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>> Chair: Ladies and gentlemen, we'll start in a minute. Please take your seat. Thank you. Good afternoon, everybody. Thank you, everybody. We'll start the afternoon Plenary session. We'll continue where we have stopped on basic definitions. And since we have half a session, we need to move in a faster pace. I see Kazakhstan is asking for the floor. Is this by mistake? Or do you want the floor, Kazakhstan?   
 >> Kazakhstan: ‑‑  
 >> Chair: Okay, thank you. Might be by mistake. Okay, ladies and gentlemen, please, if you can take your seat, I can see still a lot of people standing. Thank you. So, we'll go to DT/4 Rev 1, Page 45. On basic definitions. We'll follow the definitions, which is, which is laid down here in this document. We'll start, we'll start with the preamble of basic definitions, which starts for the purpose of these regulations. I'm not going to give the floor to, to the Member States because all the Member States who have proposed, who have proposal in this text, basically, the majority, they have no change. It's only two. The African Group and Mexico. I'll give the floor to the African Group, Egypt, to start with, to see if they can go along with the compromise of leaving the text as it is, no change and also to Mexico in the same request. Egypt?   
 >> Egypt: Thank you, Chairman. Talking about the African countries, the second part of the definition was, not strike out, but I think there is no harm of keeping it if everybody is keeping it. So I think it will be good to have reference of the definitions within the context of the ITR. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. And Mexico, is it okay to leave text as it is? Without any modification? Since all the region groups and all proposals ‑‑  
 >> Mexico: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, indeed. Mexico would join the consensus and withdraw its proposed modification. We simply wish to, to ratify that those definitions can only be modified by a Plenipotentiary Conference.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, with that, we'll leave the text as it is. Thanks to the African Group and Mexico. We move now to the definition of telecommunications.

Again, all the regional groups, all the Member States propose no change to the definition of telecommunication. Except Mexico, which suggests to strike it out. And, we see also, Paraguay with a proposal for modification. I'll give the floor first to Mexico, to see if it's possible to go along with all the other members, to leave the text as it is with no change, as well as then to Paraguay. Or Paraguay then Mexico, I don't have a preference. Mexico, go ahead. Thank you.  
 >> Mexico: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We will join the general consensus.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, Mexico, much appreciated. Paraguay, are you okay with leaving the text as it is with no change as proposed by other administrations? Paraguay?   
 >> Paraguay: ‑‑  
 >> Chair: Is Paraguay in the room? Okay, since Paraguay is not here, I, I would rephrase the question. Is there any support to Paraguay, modification or proposal? I don't need ten to say no. Is there any support? There is no support. Okay, so we leave the text as it is. As proposed by all the other administrations. Thank you.

We now move to the new additional proposal. And I'm now at Page 48 on Telecommunications/ICT. I'll start with the Arab Common Proposal. The Arabs to present their proposal.  
 >> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: This is actually a new definition, as mentioned or clarified earlier. We are not, actually trying to modify the existing definitions of telecommunications within the ITRs or even within the CSCV, which is definitely not the purpose. Here we're introducing a new term that is used popularly across all the sectors of the ITU, as well as within the CSCV and particular for a number of resolutions, as well as for the policy forums that is held by the ITU. That's the word Telecommunications/ICT. Here we're not speaking about ICT or we're not speaking about telecommunications, we're speaking about this common term, Telecommunications/ICTs. We'd like to reflect the convergence, which is affect, today, and past years, the convergence between information, communication technologies and telecommunications and the basic concept is to build on the telecommunications definitions and only add a small part that is this, uh, transmissions and receptions may include processing. This is the whole, this is the only difference between the actual definitions today we have for telecommunications. And this is, again, not to modify any definition, but rather to introduce new definitions for the ITRs only.

And just finally, I'd like to highlight something related to this. In the beginning of this article, it is clearly, in the beginnings of Article 2, it is clearly mentioned that the definitions used within this article doesn't necessarily used for other purposes beside the ITRs. This is definitions that we're proposing only for the ITRs, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. I'll take the African, no, Cameroon? You have the floor, briefly, please.  
 >> Cameroon: Thank you. Where Cameroon is concerned, since we wish to keep the definitions as they are, we have proposed the Telecommunications/ICT definition in order to bear in mind that there is a certain amount of convergence, but we maintained the same definition as for telecommunications, so there is no real change.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, the African? Egypt?   
 >> Egypt: Thank you, Chairman. My definition not be quite different from the previous colleagues. Use convergence, ICT is now part of telecommunication. Cannot deny that changing [indiscernible] or making Voice Over IP calls is distinct over being a telecommunication service. So that's why we kept a new definition and kept the old definition and added this new definition so that we are complying with no divergence, but adding more explanatory form for the telecom/ICT. Also good with the text used, we use the term telecom/ICT and higher level could be reflected to the work of the union according to the mandate in C2. So Chairman, this is the part of the African proposal and that's why you have changed the, as done a few months ago, that we said it might apply for other purposes and for ITRs. Here, telecom/ICT works for the purpose of ITRs. Thank you, Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, India?   
 >> India: Thank you very much for the opportunity. Would like to present our view with respect to definition of Telecommunication/ICT. I think that's what we're discussing now. We appreciate the existing definition of telecommunication and we also appreciate the views expressed about convergence of services, why it is demanding the implicit processing, what is already there in the telecommunication processes, including part of the definition. We want to add, to bring focus onto the telecommunication technologies and services, adding to the existing definition. Having a bearing on telecommunication technologies and services. This brings focus about ideas, what we're doing with telecommunication services, thank you very much.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, I open, now, the floor for discussion. Comments? Is there any objection to the proposals? Philippines?   
 >> Philippines: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Time and again, the issue of the word telecommunications, and the word ICT has been raised on the floor with some proposing that the word telecommunications be amended to include the word ICT, because of convergence, because of fundamental changes. Mr. Chair, we are here talking about the ITR, which is subordinate to the Constitution and even as we talk of the ITR, we always talk about the primacy of the Constitution. Now on the matter of the use of words, and of definition, our Constitution is very clear in its provision that where a word is used in the body of the Constitution and that word is used in the body of the Constitution, it's defined in the definition of terms in the annex of the Constitution. That same word, like telecommunications, cannot be used in the ITR by varying the definition of telecommunications in the ITR. This is a constitutional provision and this provision ought not be violated by us.

Secondly, Mr. Chair, we feel the term telecommunications is broad enough to contemplate ICT. Remember here that telecommunications, as defined in our Constitution says that it is the transmission, emission or reception, or is being used here in a disjunctive, not in a conjunctive mode and speaks here of the signs, the signals, the writings, et cetera and at the end we find the modes of transmission, which is by wire, radio, optical or other electromagnetic systems.

The mode of transmission mentioned in the definition of the telecommunications in the Constitution contemplates ICT. And number three reason we should not interchange the word telecommunications to ICT because very effectively, telecommunications is the service, while ICT, as the name implies, is the technology and there is a difference between the service and the technology itself.

The service is the effect of the technology, while the technology is the cause of the service. I think this ought to be understood by every one of us. And therefore, if we have to introduce a word in the ITR, which is already found in the Constitution, and that same Constitution of ITU so defines the word like telecommunications, there is no way for us to introduce telecommunications in the ITR differently defined.

If we need to define the word telecommunications as part of the Constitution, then the proper place is for us to amend the Constitution, pursuant to sections or to Article 54 and 55 of the Constitution. Short of that, we simply cannot, in our ITR, introduce the word telecommunications, but differently define as per the definition of the term in the Constitution. Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, Algeria?   
 >> Algeria: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Part of what I plan to say has already been expressed by my colleague from the Philippines. We spoke of it at some length, we entirely agree with him. What we don't like is the comparison, if you will, between telecommunications and ICT. If, indeed, telecommunications are still defined with a pertinent definition, one has to assume that it was a genius who came up with this definition, which has isotropically survived the test of time. And there has indeed, we must recognize, a revolution in the field of telecommunications and we have added to the field with ICTs. However...we cannot compare apples and oranges as our colleague from the Philippines has so clearly expressed. We cannot compare services and technologies. They're value‑added services through ICTs, so there is a convergence of services, but it is thanks to technology. So...in sum, we'd be in favor of maintaining the definition as it appears at present to maintain that definition in all instruments and in all regulations and add another definition dealing with ICTs.

