3.6. Agreed.

3.7, that is the results of the ad hoc group on nondiscriminatory access. I now give the floor to ‑‑ I give the floor to representatives from APT. There is a resolution here. First of all, Lebanon. Lebanon?

>> LEBANON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In this one ‑‑ in this article, I would like to make sure that this article contains additional statement that would read Member States shall refrain from taking unilateral or discriminatory actions that could impede, harm or interfere with another member state's access to public international telecom networks and services. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, as we offered you to this morning, AP.

It has a common proposal in the resolutions presentation, I mentioned that our own view from our organisation, this issue nondiscriminatory access to the Internet and resourcing ‑‑ the use of resources was amended in WTSA and I mentioned at the time of presentation that resolution of the WTSA 1269 reflect more appropriately the latest development that was agreed at that conference. Our view was that either we agree that to put into the provision the exact text in the operative part of resolution of the as it is, to refrain unilateral and so on and so forth with the exact text in those resolutions to impede access to any government to the Internet and its resources or Internet sources. If that is agreed to in paragraph 3.7, there's no need for any resolution, Chairman. But currently we see a square bracket and we are very happy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a principle point. I refer to comments by one distinguished delegates saying nothing is agreed until everything is agreed. So we don't want to put something, which is a views of a ‑‑ of a region and also views of many countries and then go to the other provisions. At the end sometimes at the midnight saying there's no time, and then agreement by exhaustion. Chairman, this is an important point. We have to address this issue, Chairman. We came to this conference with three important issues, network security, Spam, now it is called something else and this nondiscriminatory access. This is not something that we want to have a provision for a future. We need to have a clear indication from this conference, as was mentioned we have an indication for openness, we have an indication for transparency, indication for declaration of human rights, we fully agree with that. We want to also have a clear message from this conference that there should be no unilateral or any decision by any member state what cover to refrain any other member state to have access to Internet, and the Internet resources. That is very important, Chairman.

This must be reflected in the provision of this conference, Chairman. And that's a plea to you. I have already talked to yourself. And you are so kind that you will take that on board. And I talked to our very distinguished Secretary General that for us it is very important and other delegations. Please take it as a serious organisation for our organisation, Chairman. We should have a win/win, otherwise we have a win/lose. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Well, if I have the decision, I mean we would have been finished one week ago, but I have ‑‑ I'm at the disposal of all the Member States here in this room and we fully respect everyone, and every Member States' voice is heard and the spirit of working together is there and here we are.

I have the floor from the United States and Poland. And then Poland. Sorry, the United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, just as clarification, are you addressing 3.7? Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, we have indicated in the various groups discussing this provision that we cannot agree to this provision, that there are a number of issues involved here that are best addressed with the ‑‑ within the United Nations as a whole and in particular with respect to Chapter 7, resolutions that have dealt with these issues and that they are not pertinent to the technical work that's being undertaken at the ‑‑ at this conference.

Mr. Chairman, the details of our ‑‑ of the reasons for which we oppose this provision are well documented within the appropriate forum in which they have been raised and that is at the United Nations and within the security council. Chairman, for those reasons, we will not be able to support the adoption of 3.7. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Poland.

>> POLAND: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I'm afraid that this proposal is unclear as it is not defined to what public international telecommunication networks are. But first of all, I would like to say that this proposal, in the square bracket refers to the Internet, the Internet sites and using resources, and at the beginning of the conference, we discussed about it and I think it was clear for everybody that this is not the scope of the treaty. We all heard the statement of the Secretary General who explicitly said that Internet is outside of the scope of ITRs. So this is not acceptable for us. In our opinion, this provision has political implications that should be avoided in technical treaty like ITRs. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I have seven delegations asking for the floor. Now, it's eight. I'm going to close the list. Bahrain. Thank you. Netherlands.

>> NETHERLANDS: Yes, thank you, Chairman. We have the same position as other speakers, internet should remain out of the ITRs and I also recall the ‑‑ when Dr. Toure was making his first speech, I would say in this meeting, he spoke about the status quo and he said that the existing Internet are functioning well. So that is also our opinion. So in brief, Mr. Chairman, Internet should not be included. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. UK.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. I will be brief. The comments made by the United States, Poland and the Netherlands my government and my delegation is not able to agree to the inclusion of this provision. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Kyrgyzstan.

>> KYRGYZSTAN: Thank you very much, Chair. In order to be as brief as possible, let me just say that Kyrgyzstan is of the same opinion as put forward by the Islamic Republic of Iran. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Cuba?

>> CUBA: Chairman, thank you. Well, there do seem to be rather a lot of brackets in this provision. People are saying that this article should not be in the regulations, however, fairly recently in Johannesburg we had a resolution that dealt with this, and I believe it was in this city, and that was part of the overall work being done by the ITU. We talk about human rights. We discussed about whether the issue of human rights should be included in the ITRs. Limiting states access to public sites is surely an infringement of human rights. What's the point of talking about human rights when you are preventing a State to connecting to public information networks. I don't think we should act in a way that should be contradictory. We have discussed the issue of whether we should consider human rights, and here we are tacitly making it possible for people to prevent states from having access to service networks, to international telecommunications networks, et cetera. In 3.4, we talk about having access to the international network, and why can't we accept it in 3.7. We are being contradictory. We are allowing one member state to potentially allow another Member State having access to an international network.

We are not just talking about wordsmithing here. We are talking here about the apparent ability to express an idea which to us is pretty clear and which is in step with what we are including in the ITRs. We are trying to ensure conduct by Member State and Operating Agencies that is acceptable and we therefore support the acceptance of this text as it is.

In the ad hoc group, we did raise the issue of removing the word "Internet," but we think having the words Internet sites and using resources is sufficiently clear. In the ad hoc group, we mentioned the fact that the word unilateral which is in here between square brackets at the moment is not a problem. We can accept it. The fundamental issue here is member states potentially taking discriminatory measures which could prevent another Member State having access to international telecommunication networks. What if we got the ITRs for if it is not to promote and project the international telecommunication networks. This is the ITU, not the United Nations or the security council. We are talking about access to international telecommunication networks. We believe we should consider this and it should be included because it's in step with the regulations and reflects what we have discussed to which we are trying to observe the full observance of and application of human rights for everybody, States and individuals living in them. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I need the IT help to time for me the clock, please, or the timer. And I will give the floor now to Sudan and please, we can time it to one minute. Thank you. Sudan. I'm sorry, I need to limit the discussions because I have a long list and we need to move on with the agenda. Thank you.

>> SUDAN: Thank you, Chairman. I will not take a long time. I just want to support what is said by ‑‑ by this distinguish delegate from Cuba and also from Iran. And we are aligned with the resolution, which is denying. The we support use of Internet sites an using resources instead of international telecommunication networks and services. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Kenya.

>> KENYA: This is to congratulate the work that is being done, but we ‑‑ as our delegation, we want to say that Internet should not be included in this telecom treaty. We should focus more on telecom treaty and leave out the Internet. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. Japan would like to support the previous speaker of the US, UK and the Netherlands in the point that this provision seems to be the outside ‑‑ outside the scope of ITRs. This is talking about access to some specific Internet site and that's demanded by ITRs, it should be the promotion of the interconnection and the provision of the International Telecommunication Services. It seems out of scope. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And last Bahrain. I'm sorry, I closed the list because now it's more than 20 states asking for the floor. Bahrain?

>> BAHRAIN: Thank you, I would like to thank Cuba for their comments. The point I would like to raise in short is that let's not muddle the waters here, all right? We are not talking about internet content. Again, this is not about Internet content. We agreed on that at the beginning of the conference. We are not going to go back to that. This is about access. Now, the choice of words may have alarmed some people, but this is about access to international telecommunication networks. And I find it odd that on multiple occasions throughout this conference, we reaffirmed our commitment to the declaration of human rights and yet when it comes to a provision in which we are showing that we take this declaration seriously and that we reaffirm the right of people to communication and access to these networks, we waver. We are not willing to go through with it. I find that somewhat concerning. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I would ask South Africa again to take the resolution and the provision and to come back to us the next session of the plenary with a proposal.

I'm sorry to do that, but I have to ‑‑ I have ‑‑ this has to be discussed in a forum different than plenary to start again and come back to us with a clear proposal.

I wanted to move now to 3.8. I want to give the floor to South Africa. You can take this job? I have a point of order from Iran. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are very sorry and we are grateful to your kindness and patience, Chairman. Chairman, we are sitting in the World Conference On International Telecommunications. We are not sitting neither in the General Assembly nor in security council. Unfortunately, we are neither a permanent member of the council, the secretary council nor the member of that council. We are dealing in this conference and we have to deal with the issue of the conference. So reference to Chapter 7 of the United Nations Charter and security council resolution is irrelevant, Chairman. If you want to establish a group to deal with this matter, it should not be in parallel with the plenary. We are concerned and we have to discuss that and we have to take it seriously. Unfortunately the resolution of APT which I suggested should be superseded and complimented by the WTSA resolution was not considered. I requested the distinguished delegate of South Africa to kindly be with us and this is not Internet.

People paraphrasing the statement and advice of the Secretary General, saying the Secretary General, the Internet is not a subject of this conference. We are talking about access. I don't think this paraphrases. Okay, correct. Access to international telecommunication Internet. Internet is part of that. I don't think it's outside the mandate of this conference. Chairman, this is a serious matter. I know that up until now, every reference has been made, every effort not to have any single reference to the Internet in this conference. Either congratulations or condolence, I don't know what word I have to use, but that is a serious issue. We are talking of access, Chairman, but not Internet, nor Internet Governance, Chairman. Please kindly consider. I'm sorry for that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: South Africa.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, Chairperson. Of course, with he will do our best to assist in trying to resolve the issue and we accept the task you have given us. Thank you, Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I have five requests from the floor. We have closed the subject. If you don't mind, if you can remove the requests from the system.