So...what concerns us is telecommunications/ICT, we'd be perfectly favorable to the new definition of ICTs and would be more than willing to contribute to the definition of ICTs. Thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. I have six administrations asking for the floor, actually seven. And if you can, please limit your intervention to maximum, if you can, one minute. I know that this is a very hot subject, again, and I don't think that we'll be able, in the Plenary to finish it, so please, if you can, limit the discussion to one minute so that we can move on, and I have a suggestion for you towards that. Canada?   
 >> Canada: Thank you very much, Chairman. First of all, we recognize there are many references in ITU text, particularly in resolutions which use the form Telecommunications/ICT. At the same time, Chairman. There are no references in treaty text to that concept of Telecommunications/ICT. I think that's a very important point to bear in mind. Secondly, Chairman, we have some difficulty with the idea of trying to define, either indirectly or directly, the term ICT, at this point. Given the fact there's a lack of consensus on what, in fact, ICT encompasses. We also need to take into account that the Plenipotentiary Conference in adopting Resolution 140 requested that the ITU Council elaborate through study groups and submit a recommendation to the term to working groups of the council for changes in the next Plenipotentiary Conference. We understand that process is underway, a correspondence group of ITU-D Study Group 1, Chairman, I believe it may be, at this stage, premature to try to identify a proper definition that involved the term ICT. Again, we recognize ICT is important, but we would prefer in the interest of flexibility, at this stage, not trying to precisely define the term.  
 >> Chair: UAE, very briefly?   
 >> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, there's a preference to maintain the current definition of telecommunications, we support that, Mr. Chairman. There's also an interest by a number of administrations to develop a definition of Telecommunications/ICT or ICT. We're happy, and going to work with these administrations probably after this meeting and would like to get engaged with them, this will include Algeria, Africa, India and so on. Those interested in this manner and try to come up with one consolidated text and proposal before you, Mr. Chairman and of course, we'll take into account what was mentioned by Philippines not to contradict the CSCV. We'll take this element into account and make sure we're in consistency, we complement the CSCV, not contradict it. Thank you, Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, Korea.  
 >> Korea: Thank you, I'll be brief. Telecommunications/ICT is a common terminology, which we can recognize in numerous resolutions of a Plenipotentiary Conference. I'd like to concur, what is delegated from Philippines and Canada or the Arab Group and African states. There are many resolutions to utilize the same terminology. In order to use these terms, not to make any confusion to the readers, I believe the right place to discuss this term is Plenipotentiary Conference, not the WCIT, thank you.  
 >> Chair: U.S., briefly, please?   
 >> United States: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and good afternoon to all colleagues. Mr. Chairman, many points have been raised previously by speakers with which we'd agree. Those expressed by the Philippines, Canada, Korea, and in addition, we would also join with Algeria in supporting a definition of telecommunications or the definitions of telecommunications to remain stable.

Mr. Chairman, we've common to the conclusion at the time of the Antalya plenipotentiary that ICTs and resolutions can be used in other strategic plan, and other parts of the documentation that doesn't, in any way, challenge the definition of telecommunications, but that for working purposes only, which is to say for the purposes of facilitating the work of the, of the ITU without imposing on that term, a definition. And we have agreed with that approach and we've agreed in using that term in resolutions, but we do not agree that it can be incorporated into a treaty text. It remains a term that is largely journalistic, it doesn't have a definition that with which everyone has agreed and as our colleague from Canada has indicated, work is underway in the council to try to arrive at a definition.

We also would conclude then, in agreeing with Korea that this issue should be addressed as it appropriately should be at the plenipotentiary in Busan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, I have a long list and not planning to go through them. What I suggest, I take this issue, the same group, informal group that deals with ROA/OA so that for the sake of time, not go through a timeless debate of the Plenary meeting. We have lots of things that we can finish in this valuable time in the Plenary. If you are okay with this approach, I'd defer, not only the definition of Telecommunications/ICT, but also there's ahead of us, International Telecommunications/ICT service also to that, to avoid discussion on the new additional definition. Thank you, I see no objection.

Okay, we can move now to Portugal, you still ask for the floor? Portugal?   
 >> Portugal: ‑‑  
 >> Chair: Thank you. We now can move to international services definitions. The countries have asked to keep the text as it is. With the exception of the Arab proposals to modify the text, the African to delete the text and Mexico to delete the text. I'm going to go back to them and ask for their cooperation to, to be aligned, there's a lot of countries asking for the same thing. I'll start with Arab, then Africa and Mexico? Arab? Who will take it?   
 >> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We realize the main purpose of the WCIT is to interview national telecommunications service and international telecommunications in general and therefore the proposal that comes from Arab Group, since we're revising this, it's also time to update this definition, which is the core business of what we're doing after 24 or 25 years, maybe 26 years by the time it comes into force. So, therefore, we think that it's very essential that we also take a look at this, the proposals or the amendments that we're making, is very minor. It's probably one line that we are actually adding into this. Or even less than one line. And I think it should probably be discussed in parallel with Telecommunications/ICT. It has definitely a relation to that and we'd be happy to further explain the rationale behind this. Thank you, Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. The African ‑‑ Egypt?   
 >> Egypt: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Indeed we found that the international telecom services is found in CS1/011 and that's why we introduce intersection between the two, to just strike it out, but we feel no harm of keeping it if the majority want that. Shouldn't add or subtract from the treaty. Thank you, Chairman, however there was an addition by Africa that I think we will discuss next. Thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, Mexico?   
 >> Mexico: Thank you, Chairman. Mexico's position is to suppress this definition and we would like to make it clear that in our view, the modification should only be carried out by a Plenipotentiary Conference. However, we would join a consensus for no change.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. That keeps, so the African and Mexico, they have no objection to keep the text as it is. I'll go back to the Arab proposal, to see if they're okay to keep the text as it is. Arabs?   
 >> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Chairman. If you're speaking about Proposal Number 22 by the Arab Group, we can definitely consult on this and I have to also go back and check if the group, this is a new proposal, to suppress this or maintain it. I have to take it back to the group, but if you're speaking about Proposal 23, I think it's a very essential element, that is the core of what we're doing. Thank you.  
 >> Chair: Sorry, the Arab Proposal Number 22, yes. It is 22. We're trying to make progress here, if you can go along with the rest of the groups, I'd really appreciate it. The Arab proposal, Document 7, Number 22. Which means, leave the text as it is and not strike telecommunication offices or stations of any nature that are in or belong to ‑‑ that's the text that the other regional groups and administrations wanted to keep it unchanged.  
 >> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Chairman. I think the best I could do at this stage is go back and consult with the rest of the group. As I mentioned, this is the core of the ITRs. The changes we made is not contradictory with the CSCV, it's still in consistency, however I'd like to go back and consult in our group and at this stage, we do not say no, we do not say yes, but we have to really consult on this. This is, I would say, the most important, one of the most important definitions of the ITRs and after 25 years, we have to really think about it, if there is a need for update, at least within the ITRs. So maybe by the time the group who meets on telecommunications ROA/OA, we'd have the chance to consult with other administrations, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, I'll count that this is positive, I hope by that time you come up with an agreement, but the remaining groups are in line. Egypt?   
 >> Egypt: Thank you, Chairman. However, I want a clarification because we have changed our position now by accepting the text, however, if the plenipotentiary decided to change the definition of the, of the, this International Telecommunication Service, who this reflects by default to the ITRs or we need to revise the definition. If we need another process after 20 years to align the two texts, then we'll support deleting the text as originally, but if it follows the decision of changing it, our acceptance would be valid. Thank you, Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Any change to the Constitution is definitely going to apply to the ITRs. So that's the higher text. Okay...we can move now, we are done with the basic definitions, Philippines and Iran, you want the floor? Iran?   
 >> Iran: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, we support your last statement. What you said, it is already in number 32 of Article 4 of Constitution. In case of inconsistency within provision of Constitution, the provision of Constitution prevails. It's a text Plenipotentiary Conference and if there is any change in future for the text, that will prevail, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. Philippines, brief? We need to move to Article 8.  
 >> Philippines: Likewise, I support your position that in event the definition of the terms telecommunications and International Telecommunication Service is changed by the plenipotentiary, pursuant to the process outlined in our Constitution, then that change, automatically becomes part of our ITR, as far as the term is concerned, because of the primacy of our Constitution and any other lesser rules must follow always, the Constitution. Thank you.  
 >> Chair: We'll move to Article 8, Page 54, Rev 1. Some editorial in nature, some substantial proposals. I'll ask the speakers to be very brief and one minute to basically introduce their proposals, so we can focus on substantials rather than editorial. Asia‑Pacific, Japan, to introduce the document? Or their proposal.  
 >> Japan: Thank you, Chairman. APT, proposal is just editorial in nature, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, Arab? Briefly?   
 >> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Chairman. Similarly, the Arab Group, Mr. Chairman, most of their changes on Article 8 is basically editorial, as well as similar to other administrations, however, there are things that we just made it clearer to the text, like basically encouraging administrations to do things in timely manner. Already, administrations, for example, are delegating this, this information to some of their sector members or some of their operating agencies. We also wanted to make this clear in the text. This is already a practice that is there, but we just want to make it clear, so administrations can delegate such, or authorize this to their operating agency with such important information. This is mainly the two additional clarifications that we added and we're very optimistic this shouldn't be an issue. Thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. I see Kyrgyzstan is asking for the floor.  
 >> KYRGYZSTAN: Many thanks. Thank you, Sir. The RCC's proposal contains some editorial changes. This concerns both the Russian version and other versions. The Member States should transmit information to the Secretary‑General, in essence is what we want to change.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. I think you've used the word shall, but anyway, that's in your proposal. U.S., you have the floor.  
 >> United States: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we propose two changes. Two kinds of changes. The first is to shorten and make more specific, the information that should be provided to the Secretary‑General as it's consistent with the kinds of information we have on many occasions and in some cases, routinely provided to the ITU. That's information of a statistical nature. We must add, in addition, that we do that with a number of international organisations. So Mr. Chairman, we retain the phrase a statistical nature and supp an administrative operational and tariff and combine it into the collective, a statistical nature. The changes that are essentially editorial and creating alignment with the Constitution Convention, we add Constitution and Convention of this article. We add Constitution, we strike administrative and we then further, in alignment with the Constitution Convention, refer to the WTSA, World Telecommunications Standardization Assemblies and telecommunication conferences, consistent with the phrasing found in the Constitution and the Convention, thank you Mr. Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, Cameroon, briefly, please?   
 >> Cameroon: Thank you, Cameroon has endorsed the North African position on Article 8 and supports its position. This proposal, African Common Proposal, I mean, brings to the table, some editorial changes, on one hand and also, highlights that operating agencies can provide recommendations to the Secretary‑General, provided they're authorized to do so by the Member States. That's our contribution, Sir.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, African proposal, Egypt?   
 >> Egypt: Thank you, Chairman. I think our colleague has already presented that and to keep consistency between the, consistency of the detail coming from the Member States. We have harmonization or assurance of consistency. Thank you, Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, Mexico?   
 >> Mexico: Thank you, Chair. Like the proposals made before, what we are asking is that we make some editorial changes to the article. The idea is to make things more specific and more clearly indicate what the responsibility of the Secretaries‑General is with disseminating it with the members.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. European Common Proposal.  
 >> We agreed the ITR shouldn't overlap with the Constitution and with the Convention. Europe considers that many references are out of date, Article 8 of the ITRs and that the Provisions 98 and 99 of the Convention in Article 5 contains similar text to the current text in the ITRs. Therefore, in order to avoid duplication, and to be in line with this morning's decisions, Europe is endorsing the suppression of these provisions, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Australia?   
 >> Australia: Thank you, Chair. Australia's position is very similar to Europe's. Our position is that this provision could be suppressed. Similar provisions are contained in the ITU Provision Article 5. It's part of the capacity building work of the ITU and is undertaken in accordance with the decisions of the relative assembly and conference reach sector. Thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. India?   
 >> India: Chair, we didn't make any decision on this Article 8.  
 >> Chair: I'll go to Iran then, summarize. Iran?   
 >> Iran: Thank you, Chairman. Although we haven't made any common proposal, we've seen several proposals, modifications and deletion. Let's go to the substance of the matter. It says that using the suitable and economical means, shall disseminate information. We're talking about disseminated information, do we need to have this text at all? Secretary‑General is quite wise and knows what he has to do and choose the most efficient and propose manner to disseminate information and so forth. And take account of that. Do we need this one, Chairman? Maybe 24 years ago we need that, but now today, we've developed a lot of things that the Secretary‑General is doing or has done. Do we need this type of instruction? If the Secretary‑General need that support, let's discuss it. If Secretary‑General believe that he can go ahead with whatever the trust is, we don't need that, we may go to the deletion of that, thank you.  
 >> Chair: So you're proposing to delete it? There is, I would say, editorial nature of this, of this text, and there's also two, two fundamental additions. One, the transmission of information to the Secretary‑General in a timely manner and second, authorization of Member States to transmit the information directly by the operating agency. So, one way is to strike out the entire text as proposed by some administrations and/or keep it with minimum changes or propose, you know, in addition to the existing text with the small editorial changes, some additional information. With regard to the transmittance of information in a timely manner as a concept, as well as allow authorization by Member States to allow operating agency to send the information directly to Secretary‑General.

So let's try the first approach. Strike out entire text. Is there any support to strike out entire text? United Arab Emirates, then Canada.  
 >> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, I think a very important point has been raised. Either Mr. Malcolm or maybe Richard Hill or any of the Secretariat dealing with such information can give us, very brief, the importance of how others are making use of it. Many people in this room usually are dealing with such informations, maybe operators are much more concerned about it. So before we decide do we need it or not, very brief, if we can get little information about the importance of this information. Maybe this will help, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Malcolm, please.  
 >> Malcolm Johnson: This information is provided online, we used to use operational bulletin, now we have it online. We find it is very much welcome by operators, so we would continue doing that. And so, this is the basis for us doing that action. Having this text here. Thank you, Chairman.  
 >> Chair: If the text is deleted, will any of your operations be affected? So basically, you're saying the text can be deleted? Okay...so that's the reply, Canada?   
 >> Canada: Thank you, Chairman. In light of that explanation, certainly we can support the idea of deletion, thank you.  
 >> Chair: U.K.?   
 >> United Kingdom: I support the European petition and in light of the explanation, given about not affecting operations at all, I would, of course, support deletion.  
 >> Chair: Brazil, then Iran?   
 >> Brazil: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Given the explanations, we also support that. Thank you.  
 >> Iran: We suggest asking the Secretariat with the explanation, even if we delete that, still Secretariat provide information, even with deletion of that. To disseminate that information, they disseminate many, many information, without provision in ITR or anywhere. I don't think that deletion of that will affect the dissemination of information. In other ways, they don't need specific instruction, they can do it as a day‑to‑day operations, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Egypt?   
 >> Egypt: Thank you, Chairman. Talking about Africa, I think we have some difficulty in deleting this provision. The information provided is sometimes essential for operators to harmonize their work and be at work with the numbering, but more importantly, the misuse of numbering. Now we've seen increase in the case of misuse of numbering sources and Member States publish their complaints. This should be brought to every public operator, it doesn't have any legal arm, until now, to combat such activities. But at least we should, if this means such information will be some sort of, of action to put pressure on operator to abide with the recommendations and avoid such malpractices, if this is not included in the 3T, it can be subject to deletion by any assembly or just mere decision by the TCB or whatever. So putting the 3T assures that information is exchanged and be way of conveying such practices put pressure on fraudulent activities or mis-operation of work by some operators. Thank you Mr. Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, Philippines. You have one minute, please, we are pressed on time.  
 >> Philippines: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I support the position taken by Egypt that we ought not let this provision, but let me advance another reason. The mere fact that the Secretary‑General is doing this on a day‑to‑day basis, if that is the fact, an occurrence, this is important in the sense that it fixes a legal obligation on the part of the Secretary‑General to disseminate the information, subject of this matter. So if the Secretary‑General, for one reason or another, neglects to provide the information, although he may already be doing it on a day‑to‑day basis, this is the provision, which would encourage us to say, Mr. Secretary‑General, here is your duty, specified in the treaty, which you must do, because it is a duty, it is something with the Secretary‑General, cannot waive, as opposed to a right. This is important because it speaks of a duty, not so much of a right. Thank you.  
 >> Chair: Okay, I think we are going to take a lot of discussions on this, let us put this in an informal meeting to harmonize the text. To cater for all the concern, I thought this was one of the articles that would pass very quickly, but I was wrong and for the sake of time, I think we need to move on.