We have assigned task South Africa to have an informal ‑‑ or an ad hoc group that the deal with this issue because it's not going to be fruitful to open such huge debate in a plenary. I still have the floor from China, Nepal and Lebanon. So China?

>> CHINA: We think that this provision action is on the access. So the access to international telecommunication network is right. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Lebanon?

>> LEBANON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Part of the group, please.

>> CHAIR: Yes, be part of this group, it will be chaired by South Africa and immediately after plenary and will not be working in parallel to the plenary and we will announce a room for the group shortly.

Now, let's move to provision 3.8. I just want to say the square brackets was mistakenly put here. And there are also two few other square brackets put on this document by mistake. I want to remind the entire meeting, the entire document is in square brackets, so not to confuse the discussion. 3.8, I have the floor ‑‑ oh, my God, what happened?

Is this on 3.7 in okay, 3.8, Poland. Let's start with that.

>> POLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess I will have to disappoint you as I will not say nothing new. I will just repeat the argument that we are here not to extend the scope of ITRs. We are here to update the text so it would reflect the current state of the telecommunication market the this proposal in point 3.8 concerns Internet issues, for example, naming addressing, identification, resources, that are subject of works of other organisations. We believe we had a good compromise so far, and that this proposal may deprive the agreement reached to this moment. And I want to express that, of course, we approve the discussion connected to with access to the Internet, but in point 3.7, we also had the wording Internet sites, and it means content of the Internet. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Germany.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Chairman. The term naming, numbering and addressing, and identification resources is a very broad one and includes names and numbers not within the CITU, so therefore we would prefer to suppress such regulation. And one question, you were mentioning that part of the issues that are in bracket, one of them is also 3.8, was not designated to be in brackets. Is this also true for 3.8? Or only for 3.7? Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: No, this was no bracket in 3.8.

Czech Republic.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to bring your attention ‑‑ or the delegates' attention to the Article 3.5, it deals with provisions of numbering and they are here mentioned as ITU‑T matter the however, the provision of 3.8 is out of the scope as already mentioned by my colleagues. So we do not support this proposal to be included in to ITRs. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We fully support the proposal ‑‑ the statement from Poland and the Czech Republic and Germany. We know that we in many cases have discussed the Internet and included or not, and we thought that the agreement was that the Internet is not included in this conference, in this treaty, and in order to avoid any ambiguity, we proposed to delete 3.8 and we may also come back on 3.7 when we see the result from the South Africa consultation.

>> CHAIR: US.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We will be brief. We associate with Poland, Germany, Czech Republic, and Sweden in their remarks with respect to 3.8. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, US. Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: We would support the comments from the previous five speakers regarding resources that are not parallelling the remit of the ITU. We question what is managing the naming, within member state territories to us it's conceivable that that could mean the management by Member States of global numbering resources which happen to be used within their own territories, for example, international free phone numbers.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you very much, Chairman. We too align ourselves with the previous speakers. And we note that the Czech Republic has made reference, a cross reference to 3.5. We think that it is appropriate in that context, but certainly not in 3.8. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. UK.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, I would associate myself with previous speakers, including Germany, Czech Republic, Poland, Sweden, United States, Canada, and Australia. And I would just like to note as well that in the preamble, the rights of Member States to regulate their communications are noted. The sovereign right is noted. So we also feel this proposal is unnecessary in its entirety.

>> CHAIR: Japan and then Saudi Arabia.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. As we have already, there's a strong opposition to this article, in the sense that this is wording, naming, numbering, addressing and identification resources, it strongly demands of the Internet Governance. And ITU, within the scope of ITU, Internet governance is not here or there. Internet government may be very important issue for maybe all of us, but maybe this issue should not be included in ITR. I suggest we should make an agreement within the scope of ITR. This is a very constructive way and in that regard, this 3.8 should by no means be included there. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. It appears the multiplicity of talks that we have had to deal with made us forget that we are here to discuss a series of issues we have undertaken negotiations, debates on these issues. We have had meetings with the Secretary General, meetings that were successful. The Arab group, like other delegations, would have wished to see other matters in this document we should have liked, for example, to see the mention of telecommunication/ICTs. We would have referred to see ITU, not ITU‑T. We should have liked to have seen mention of a next generation networks, which have been developed over the years.

There were many other matters, Mr. Chairman, which we should have liked to see in this document, however, and subsequent to lengthy negotiation, we agreed, we accepted language which did not meet our expectations. We accepted a text, which is the absolute minimum that we could agree to. We have great respect for the Secretary General and for his views and certainly in any negotiation, all parties have to compromise, but certainly, where this photograph in particular is concerned, 3.8, it was discussed in a meeting with the representatives of the regional groups. The paragraph here has been ‑‑ is the result of amendments. It's been modified on the basis of the original provision. What we have before us then is modified text. And here we have delegations asking for the suppression of this paragraph, which has been ‑‑ it is the minimum expression of what we would have liked to see in the ITRs.