If you don't mind, we will move on, I see a lot of requests coming. For the sake of time, let's move on. We'll defer this discussion to an informal group to discuss it. We have seen different views, Mr. Malcolm, you want to have the floor to explain something? Algeria, you still want to have the floor?   
 >> Algeria: Thank you, Sir. We share your concern with regard to managing time. Now I know you've hesitated giving me the floor, I understand, that but I appreciate it, nevertheless, Sir, we have, no doubts about the good faith of the directors of the Bureau, Mr. Johnson is very generous and very careful to make sure that administrations and Member States have information, Mr. Sanou and Mr. Zhao, this is why we elected them. But I share the view of the Philippines, initially, the Secretariat did all this. This provision exists, this means the Secretary‑General has to conduct business in this manner, if we suppress this provision, a day may come when the Secretary‑General, not this one, but another Secretary‑General may say "I don't have to do this, so I'm not going to do it at all." This is the reason why we have no trouble in asking to maintain this provision, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, I'd ask the administrations to bear with us now. This isn't a very substantial issue that I can see in the ITR, dissemination of this information, I think it would be good for an informal group to discuss it, come up with a concrete proposal. I don't see controversial issue here, at least from my point of view. So if you can bear with me and to give it to an informal group to discuss it and come up to the Plenary with a proposal. Sweden, do you still want the floor? Thank you very much. Yes? No? Okay, Sweden, go ahead.  
 >> Sweden: Thank you, Chairman. I hesitated taking the floor but since you gave a few more seconds to express views, we'd like to express our view that we'd support suppression of this text in order to balance the situation and debate here, but we're prepared to participate in a small group discussing the issue, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, now we move to Article 8A, environmental issue. I'll give the floor to the African Group to present their proposal. And I hope it's going to be easy, please?   
 >> EGYPT: It's an important issue, taken by operating agency in particular to take care of the environment. It's divided into two parts. One is energy efficiency. I've seen data servers extremely hungry for energy and heat production, also the e‑waste resulting from operations of telecommunication equipment. It's hurt us and prevents us from dealing with dangerous materials. Encourages operators, but however, Member States should cooperate in such activities. Member States shall cooperate in such activities to preserve the environment. Thank you, Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Cameroon?   
 >> Cameroon: Thank you, Sir. On this item, we would like to endorse the African Common Proposal which has just been presented.  
 >> Chair: Is there objection to add this to ITR? Thank you, I see Canada and U.K.   
 >> Canada: Thank you, Chairman. We fully appreciate and understand the importance of the issues that have been raised in this proposal to include a new provision in the ITRs. Chairman, our only comment concerns the number of resolutions that we already have in our text that refer to various issues associated with the environment and climate change. For example, Chairman, we just recently, in the, in the World Telecommunications Standardization Assembly, updated Resolution 73 on the subject of ICTs and climate change and a new resolution was adopted on the role of telecommunications, information, and communication technology, in handling and controlling e‑waste from telecom equipment and methods of treating it. Chairman, we also have a Plenipotentiary Conference resolution and a development conference resolution.

My only point, Chairman, is perhaps in the interest of harmonization, we need to give some thought to how we deal with all of these various resolutions and if we have a new provision in the ITRs, how those resolutions relate to this particular revision. Thank you.  
 >> Chair: U.K.?   
 >> United Kingdom: Thank you, I'd like to associate myself with the remarks made by my colleague from Canada. This is an issue that's being looked at by Study Group 5, especially Working Party 3 and we think this is the correct way to look at these issues. It is not clear, as it relates to the telecommunication services or, like Canada, I would associate myself with the remarks of recognizing the importance of these issues and particularly to many developing countries. But perhaps this is more the territory of ITU‑T recommendations and study group work.  
 >> Chair: Egypt?   
 >> Egypt: Thank you, Chairman. I'll talk once more on behalf of Africa. Listening carefully to what's been said, we haven't forgotten the debate about recommendations, voluntarily, not mandatory. And with importance of such provisions, should be, not just left to recommendations. These revisions are high level as requested by several Member States. It's high level that corporations or Member States, this cannot be put into a recommendation. The recommendation doesn't imply any such mandating of activities. And still, it is relevant to the international telecom. Telecom is part of international telecommunications and it's disposal or reflect of the environment, used with international telecom. I think these are relevant and high level and reflects necessity to corporate, which is a high level request. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, Australia?   
 >> Australia: Thank you, Chairman. Australia would like to associate with the comments of Canada and the U.K. on this particular issue. We do appreciate that the issue of energy efficient and climate change more broadly are of great concern to a number of ITU Member States. We believe there's a positive role that telecommunications can have in this issue. Australia supports the current work of the ITU‑T and ITU‑D sectors. Including the work of Study Group 5 and Study Group 2. And through Resolutions 54 and 66 for Information Communication Technologies and climate change.

Also, in terms of international law, energy efficiency in the use of ITU‑Ts in addressing climate change are being addressed through the U.N. framework and climate change. ITRs addressing this issue, do not interfere with existing international law in this regard. Thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, I think what I understood from Canada, that Canada issue is that we need to look into the outcome of resolutions, recommendations from the previous conference when dealing with environmental issues. I haven't heard Canada objecting to the inclusion of such issue in the ITR. So I think this is, this is another issue which we have to deal with. Germany?   
 >> Germany: Thank you, chair. We, our understanding was different. When listening to Canada, we'd like to associate with the remarks by Canada and also with the remarks by the previous speaker from Australia and also by the remarks by U.K., thank you.  
 >> Chair: UAE?   
 >> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Chairman. We'd like to express our support for the proposal submitted by the African Group on e‑waste and the protection of the environment. As Distinguished Representative Canada rightly pointed out, we've adopted a resolution on e‑waste during the assembly and this was the first resolution of its kind, no other assembly or conference adopted this resolution. Equally, I'd like to support the views of the representative of Egypt, speaking on behalf of Africa that there is a need that reference is made clearly to e‑waste and to climate change in an international treaty or Convention. Therefore, we support this proposal, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Mr. Bruce, can you repeat your intervention? I think what I got as a Chair, there's no objection on such conclusion of ITRs, but you're referring to recommendations and resolutions.  
 >> Bruce Gracie: I'd be happy to try to explain what I was suggesting. I was pointed out, we have a number of resolutions, not only two now from the assembly itself, one new resolution on e‑waste and another resolution on ICTs in climate change which we updated and modified at the assembly, but we also have resolutions from the Plenipotentiary Conference and indeed from the Telecommunication Development Conference. So in light of that, what I was asking, is when we consider the possibility of inclusion of a new provision, in the ITRs, we need to take into account, any actions associated with these resolutions in order to ensure that there is no redundancy or overlap in the actions that are contemplated. If, in fact, the actions are already covered, in those resolutions, then perhaps there is some argument as, for not including a new provision. However, if the new provision is addressing issues beyond those which are addressed in the resolutions, then perhaps it is feasible to include a new provision. I hope that clarifies matters, Chairman, thank you.  
 >> Chair: When you started the discussion, and I go back to what you just said, in principle, these are you know, high level principles that deals with environmental issues. And therefore, the resolutions of the assembly as you know, specific to you know, how they deal with for example, e‑wastes. I don't think there's a contradiction with that, but in any case, your point is taken. I want to capitalize on this. These are high‑level principles, to help the meeting. We need to consider what you just said. I haven't seen, since a lot of the administrations supported your views. I don't see that there's an objection to include them in the ITRs. That's what I was trying to reach to. Thank you. Japan?   
 >> Japan: Thank you, Chairman. Japan associates with the comment made by Australia, Germany, and England, United Kingdom. In the sense that we have to, we're not sure whether there's an e‑waste issue within the scope of the ITR. Understand that ITR is a high level provision, concerning the International Telecommunication Services and interconnection. This environmental issue is just a bit outside of original scope of ITR, so I'm not sure. Thank you very much.  
 >> Chair: United States?   
 >> United States: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we'd associate with Germany, Australia, Japan, and United Kingdom on this issue. We believe, of course, that these are very important issues, indeed the environmental issue was dealt with at the, in Lisbon, during the last World Telecommunications Policy forum and developing an opinion on that subject, we also, a colleague from Canada had noted the work being done in WTSA and Study Group 5. We believe that's the appropriate place for that work. Mr. Chairman, we may be faced with a number of issues during the course of our conference that have merit, but they are best dealt with in other environments, in other fora and in some cases are already being dealt with. So we believe this issue falls into that category that is being dealt with appropriately in other aspects of the work of the ITU and other fora. We do not see it needed to be included here. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, I think also, I have a very long list of speakers here. This is one of the texts that I'll defer to an informal group and also with the energy efficiency text coming from Cameroon. Otherwise, I see views that will not reach to anywhere in this, we can debate that for long time. So if you don't mind, I'll put this issue also with the informal meeting. I will be, I want you to bear with me, I'm trying to establish an informal group or an ad hoc group to look into a number of issues when we come to. I have a very long list. If you don't mind, I don't want to take them, we're going to repeat exactly the same thing. If there is no objection, we can move on and I want to move to the new article or new proposed Article 8B, accessibility for persons with disabilities. I have one proposal from Hungary. I want to give the floor to Hungary to present the proposal.

I still have, on my screen, Iran, Ghana and Costa Rica asking for the floor. Is it on the same subject? Iran?   
 >> Iran: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just so we can agree with you, you treat Article 8B, however we have a suggestion that we now convert the informal group to an ad hoc group, open to all Member States with sufficient number of seats and possibility to listen. And second, I have a point to raise under any other business, I request that you kindly give the floor, at that time to the Chairman of the APT, the group to inform the community of the decision we made at that meeting, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, Costa Rica?   
 >> Costa Rica: Yes, I wanted to speak to the same matter, Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, Uruguay?   
 >> Uruguay: Thank you, Chairman. On behalf of CITEL, we have a proposal on persons with disabilities and we also have a proposal regarding persons, elderly persons, elder persons. It was discussed and we had in fact come up with a resolution. We've been dealing with this since 2008. It was discussed at the Plenipotentiary Conference in 2010 and the Member States of CITEL would propose the inclusion of a new provision which would be under 38A of the eight ITRs and the Member States should ensure the accessibility of telecommunications for all persons with disabilities, including those disabilities related to H, which would serve a different purpose from that established in existing regulations, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. Before we get into it, I'll give the floor to Hungary to present their document.  
 >> Hungary: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. In accordance with Document 5 on behalf of Hungary, I'd like to briefly introduce our proposal on the issue, making ICTs accessible to people with disabilities. We proposed a new article covering this issue should be added to the ITRs when they're reviewed at this conference. The new provision would encourage national governments to provide global telecommunication and ICT services based on technical standards that ensure accessibility. This is in line with Article 9 of the U.N. Convention on the rise of persons with disabilities, which promotes the use of ICTs to enable everyone to participate fully in society on an equal basis with others. It'd seem appropriate that the conference on international telecommunications recognizes this new provision. Thank you very much for your attention, Mr. Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, as you can see, we have a new proposal from Hungary on accessibility for persons with disabilities. Is there any objection to include this provision in the ITR? Sweden? And UAE?   
 >> Sweden: We noticed this proposal would interest, in order to be in line with the previous discussion that we had on the definitions, we believe that the word ICT shouldn't be included in this text since we are discussing ICT in other cases, thank you.  
 >> Chair: UAE?   
 >> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Chairman. To support Sweden in terms of that, I think this will go through the same discussions as the previous article and probably we can deal with it all in the same informal group. Thank you, Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Can I put the words "and ICT" in square brackets and approve the text? Is that okay? Japan? U.S.?   
 >> Japan: Thank you, Chairman. Again, like the previous text concerning e‑waste, Japan, we're not sure whether this accessibility issue is within the scope of the ITR, since ITR is about the provision of International Telecommunication Services and interconnections. This is apparently it's out of that scope, so I'm not sure, thank you very much.  
 >> Chair: U.S.?   
 >> United States: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We'd note there's a resolution from Guadalajara, Resolution 175 dealing with the issues raised in this proposal by Hungary. Secondly, Mr. Chairman, the WTSA has just approved Resolution 70, which also is relevant to the same issues. Mr. Chairman, as a result, we'd be, we'd indicate that while this has merit, we would wish to look at the implementation of those resolutions as being important to addressing the concerns expressed in the Hungarian proposal.

However, Mr. Chairman, we'd also ask, through you, that the proposal by CITEL on the same subject be made available to the Plenary in writing so that the two proposals, one by Hungary and one by CITEL can be seen in comparison. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Botswana, then Iran?   
 >> Botswana: Thank you, Chairman. Botswana supports the proposal from Hungary. As we provide International Telecom Service, we are to take into consideration the persons with disabilities or persons with disabilities. We have to bear in mind, this thing, we cannot really get anything to resolutions. This is high level provisions, which is appropriately included in the ITR.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, Iran?   
 >> Iran: Thank you, Chairman. There are several hundred millions of people with disabilities and in fact many of us are potential persons with disabilities, potential persons with disabilities. So I don't think that anyone is against the substance of the proposals. The issue is how to take that and the provisions of the ITR and in the resolution of ITR. That may be a good discussion at the level of the ad hoc group, not informal group, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Uganda and Peru.  
 >> Uganda: Uganda supports this provision, we don't see harm in having this high level language in ITRs. Thank you, Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Peru? I know there are a lot of people asking for the floor, but we need to have a coffee break and finish in two minutes. Peru?   
 >> Peru: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, we'd support the proposal by Hungary that, indeed, we should provide access for persons with disabilities. We believe that we, this article could be considered together with Article 43 which establishes quality of service. To my mind, disability is related to terminals and web capacity in order to provide access to persons with disabilities.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, I think we need to continue the Plenary to the next session. We'll have a coffee break and then convene. It's really critical important that we finish the agenda for today. So that we can make progress. The afternoon, we had discussed a number of issues, but I wish that we would finish them in the Plenary, but we will defer many of them to an ad hoc group that will be created from the Plenary. We'll have 15 minutes coffee break, we'll come back with resolutions. I know that Portugal, Cote de Ivoire, is asking for the floor ‑‑  
 >> Iran: We have discussed an issue and the Chairman of the APT Preparatory Group think it's important to be informed. I know you gave the floor to the preparatory group that will provide you with that information, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, let's have a coffee break, we are not onto other business, unless you want it here now. Okay, APT? Chairman of APT? Japan or...Philippines?   
 >> Philippines: Yes, Mr. Chair, I'm speaking on behalf and for APT. Mr. Chair, the clarification sought yesterday, during the first Plenary meeting by Iran, with respect to agenda item number 18, DT/4 was made on behalf of the APT members. The APT members asked Iran to seek clarification on that item. And we are requesting, Mr. Chair, that the statement be reflected in the minutes of the first Plenary. So that's all, Mr. Chair.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. Take a note of it. Thank you. So we'll have 15 minutes coffee break and then come back, convene at 15 past 4:00. Thank you.

[Plenary 3 continues...16:15 local time]

>> Chair: Ladies and gentlemen, if you can take your seat. Sorry for the slight delay. We were just trying to figure out the arrangement of the new created ad hoc group which I'll announce in a minute. We had discussed the previous Plenary, that different issues, I'll start with the easy one, which was just recent and that's Article 8. And the new addition, which is 8A, which deals with environmental issues. And energy efficiency and then 8B, accessibility for persons with disabilities and there is, there is a proposal from Hungary and CITEL. That is going to go to an ad hoc group of the Plenary.

This ad hoc group is going to meet tomorrow at 8:00 in room B. And it's going to be also on the screen. I'll ask Egypt to Chair this ad hoc group. I'll ask Dr. Sherif to Chair this ad hoc group that deals with addition of 8A and 8B. Room B, tomorrow at 8:00. Okay?

As far as the binding nature of recommendations in Article 1.5 and 1.6, we'll create ad hoc 2, which will deal with that. And I'll ask South Africa to lead this group. And ask Mr. Jim to chair this group and it's going to meet tomorrow at 1:30. Again, room B. Now, as far as the issues related to Telecommunications/ICT and Telecommunications/ICT Services, I'll take them in the same informal group that deals with ROA/OA. We're going to announce, going to meet tomorrow at 5:30. In room B. Sorry, 5:30 in the afternoon. Is anybody here in the morning? Okay...you can see how much pressure I have now.

Okay...with that, can we move now to the titles of articles? This should be fairly easy. And we'll go to Page 57 of DT/4 Rev 1. And I'll start with the no change of the titles of articles and I'll start with the International Telecommunications Regulations, the ITRs and all proposals, proposes no change. If you're okay with that, we can proceed. No need to present documents. And this is for approval. Thank you. We go to the title of Article 1, purpose and scope of the regulations. Again, all proposals coming to this conference proposes no change to the title of this article and this is up for approval. Thank you, Article 2. Definitions. Again, the same thing. Submitted for proposal, for approval. Thank you. It's approved. Article 3, international networks, as well, all the proposals coming to the conference proposes no change. Thank you. Article 4, International Telecommunications Services, we have also, majority of the proposals proposes no change and we have one proposal from RCC, I'd ask RCC?   
 >> Russian federation: Thank you, Sir. The RCC proposal is, is just editorial change to the Russian version of the text. In the Russian, Article 4 is as such. International Telecommunications Services, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Great, so there is no change to the English version? Thank you. Article 5. No change to safety of life and prior telecommunications? Thank you. Article 7. We have Cameroon and RCC, probably on the English, on the Russian version, but I would listen first to Cameroon.  
 >> Cameroon: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is simply a typographical error here. Our proposal is no change, there's an error in the document.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, RCC?   
 >> Russian federation: It's just an editorial change in the Russian version, nothing serious.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, great. Article 8. Dissemination of information? Now...I know that there has been a proposal on the suppression versus modification, so I'll skip this for the sake of time and put it into a square bracket here. Article 9. Special arrangements. There's a proposal of no change to the article, to the title, sorry. Thank you.