Under the circumstances, we are tempted to go back to our initial demands. What we said we wanted at the beginning of the conference, it is unacceptable that one party to the conference gets everything they want and everybody else must make concessions and after having made many concessions, we are then asked to suppress the language which was agreed to. I think that that is dangerous. We are on a slippery slope, Mr. Chairman.

We are not talking here about Internet Governance. Obviously, it does not have its place here, as the Secretary General has said, and we agree we are not speaking here of Internet Governance. We are speaking of new networks. Matters which are the subject of study in the ITU. There's no mention here of Internet.

I am astonished when I hear other delegations who believe that there is a hidden agenda behind this provision. And as I say, some parties are asked to make concessions and at the very last minute, the ‑‑ we are asked to suppress the compromised language. If that is what is going to happen, I will ask you to allow us to resubmit all of the proposals. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Director of TSB.

>> MALCOLM JOHNSON: Saudi Arabia, I would ask we shall not resubmit our proposals but these proposals were presented at the conference and we would ask that the content of our documents appear in the ITR so that there's some balance in the language.

>> CHAIR: TSB.

>> MALCOLM JOHNSON: Thank you, Chairman and good afternoon, everybody. I wanted to point out that in ITU‑T, we deal with management of naming, numbering, addressing and identification, and we do have a number of recommendations covering these topics, in particular on naming we have X400. So perhaps if it was clear that when referring to neighboring, addressing and identification resources, we are talking about within the scene of ITU‑T recommendations.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, we will take a coffee break. I want the regional directors to come up here to discuss this. We will come back at 4:30. Thank you.

(Break)

>> CHAIR: We will start in ten minutes. The team, the group wants ten minutes just to finalize this issue. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Can you take your seat, please. Can you take your seat, please.

>> Ladies and gentlemen, please take your seats. We need to begin the meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. I see the room is not settled yet. I will start. We have left with provision 3.8. I will invite director of TSB sir Malcolm Johnson to read out what looked like a compromise for that provision. Mr. Malcolm.

>> MALCOLM JOHNSON: Yes, thank you, chairman. In 3.8, the amendments to the current text would be to insert the word telecommunication before naming and then after the words identification resources, to add the words within the mandate of ITU fall within the mandate of ITU for and change used to use.

So they should be able to manage the telecommunication naming, numbering, addressing and identification resources within the mandate of ITU for use within their territories for international telecommunications. Thank you, chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Is there any objection? Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Chairman, thank you. We have some difficulty, when we look at this text in its entirety, the text says that Member States shall be able to manage resources within the mandate. Now this seems already to be limiting the rights of Member States. I'm afraid we have very considerable doubts about this, and Chairman, generally speaking, we have some considerable concerns about the compromise which we achieved over work ‑‑ throughout work done over a very long period of time.

It seems to be falling apart in front of our eyes. I had the impression that we are going straight towards submitting document 47 as we already said that is a compromise between several countries, APT, the RCC, the Arab States, et cetera, and it seems to me that that fully revises the regulations and takes into account the various changes in respect of Member States and the future ITRs. However, we will never be able to agree that Member States have to be limited by operating within the mandate of the ITU. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And I think everyone is trying to ‑‑ to reach a text that will be satisfactory by all. It's not going to be that easy, but I think everybody is trying very hard. We have a long list now. I have a long list of speakers. Egypt briefly, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It will be very brief. Maybe RCC mentioned what I was thinking of, deleting within mandate of ITU, maybe ‑‑ maybe we could consider the word telecommunication but within the whole package of the articles. Thanks, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Bahrain?

>> BAHRAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There's a few points a want to actually make regarding this. First off, every time we start talking about things within the ITRs, two concerns come up, one is usually the Internet. The second is usually scope. Now, on multiple occasions, we have tried to reassure people that we are not talking about content. We are not talking about governance, but I believe it was the delegate of Japan that said something interesting. This phrase "naming, numbering, addressing and identification" strongly reminds us of Internet Governance, but frankly, in today's world, everything will remind us of the Internet in one shape or form and we are constantly reaffirming that we are not trying to talk about content or governance. It's outside the scope of the ITU. We have agreed on that. Which leads me to the second point, scope. There are two different kinds of scope here. There's the scope of the ITRs and there's the scope of the ITU. The scope of the ITRs may very well change because telecommunications is changing. Okay? It's a dynamic environment. We all know that. But the scope of the ITU is set, and it is ‑‑ we are not here to change the scope of the ITU. We are here to update the ITRs and bring them into line with changes made at the PP, with the changes made in the telecommunications sector.