We can move now to resolutions, recommendations and opinions and if you can go to Page 71 of DT/4. Thank you, we have, we'll start with the Resolution 1 and we have all the proposals coming to the conference to suppress this resolution, except Cameroon. Cameroon, can have the floor if it's possible to go along with the rest of the conference. I see the editorial, if there's no objection, we can go along with the remaining administrations and basically propose expressing this resolution. Cameroon?   
 >> Cameroon: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We had proposed some editorial changes, but inasmuch as the proposal can be taken into account, we nevertheless agree to the suppression of the resolution.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. So the Resolution Number 1 is put as a proposal to be suppressed.  
 >> INDONESIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to draw your attention for these resolutions, recommendation and opinion. We'd like to draw your attention from the meeting for proposals in Article 1, this 1.8, document 8A. And this consists of the need of the global corporations among Member States in this ICT sector. You can call it telecommunications sector, if you disagree. For the sake, for cyber security, cyber threat and so on. This is to make sure that in line with other meetings and result of ITU meetings, we need to enhance the cyber security and defend cyber threats among countries. We need global cooperation in this field to make sure that while the ICT sector is increasing, it's developing, we need to make sure that cyber threats and security will not suppress that development.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, we're talking about Resolution 1, the proposals are to delete Resolution 1. I'm sorry, I was totally confused. Indonesia, if you can delay this, because we are talking about the, I know that you might be asking for resolutions or recommendations opinion, but we are tacking the issues of resolution that we have proposals on the table here for suppression of modifications. Indonesia?   
 >> Indonesia: Yeah, my point is general comment for all the resolutions, resolution recommendations and opinions. And not, and not yet on a particular expression of Resolution 1, thank you Mr. Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. So the Resolution 1 is now put for suppression. There's no objection, you can proceed with that. Thank you. Resolution 2? Again, we have proposal from Cameroon. I'll give the floor to Cameroon if they can go along with the suppression of this resolution as well, Cameroon?   
 >> Cameroon: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would repeat observations regarding Resolution 1 that if the concerns are covered elsewhere, we would have no problem with agreeing to a suppression.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, your proposal, as I can see it is editorial, I think it can be suppressed along with the others. If you don't mind, we can go ahead and proceed. Thank you. Resolution 3? All proposals for suppression as put forward for the meeting for approval? Thank you. Resolution 5? Again, all proposals to suppress Resolution 5. Thank you. Resolution 7? Again, all proposals coming, except Cameroon, to suppress Resolution 7. I give the floor to Cameroon again. Again, I see it's editorial, but I'll give the floor to Cameroon. Cameroon?   
 >> Cameroon: Once again, thank you Mr. Chairman for giving us the floor. This is a new version of an older resolution. As old resolutions are concerned, I would agree that they can be suppressed.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. Resolution 8. It's also put forward by Member States for suppression. And I'll ask Cameroon for their proposals, if they can go along with the remaining administrations. I can see editorial changes only to the proposed Resolution 8 and there is no objection; that can be deleted as well and suppressed. Cameroon?   
 >> Cameroon: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would have no objection to its suppression.  
 >> Chair: Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you, I'm now at Page 72. And if you don't mind, let us go through the suppression of recommendations and I'll take it once before the draft new resolutions and the proposal here is from all the proposals coming to the conference to suppress Recommendations 1, 2 and 3. I'll take it all at once. If there are no objections, we can suppression them. Thank you. I will also take the proposal of the Opinion, Number 1, for suppressing Opinion Number 1 and ask Cameroon if they can go along with remaining Opinion Number 1. Cameroon?   
 >> Cameroon: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we'd agree. In order to ensure that our conference goes ahead in a positive manner.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, Cameroon, for your cooperation. Now we'll go to the new draft resolutions and I'll give the floor, now, to Asia‑Pacific to present their new resolution. Egypt, you ask for the floor? Egypt?   
 >> Egypt: That was an issue about Resolution 7. Allow me to bring this now, this is related to Article 8, submission of information. And since we didn't conclude yet, Article 8, it's all right to come back to Resolution 7 if something arise from Resolution 8. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Okay, Asia‑Pacific? Continues presenting Asia‑Pacific on the new resolutions, please go ahead.  
 >> Asia‑Pacific: Chairman, could you kindly indicate which Page?   
 >> Chair: Yes, thank you, Page 80. ACP1 towards the end of the Page. I need the country who presented to present it from Asia‑Pacific. This is to deal with land‑lock, developing countries and small islands. Nepal, please go ahead.  
 >> Nepal: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is a special proposal for the land‑lock countries and a small island of developing states for access, the International Optical Fiber Network for the consideration of the Plenary, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, I'll go to Cameroon now, on the same issue. India asking for the floor before we give it to Cameroon. India?   
 >> India: ‑‑  
 >> Chair: Okay, Cameroon, if you can present your proposal on the same thing. Land‑lock developing countries, LLDC for access. Cameroon, you have the floor.  
 >> Cameroon: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Bearing in mind the evolution towards broadband, recognizing the importance of optical fiber at an international level and recognizing the importance of access to the fiber‑optic network for land lock countries proposes that measures be taken in order to make, to facilitate the access of land‑lock countries to optical fiber so that they can enjoy all the benefits of it by broadband.

If we go directly to the resolves section, it is proposed that this resolution be submitted to the U.N., the Secretary‑General of the united nations under request Secretary‑General with a view to bring to the attention of the U.N. high representative LCs and also encourages active cooperation in order to accord a high priority to telecommunications and ICTs in such land‑lock countries and, in other words, we continue to bear in mind the role of broadband in developing countries and to ensure that measures are taken in order to provide access.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. I'll take these two resolutions at once since they are talking about the same thing. So we have new also. Okay, we'll take, we'll take the inter‑American proposal and then we'll discuss it, Paraguay on the same issue, Page 86.  
 >> Paraguay: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I apologize, I haven't got Page 86 in front of me, but I'd like to come back to the resolution we're looking at right now which goes along the lines of the Nepal initiative and we wanted to include two initiatives which are already underway in the Americas and would also speak to the South South Cooperation as recognized by the United States and Triangular Corporation. We'll have to consider, Mr. Chairman, the merging of these different texts.  
 >> Chair: Iran, you're asking for the floor. Please.  
 >> Iran: Thank you, Chairman. This resolution relating to land‑lock and small islands states was first disseminated from APT and Cameroon. Perhaps saying there's no objection to the resolution, but you may give it to one of the countries to combine the differences and resolve the text which has a point of all resolutions. I don't think there's any difficulty in our view in the substance of the resolutions, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, Iran. I'll put Iran's proposal to the meeting. If there's no objection to such resolution or concept to start with? And then we can give it to Paraguay to meet with Asia‑Pacific and Cameroon to draft a unified resolution and submit it to the Plenary. Paraguay and Jamaica? Paraguay?   
 >> Paraguay: Of course, Mr. Chairman, I'd be delighted to do so. We will work together.  
 >> Chair: Jamaica?   
 >> Jamaica: I'm sorry, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Jamaica, speaking on behalf of Caribbean Countries are tries in this resolution and would like to be part of group that would decide the final text. Thank you very much.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, we'll assign this to Paraguay and Jamaica, Ghana, and Asia‑Pacific to get together and come up with a, with a final draft text.

Now we go to new resolution from Ghana. Sorry, Asia‑Pacific, Cameroon, and Paraguay, Jamaica to get together and, and come up with a resolution, the final resolution. I give, now, the floor to Ghana. I have it here in the printed copy, Page 85, draft new resolution from Ghana. Ghana, you have the floor to present it.  
 >> Ghana: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and good afternoon to all colleagues. Mr. Chairman, we're here today because we've had these ITRs which are very important to us and never been looked at until 24 years since it was first introduced. Now, recognize the importance of these ITRs, supporting ITUs mission and we further recognize there's this radio regulations, similar to ITU that define a location of different radio services. That are looked at periodically. We also note, following, we note the following. The Council Working Group to prepare for the 2012 World Conference on International Telecommunication has held extensive consultations associating academic members and civil society groups, showing great interest in the innovation of the ITRs. That technological development and demand for services that require high bandwidth continue to grow, especially in the developing countries. Therefore, we request that the ITRs should be reviewed much more frequently at the occasion of every other WTSA as a result of rapid changes in technologies and services and thus, policies and regulations on ICTs should reflect these changes.