So frankly speaking, what are we afraid of? Because it was my understanding that we had reached a compromised text and many of the people ‑‑ apologies, many of the delegates that have raised their opposition were actually present during the crafting of that compromised text, and my question is: Why weren't these concerns raised this? Why are they now being raised in plenary? If there's an issue, maybe we could have discussed it, but bringing it to plenary is worrying, as the delegate of Russia said. Where's this going to end?

If they have a fear about 3.8, then let me be honest. This is my fear. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Algeria, briefly, please.

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Chairman. As you know, I'm always brief. Chairman, we thought that we had actually reached an agreement, an agreement in principle, a gentleman's agreement if you prefer between people whose only concern is to achieve results at this conference. All of us together on a basis of solidarity have started to build something. Maybe the building that we are constructing isn't as high as the silhouette of the one behind you, but it is a building that we thought we could strengthen step by step as we moved towards the conclusion of the conference.

Now, what I see, chairman, and I see with very great regret, is that the building is actually beginning to crumble. You have made a great deal of effort, Chairman, the Secretary General has put in a great deal of effort, so has Mr. Johnson. Therefore, through you, may I address myself to the Secretary General. Sir, could you please give us your feeling about what we can see happening here at the moment. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I see the Secretary General smiling. The Secretary General is enjoying this. Secretary General.

>> SECRETARY-GENERAL: He's just trying to provoke me here. I will not ‑‑ it's okay, I think we should ‑‑ he knows my feeling. He knows that I enjoy this job. We are having some frictions of brains. Let's not get angry. This is normal. There are many bigger things that we do and, it's again, friction from friction comes light. And when you get ‑‑ you run out of ammunitions, then you become angry and you make mistakes and that's a problem.

If you all went to school to try to as many admissions as possible and we try not to be personal when we run it. We make a good sense of what you are saying, one has to recognize it. I may disagree with you, but if you make a point that makes sense to me, hey, I will ‑‑ I will love it. And that's what this thing is about. I think everybody comes here with a passion, about what we are doing. That's why people are passionate about it. And that's why I'm very much optimistic about what will come out of this thing. And people are defending serious issues here. And it's very important. And therefore, what we are doing here is an important part of the process. So let's not ‑‑ let's continue to ‑‑ to respect one another and continue to learn from one another as we do in every debate that we make here.

So I would encourage us to move forward. Mr. Chairman, there is a compromise that is on this issue. I think I will appeal to you all to let's go for it. We have been very clear enough in this thing so we will not be too long. There are many other issues that are more difficult that are to come. And when I'm not the fighter, I'm the referee. I like to see the fight going on, until all the fighters are tired, I look up to see. And so it's fun from my side.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Can we try it one more time? Is there any objection to go along with the compromised text?

We add after the first sentence, after "to manage" we have telecommunication before naming and after resources on the second line we say within the mandate of the ITU for and then adjust used to use. So the entire statements reads Member States shall, if they so elect, be able to manage the telecommunication naming, numbering, address and identification resources, within the map date for the ITU for the use within their territories or international telecommunication.

I have eight delegations asking for speaking. Do you have an objection? Can you remove the requests from the floor, just to focus on if you have an objection to that.

Saudi Arabia?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. I would hike to thank the Secretary General and thank you, personally, for attempting to reach a solution. I believe that a certain group of us have made important concessions and we believe that these concessions should be enough to encourage others to accept this position that we have taken, therefore, we cannot accept any other changes to the text that you have read to us.

>> CHAIR: Lebanon.

>> LEBANON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to try one thing and I hope regardless of my view of the Internet Governance or not, and I'm going to read it slowly. Within the scope of these regulations, Member States should, if they so elect, be able to manage within their territories naming, numbering, addressing and identification for international telecommunication resources. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I think we had a lot ‑‑ a long time to have a compromise ‑‑ a compromised text. If we can stick to what Mr. Malcolm presented, I think it will be wise so that we don't open the discussion begun and rechange the entire thing.

Lebanon? If you can please go along with the proposal, out of the discussion. Lebanon?

>> LEBANON: Mr. Chairman, what I proposed takes care of both of the objections as well as the compromise without compromising the compromise.

>> CHAIR: Yes, but after the discussion, the entire group came up with a text and now we are talking about a new text. So if we can focus to that. I have seven asking for the floor. I really need to get to Article 4 before 5:30.

Azerbaijan.

>> AZERBAIJAN: Thank you very much. We strongly support and in favor this compromise, which based on hard work and a mutual cooperation of the ‑‑ of all member states and special thanks to our charm and Secretary General who contributed to this achievement, but we want to also clarify and kind of extend this clause and would like to add some important point with sentence, which will enter this article. We think that if we will add this wording, Member States shall exclude, Granting and/or sharing the naming, numbering, and addressing and identification resources used within their territories to the unrecognized territories, which will make this article even better. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I think you got the reaction.

(Laughter)

Let's not go there even.