We invite the Secretary‑General to bring this resolution to the attention of the conference for consideration. Thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, Ghana. Is there any objection to include such a resolution? United Arab Emirates? Sweden?   
 >> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, chair, certainly no objection. I think this is a very, very constructive proposal that, that we just actually now are studying and I think it's very reasonable and definitely recognize this is an occasion to be addressed by the plenipotentiary and propose measures.  
 >> Chair: Sweden?   
 >> Sweden: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Sweden notes, with interest, the proposal from Ghana, but we also believe that since we're trying to establish a treaty text that will be a high level and would be, say applicable for many, many years, for what we already have existing procedures in the basic text of the union on how to convene World Conferences on International Telecommunication, we do not see a special recognition from this WCIT. We could apply the procedures that exist in the future to new WCIT. We do not see a need for this in the foreseeable future, because the intention is high level text. We aren't supporting this text. Thank you.  
 >> Chair: Iran?   
 >> Iran: Thank you, Chairman, the trust of the proposal is valuable. In fact, if we try to find a solution, many of our worries and anxieties will be removed because people are talking about the ITR would not be changed for many years. Then let us put whatever we can now, because there is no opportunity in the future. What Ghana brought to us is to more or less take the same approach of WRC, but in order to take advantage of the advances of technology and so forth. However there, are some other logistic issues to be discussed. We have to see how it needs to be held, what are the arrangements and the costs involved and so forth. So from that aspect, need to be studied. The proposal is positive and I think, it implied to my Distinguished Swedish Colleague, there's nothing wrong with trying to have a resolution and calling the plenipotentiary to consider having the conference every eight years. I don't see any difficulty with that. We look at the proposal with the optimistic way of approaching and perhaps seek further process of this resolutions or this draft in some other way, perhaps in a group or some informal discussions. We have general support for the resolutions, thank you.  
 >> Chair: United States.  
 >> United States: Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We wish to express our appreciation to our colleagues from Ghana for this proposed resolution. Mr. Chairman, as a principled matter, the United States has, takes the view that the ITRs that we are currently discussing and negotiating should remain stable. We believe there has been a benefit over the years of, of allowing a period of maturation to develop between ITR negotiations. We would note that this maturation allows for technology to develop such that we have a view of that technology in a way that informs the negotiations of the ITRs.

So, Mr. Chairman, we faced this same issue in 1988 and we developed Resolution Number 4, the changing telecommunication environment and called upon the plenipotentiary to look at the new types of services and diversity of arrangements that were developing as a result of those services.

In the same spirit, Mr. Chairman, we have proposed, the United States has proposed a revision to Resolution Number 4, retaining the title of the telecommunication environment and it also notes the developments that are taking place in the environment and that the ITU should take those into consideration and review them and inviting contributions from Member States and others to enrich that discussion. We are pleased, would be pleased, Mr. Chairman, at your discretion to introduce more‑fully that resolution, but we'd note a response to our colleagues from Ghana, we believe they're raising a broader issue and that we'd ask that we would take the view at this point that we cannot agree to a resolution that gives a definition time period, but rather, we want to look at it more broadly as a part of a discussion of the changing telecom environment and we wish to then introduce our Resolution, Number 4, that does precisely that. Takes into consideration existing Resolution Number 4 and updates it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
 >> Chair: I want to limit the discussion to one minute, even or less, so we can progress. We have a few things we need to finish before 5:30. South Africa?   
 >> South Africa: Thank you, Chairperson. We'd like to support this initiative from Ghana. It's been 24 years since the last time we dealt with the ITRs. We allowed a situation to pass where they became outdated and failure relevant in some ways. And, it took numerous meetings and discusses just so we could agree to hold this WCIT now. And understanding the comments, we believe the ITRs need to be high level, they need to be quite stable, we shouldn't also allow a situation to pass where we once again allow all the developments and the exciting technological developments that have happened to occur again without us once again being able to update this important document.

So, I think we would strongly recommend that this, this resolution is given consideration. I think it's a useful step forward, thank you, Chairperson.  
 >> Chair: Netherlands?   
 >> Netherlands: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We'd like to associate ourselves with what was said by Sweden and the United States. We are also looking for stable ITRs and to be brief, we would not like to support this resolution. Thank you, Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, the list is growing and there is, the U.S. have also a proposed Resolution Number 4. Modification of Resolution Number 4, changing telecommunication environment, assigned to Working Group 1. Since we're at this junction, I think we, if you are agreeing with me, if we can assign this resolution to be discussed in Working Group 1, under the same matter. Grouping them together and discussing them there. If there's no objection, let us do that. The list is huge and I don't think that we would reach a conclusion on this issue. And perhaps it's a good idea to discuss them with the U.S. modified proposal. Do you still ask for the floor? Bahrain? Canada? Costa Rica? China? Canada? Mexico? Iran? Can we defer this issue to Working Group 1 and discuss it there? Thank you for your cooperation. I still have Costa Rica, China, Iran. Do you still insist to have the floor? Iran?   
 >> Iran: Thank you, Chairman. What do you mean by Working Group 1, 5.1?   
 >> Chair: Yes, thank you, Iran. So let's take this to Working Group 5.1 and discuss it along with the U.S. proposal, thank you. Can we now move to Article 7? You can find it on Page 36 of DT/4. Again, I can see that majority of resolutions, majority, sorry, of the proposals are editorial in nature. I'll start with 7.1, I can see a lot of similarities between the different proposals. So if you don't mind, fortune the sake of time, to take 7.1 and the proposed changes is to add the word state after member, to add Constitution, and, and on the third line, we add state after member. If there is no objection, we can take these changes and approve it. Thank you, don't see anyone asking for the floor. I'll repeat, just, just in case I was too fast. Under 7.1, I see very similar proposals to add the word state on the first line after member, towards the end of the first line at the word Constitution, and, and the third line at state after the member. I believe this is editorial, that we can go ahead and do it, thank you.

Moving to 7.2. Again, I can see that it's only the addition of states after member on the second line. So if you are okay, we can move ahead and do that without going through state by state presentation of the document. Thank you.

Now we move to Article 5. Since it was added in the Plenary, so it's not in DT/4, if you can bear with us to locate it. Under Article 5 and the, there is a proposal, there's a common proposal to suppress Article 6.3.2. Wait sorry. My apology, not to confuse the meeting. I'm not sure if you can pull DT/1. I'll give you a minute. On Page 113. We will give it a try. So...we'll start with the Article 5. And, I'll take 5.1. I'll give the floor to Asia‑Pacific to present their proposal on 5.1.  
 >> Asia‑Pacific: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Concerning 5.1, AP has only some editorial modifications. It's about the life and priority obligations, shall be entitled to transmission as a right, we should remove the CCITT to be replaced by IT. That will allow us to be in line with the CSCV. Thank you Mr. Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Who's going to present that? 5.1. If you're not ready, we'll go to the U.S. U.S., are you ready? Yeah, please go ahead.  
 >> United States: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. With respect to our proposal on 5.1, we would add the phrase that Member States shall adopt policies to ensure that safety of life, telecommunications, that text then continues and we then further update to include the Constitution, the Constitution and Convention and we further update to change CCITT to ITU‑T. We believe these, Mr. Chairman, are essentially editorial matters, but we offer this for the consideration of the Plenary. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. UAE?   
 >> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Chairman. With regards to the other proposals on 5.1, Mr. Chairman, most of the modifications in there is editorial, however, we'd like also to highlight that there are a number of resolutions in the ITU that are related to this, that are also respected when it comes to safety and life, safety of life and priority of telecommunications. We also would like to align ourselves with the language that is used in the Constitution by using the word shall be entitled or to give the absolute priority for such telecommunications. I'm speaking about provision 191 from the Constitution in this regard.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, that proposal is just trying to make sure there's alignment in terms of the commitment in this regard and also highlight resolutions in the ITU in general that gives priority for this matter. Thank you, Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, Iran is asking for the floor. Iran?   
 >> Iran: I wonder if you will allow some clarification in order to make it clear. There are a lot of issues pending to other discussions, for instance to ITU recommendations or ITU‑T recommendations, this is a pending issue that we have to deal with elsewhere because there are, in some proposals, ITU recommendations, and we deal with it later. There are editorial issues, reconstitution and so forth. I ask whether you allow some comments. We have some comments with respect to this proposal, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Yes, we do, I'm trying to skip forward quickly because a lot of these documents are allocated to Working Group 5.2 and today we, during the beginning of the Plenary, the meeting asked me to include Article 5 for discussion. But we allow, of course, comments and clarifications. Iran?   
 >> Iran: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. First of all, our comments with respect to the proposals. USA and 9, A215. Member States shall adopt policies, is this conference entitled to instruct Member States with respect to adopting their policies? Policies of Member States is a policy of Member States and it is a sole right to adopt it. It's not up to this conference, any conference to have such obligation for Member States using the word shall, adopting their policies. I don't think any conference or any entities in ITU could have such a mandatory language with respect to any country to adopt the policies. This is the question that needs clarification.