(Laughter)

Iran.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, from the beginning of the conference, we continue to smile and I don't think that people should deny that.

Second, we are not coming here to fight with anybody. We are coming here under the preamble of the constitution, with peaceful relations. That is chairman, very, very important issue. Now we speak clarification, what does it mean telecommunication naming. Mr. Johnson, what does it mean telecommunication naming? Telecommunication addressing and telecommunication identification? What does it mean?

And then where the mandate of ITU, apart from the resolution 71. You talk about mission of ITU where mentioned. Could that be stipulated after Article 1 of the constitution? So please distinguish, chairman, is it possible to seek clarification. What is the meaning of telecommunication naming, telecommunication addressing an telecommunication identification. And then mandate ITU. Mandate of ITU may change but this ITR will remain for years I don't know how many years. That's a simple clarification. Chairman, you have a smile, you continue to have a smile and we don't fight with anybody. We would like to be in peaceful relations with everybody, and that has been demonstrated from the beginning of the conference. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I will call the vice chairman of Saudi Group two who have helped in this draft from UK. If you can clarify.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, chair. I will endeavor to do so. Telecommunications numbering is fairly self‑evident, the telephone numbers we used as defined in ITU recommendation EU164. There are telecommunications naming, that is defined in the X400 series of ITU‑T recommendations. Identification, there are object identifiers used in X660 recommendations. As for addressing, you also have Q708 recommendation that assigned signal and point codes. You also have for addressing data network identification codes, and resources used in X25 networks as well. So there are many examples that I could, believe me, go on at ad infinitum that I don't think you want me to do.

>> CHAIR: No, thank you. I think that's enough.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I will go back again to the proposed text. Is there any objection? I have four or five asking for the floor. I really need to get to Article 4 and we still have to discuss 3.9. Egypt, briefly, please. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. And with the spirit of the Secretary General, I was about to accept some flexibility but with explanation that the naming, numbering and addressing are within the scope of ITU for legal issues as explained by the RC C., there are some implications of using within the mandate of the ITU and maybe there is some interesting proposal from Lebanon within the scope of the regulations so either within the communications or within the mandate, it seems not to be appropriate or needed. Maybe the original proposal or maybe taking the proposal of Lebanon which is quite agenda.

>> CHAIR: The only thing I can do is if we start opening the text again, I think I will put it in square bracket and move on, because we are consuming a lot of time from plenary on this issue. Russian federation, please, I will appeal if you can go along with the proposed text.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. And my thanks to the Secretary General for being so kind as to work so hard on this area, but we have expressed our concerns. Our concerns being that the ITRs cannot limit the rights of Member States on their territory. In particular, when we talk about governments of Internet resources, at the moment each Member States on its territory governs those resources. That is carried out either by civil society organisations or by other bodies or organisations but that is determined by the state.

Numbering resources, naming resources, et cetera, et cetera, that's done by the State. So this already exists. We can't stick our hands in the sand like an ostrich and say we don't know what the Internet is because that just isn't going to go down at all.

I have a question to the Secretariat. We had a compromise yesterday on 3.8, as I understand it, with some square brackets. The representative of the Arab States groups asked where the square brackets came from. I don't think he got an answer, yet it seems they have appeared again. It seems there's a lot of mystery before the conference, during the conference, indeed, let's look at each other in the eyes dot the Is and cross the Ts and make some movement in the right direction, forward. We cannot have limitations from Member States' rights on their territory and these words about within the mandate of the ITU are therefore unacceptable. We are, however, ready to go for a compromise in the spirit of the compromise we thought we had already reached.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I don't think there's a point of continuing discussing this point. This provision, I think we need to move on to 3.9, try to finish, if we can and start on Article 4.

>> Yeah, thank you Mr. Chairman. I simply want to tell you that there's no conspiracy theory here Secretariat. There was some square brackets. The Secretariat noticed it and before the opening of the meeting and we mention it to the chairman. I take full responsibility for anything you see happen. There's only one captain. It's me. I have taken full responsibility. And there's no conspiracy theory. And I think that I have been in all the discussions. So far we have succeeded and we have been very much straightforward. There was nothing between the lines or between the words that we have been saying.

I appeal to you that the compromised text that the director of TSB has proposed has is a good text that will enable us to move forward. It doesn't harm anybody. And it enables you to do the tasks that you should be carrying out and it's within the work that we do in ITU and is no misunderstanding about it. This was a little bit nervousness in the beginning because as I said during the discussions, there were names ‑‑ those four names, naming addressing, and identification, because they are used by the Internet community as well, it became a problem. It became a taboo and those words were being used by IT and ITU before the Internet was born. And therefore, there's no need to be suspicious about it. And there are many things we do together. The two communities need to continue to work together. And as they are living side by side, in fact, living together, and this will continue. And we have been trying to build bridges here. I think ‑‑ I hope that this audience will also help us to continue to build those bridges, so that the consumers get the best benefit from both worlds and I think that's ‑‑ we should keep that in mind.

I appeal to you, please let's make our chairman happy. Please make ‑‑ let's make his day. Give that to him. There are many other things that we will be discussing an I hope that you will understand. Please, Mr. Chairman, I hope you will ask for now ‑‑ if there's any support for this proposal as opposed to anybody against. I think that will help matters move forward and we will see that there's a large majority of people supporting it, and will ‑‑ will talk to the others that will join compromise hater. This is a true tradition of ITU and I would like to remind it to you again. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I have five administrations asking for the floor, and I will ‑‑ I will put it again, and as Secretary General advised, do we have support for this? Do we have support for this compromised text? Mexico?

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chairman. Mexico very much appreciates your efforts to arrive at a compromise solution. Mexico intends to support any compromise solution which we reach, however, we would beg you, Mr. Chairman, to ‑‑ the word in the Spanish version of the text, it doesn't say manage. It says control. And it says all. We would prefer the Spanish text to be translated more in tune with the English.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. The word is managed and we'll take an audit. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. I will start by thanking the Secretary General and by thank you, again, for your attempts to reach a compromise, and the request by the Secretary General to make it the Chairman's day today and we really would like to make your day today, however, it is very difficult for us to go along because the changes run contrary to a lot of the concessions that we have made, and I believe that your appeal that we agree to the text that was discussed, that was reached through compromise and to accept it as is. If there is no such agreement, then we agree to your proposal to put the whole text between square brackets. I believe that we should stick to the text as agreed in the negotiations and then put the whole document between square brackets and then we can go back to that issue at a later stage. Thank you chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I think it's time for us to just ‑‑ we don't ‑‑ we have no agreement on this. I don't want to prolong the discussion anymore. We are almost five minutes before the end of the plenary and I want to take 3.9, if you don't mind. Sudan, Iran, Jordan, if you can take the request for the floor, I don't want to open the discussion on this issue anymore. I think we will just postpone it and move to 3.9 for approval.

Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. I would hike to ask for clarification. Will we go back to this provision having finished the discussion of all other issues are we not going back to this provision at all?

>> CHAIR: Definitely for sure we have to go back to this definition, or this provision, sorry.

Can we move on in thank you. I have Sudan, Kenya and UK. Can you please ‑‑ I really need to move to 3.5. Sudan, do you still insist to have the floor? Is it on 3.9? 3.9? Sudan?

>> SUDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sorry to take you back to Article 1.6, where you will have to remove in the instructions but you will have to rephrase that article. So I would like to see how it is rephrased. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: We will have a consequential change to the article. So we have done it. Thank you. UK?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, chairman, and I'm really sorry to have to take the floor on this subject of Article 3.8, but it's a point of clarification. It has been said that in the small group that the text was discussed and agreed. I'm afraid that does not fit my recollection. It was certainly the case that it was said that there would be a need to return to this article, as had been raised in relation to Article 3.5 on numbering misuse, but at no point, in my recollection did we go through the text of who is now draft Article 3.8 and come to an agreement on it. I'm sorry to disagree on this point, but I think it's important that this clarification is made.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UK. I have Kenya and Jordan. I really need to move to 3.9. We need to make progress. Otherwise, we will be still ‑‑ we will work still morning tomorrow. Jordan?

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chairman. Thank you for giving me the floor. I was trying to express my views on this issue, however, I would like to remind you that you asked two questions. First, who was against, and then who was for. We are not talking about the content only. We are talking about a ‑‑ a general principle. We did not have the opportunity to attend discussions attended about regional coordinators and we relied on the messages conveyed by the coordinators to us and we agreed to the principles that you outlined. You said that the whole document between square brackets. We respect the views of others with respect to your views, but if the principle revolved around opening discussion of items discussed by regional coordinators and heads of groups, then we have to reopen the whole thing and we have to take ‑‑ be given the opportunity to express our position on these points. Thank you, chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Kenya?

>> KENYA: Yeah. Thank you, chairman. I could make you happy by moving to 3.9 and we want to propose that 3.9 reads as follows: Member States should create an enabling environment for the implementation of regional telecommunications traffic exchange points with a view to improve quality, increase the connectivity and resilience of networks, foster competition and reduce the costs of international telecommunication intersection services. This is because Kenya has been very successful as an exchange ‑‑ as a regional ‑‑ sorry, the regional success of Kenya as an exchange point has managed to make this proposal. This is simply by removing exchange point. This is a technology neutral. We create a technology neutral space and strengthen it by taking out services and fix the beginning to the ‑‑ to make it more stronger. I don't know whether I should read it again.

>> CHAIR: No thank you. You just proposed to add the word services towards the end, isn't it?

>> KENYA: And remove exchange point.

>> CHAIR: I will try to avoid that. Please.

Can we ‑‑ I don't want to provoke the discussions right now. Brazil, Chile, Sweden, if you can take your ‑‑ take the requests. 3.9 as it is. Is there any objection to include it? Chile?

>> CHILE: Hello, Chairman. As far as the Chilean delegation, it's absolutely critical that we refer to traffic exchange points. This was part of a considerable amount of work we have been doing in our region in South America and it is, as far as we are concerned, a crucial issue when it comes to bringing down the costs of international broadband links. We think it is essential this issue should be dealt with here. If it is not dealt with in this forum, where is it going to be dealt with? This is the ITU. We are talking about technical issues. This is a technical issue. We want to see a general compromise that, yes, this doesn't have any Internet or Internet Governance implications. What we are talking about is connectivity and bringing down international broadband costs and that's all. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I would like to ask the interpreters to stay with me five minutes and I know I'm delaying another meeting, which was supposed to start now in room E for the non‑symmetry access.

I will rephrase my statement by saying is there any objection to include 3.9, provision 3.9? Sweden?

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We note we have satisfaction to proposed from Kenya and in order not to delay the debate, I would recommend that this issue will be taken out and discussed separately. I think there's a possibility to find a compromise on this very important issue. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: This was already ‑‑ this was one of the texts, again, that was discussed in details and the proposal to add and strike out traffic exchange points and add services will definitely create tremendous amount of discussions again.

So I would prefer ‑‑ I would prefer to keep the text as it is. I'm seeing huge number of countries. Please do not react. We have to time for ‑‑ for support. I'm just asking is there any objection to keep the text as it is? Senegal, do you object to keep the text? Senegal?

>> SENEGAL: Thank you, Chairman. I don't object. I'm trying to seek clarification. I'm afraid that I'm getting a bit confused with all of this. Traffic exchange point, I know what an Internet exchange point is, but traffic exchange point, I'm afraid I'm not 100% clear as far as what it means. I wonder if someone could clear that up for me. Thank you.

>> SECRETARY‑GENERAL: Again? Senegal, this question came up during the discussions of which I had and it's a problem that arises particularly for developing countries and particularly the smaller ones or the island developing countries. They have a low level of traffic and the volume cannot actually justify bringing down the tariff. Therefore you have to regroup the traffic in order to be able to take advantage of lower tariffs. The large operators can negotiate those on an individual basis among themselves. The question, therefore, as I say, has been raised. There is a certain amount between Senegal and neighboring countries. An operator like Orange does it, in order to take advantage of the lower rates. Countries like Mali, I believe, are also engaged in it. That is what we mean when we are referring to traffic exchange points here.

This provision is especially because this was also a request from countries in another paragraph which I can't identify right here and now, concerning access at the tariff of course on a nondiscriminatory basis. The nondiscriminatory caused a commercial problem for the major larger operators, therefore the word has been eliminated in other places.

The technique here would make sense and it would provide this opportunity for smaller countries and smaller companies to take advantage of it. The overall plan is to bring the costs down. We felt that to add foster competition would be helpful because that would contribute to bringing down costs. That is why this text has been negotiated. All the regional representatives that were with me agreed to it yesterday and that's why the text is presented to you in this form now. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Czech Republic.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and thanks also to his Excellency Secretary General for the clarification. Nevertheless, the discussions held at ad hoc group, it was clear that it is, of course, internet exchange points, that's clear, and therefore, we ‑‑ we are not in favor of this expression and for compromise, because we really understand the needs of these countries. So we ‑‑ we saw just to suppress these two expressions, because it also in our view, there is much more needed, not only exchange points. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I think the Secretary General already discussed it ‑‑ or sorry, mentioned that this has also went through a very extensive discussion yesterday in the closer group and then to the bigger group and now we are bringing it to the plenary. And the text is we are not using the word "shall." We are saying Member States should and we don't see a point in that.

I think ‑‑ I think it will be very, very useful for the global connectivity to have exchange points. Japan?

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We believe that the implement of telecommunication traffic exchange points should primarily be handled by the private sector and therefore we also ‑‑ we are not in favor of this article to be inserted into the ITR, however, as a compromise, we support ‑‑ we fully support the compromise suggestions expressed by the distinguished delegates from Kenya and Sweden and Czech Republic. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: I think the text just reads, the Member States should create an enabling environment for the implementation. Whether it should be invested by Member States or private sector, it is an enabling environment that will foster competition and reduce costs.

I don't think that we are going to solve this issue at the time. I think the time has passed. We have a sitting committee meeting. I want to reiterate one fact, that the progress we are making need to be enhanced because this ‑‑ this text has been discussed in the working groups, committees, plenaries, went to, you know, smaller group for a major compromise. Japan was there.

 So I will come back to this at 6:30. I cannot give the floor to anymore. The interpreters' time is up. I wanted to remind the steering committee that we are going to hold it immediately now in room C. And we will meet again at 6:30. Thank you very much. The meeting is adjourned.

(End of session)
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