With respect to other proposals, they delete the word such as and put including. Which means they might have some other things, other than safety life of telecommunications. Including distress and what other there are, so might be some other. Such as with another language, therefore there, is some discussion and at the end, referred to resolutions of the ITU. What resolution? Resolution of assembly? Resolution of WRC? Resolution of plenipotentiary? These are something which is to be clarified and also referred to ITU recommendations which is pending for discussion. So there are several questions about that and I think it matter to be discussed that yourself and colleagues agree at the level of Committee 5 or 5.2. It's difficult to have any agreement because there's a lot of ideas here and we have to have some clarification and understand them, thank you.  
 >> Chair: I totally agree with you. I think there's a lot of things, but I'm working according to what I was asked and UAE asked for Article 5 to be included. I'm going back to them if we can defer these discussions to Working Group 5.2 in order to have more discussion and move onto the Russian proposal, Article 3A, the last two pages of DT4. If that's okay, I think, let's defer that to Working Group 5.2 for discussion. And make use of the Plenary. I see no objection, thank you very much.

In DT/Rev 4, Page 53, there's a proposal from Russia. I want Russia to present it. Russia, you have the floor.  
 >> Russia: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In accordance with the plenipotentiary resolution, it's clearly indicated that the development of technologies, the use of IP infrastructure and services based on IP opens opportunities for State Members and members of the sector at the same time and also means they have an important task in preparing the contribution, the administration of telecommunications, Russia considers that it's the United Nations Organisation's responsibility to carry out C2 and look at security concerning ICTs. We also understand that the internet system is an inalienable part of the telecommunications infrastructure. So, looking into the infrastructure of the internet overall, and especially at our conference is entirely in line with the tasks of the [no sound]. [Internet connection problem].  
 ...the fourth item, recognition by Member States to carry out policies aimed at meeting public requirements with respect to internet access and use. And five, and highlight the importance of cooperation of administrations and operating agencies in providing the integrity, the reliability and the functioning and the security of the national segment of the internet network through working, carrying internet traffic and through the basing internet infrastructure. Our proposal is based on the conclusions of the Tunis meeting and is aimed at highlighting the rights of Member States of the ITU on issues related to internet governance. I'd like to note that our proposal fully corresponds to those appeals that we've heard at the opening ceremony and the words that we heard from the director and from the Secretary General, Mr. Toure. Thank you, Sir.   
 >> Chair: Thank you, I open the floor now for discussion on this issue. Is there any support or objection to, to the Russian proposal? Algeria?   
 >> Algeria: Thank you, Sir. In reality, we're a little bit lost here. We were on 5.1 and we were very interested in 5.1. We have been very interested in talking about the security of human life and, and we were ready to intervene that point. Well... because we made a proposal that should normally have been in this DT, maybe among the common African proposals or the Arab proposals, we submitted to these two groups because maybe timeline problems, our proposal wasn't included. But we have a great deal of interest in discussing 5.1. Perhaps you'll give us the opportunity later to come back to this item. Now you're asking us to move on from Article 5.1 to Article 3 where we heard a very interesting proposal from the Russian Federation concerning the addition of Article 3A. You're asking us to react to this point. We'll be brief, but we're very interested here and like we made proposals for 5.1, we, here, we also added articles. Here I would like to reassure my Russian friends that we not only endorse the substance of their proposal, but we also support them in, in forum, but we also have complementary proposals. Russia talks about the internet, it introduces the concept of the internet in ITRs and it's, Russia took care to propose definitions. In turn, we will make other proposals because the internet is also related to cyber legislation, cyber security. So what we'd propose is complement this entire package presented by the Russian Federation by additional definitions.

So, I hope other Delegations will join us, but I can say that our Delegation will approach the Russian Delegation so as to flesh out the package and perhaps present something at the, perhaps at the next Plenary session. But to sum things up, Algeria entirely supports the Russian proposal of adding Article 3A.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, I want the interventions to be very brief, we have four minutes to go. I have a lot of countries asking for the floor. Please limit your intervention to, if you can, less than a minute. Otherwise, we'll be asking for interpreters to stay longer and there's a Committee 5 meeting after that. So, China?   
 >> China: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Concerning the proposal for Russia, we've seen currently, our internet is becoming a global infrastructure and in the global environment, playing a more and more important role in economics and development. We think these trends should be reflected in the ITR. In recent years, with IP development, more and more traditional telecommunications are carried by internet system. So including internet issues, in International Telecommunications Delegations is very in line with development trend. We're ready to discuss such matters in order to include such matters in future ITR. We suggest that when Group 2 of Commission 5 to start discussions of the proposals by the Russian Delegations, thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. I have almost 15 requests for the floor and there is a proposal from China to have this issue discussed in Committee 5 before it goes even to the working group. So if there is no objection to put this to the committee 5 for discussion first, then goes to the working group for, for further discussion and elaborations. I have lots, actually the screen cannot even fit what, can't even count the number of countries asking for the floor. Is the meeting, is there an agreement with the proposal? I want you now to raise your flag because the list is too big for me to handle. And I would ask the indulgence from the interpreters, stay with me for the next ten minutes.  
 >> Sure, that's possible, Sir.   
 >> Chair: Just want to repeat what I just said. Is the Russian proposal to be put to Committee 5 for discussion? Okay...I'll go, Portugal? Please be brief.  
 >> Portugal: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The proposal that we have in front of us, I believe is a fundamental one that would substantially enlarge the scope of the ITRs. Europe is not prepared to support, is not supporting this proposal and would have some difficulties at the moment to accept that the issue is discussed in Com 5. Given that this is a fundamental issue. I would also say that the, Europe, as a general statement, to do, to make at this point, we have, we want to facilitate discussions, we want to facilitate a successful outcome, but, given that we are confronting with some proposals, that are very difficult from our side, or impossible from our side to accept, it is, it, it will not be possible to have such easy negotiations as we would wish. Thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, UAE, very briefly?   
 >> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Chairman. We support your proposal and China proposal and we'd like to drawl the attention of Resolution 101, 102 and 133 and other resolutions that speaks about the importance of IP networks and how we deal with them within the scope of the ITU. So we support your proposal, Mr. Chairman and we're ready for discussions, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Canada?   
 >> Canada: We fully align ourselves with the views expressed by Portugal on behalf of CPT. Thank you.  
 >> Chair: U.S.?   
 >> United States: We'd also associate with Canada and Portugal. These are fundamental issues facing the negotiations today and through the next two weeks. We'd also, Mr. Chairman, call upon you to have this discussion at the proper level, which we believe at the Plenary, since this is a fundamental issue, tied to the success of these negotiations. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
 >> Chair: Okay, the list is growing in an exponential way. I still have lots of people asking for the floor. I would go with now, deferring this discussion. I'll have an informal discussions with Russia and the regional groups. I'll defer this to the next Plenary, but in the meanwhile, I'll have, I'll run a consultation, informal consultation with these groups on this fundamental issue.

There is agreement on my proposal ‑‑ if you can agree, if you can cancel the requests for the floor because...the list is still very, very long. I'm proposing that I will conduct informal discussion between Russia and a representative from the regions on this issue. And come back to you on resolution. I still have a few who are okay with it, can you please cancel your requests for the floor? I still have a number up still. Kazakhstan?   
 >> Kazakhstan: Thank you, Sir. We fully support the proposal made by the Russian Federation and we think, as well, that this issue should be addressed at the Plenary session.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, Saudi Arabia?   
 >> Saudi Arabia: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. We fully agree with what you've proposed, thank you.  
 >> Chair: France?   
 >> France: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would fully support the statement made by Portugal. Also by Canada and the United States. I would put a question to you, however, Mr. Chairman. The informal group you propose, what would be the intention, what would be the hope for output of that group? What exactly would the informal group be doing? Because, we would then be setting aside the proposal of a number of Delegations that this is a matter that should be discussed in Plenary.  
 >> Chair: I'll make myself very clear. I'm conducting an informal consultation on this substantial issue between Russia and the Regional Groups, in order to see a way out for it as a matter of principle. I'm not asking for discussion on the details, because, I don't think that, we are already at this stage of the details of this proposal. Since I'm seeing the reaction from the, from the meeting.

Iran, Sweden, Armenia, then I'm going to close the discussion, sorry. Iran.  
 >> Iran: Thank you, Chairman, we agree in whatever way you want to discuss, but we don't agree with the informal group limitations to regional organisations. There might be Delegations having similar views but entirely different views not attending. We'd like to have open sessions that everybody could agree freely under your Chairmanship in a normal manner, but not informal. This is a formal issue, whether Plenary or elsewhere that should be open for all Member States to discuss. Bring it to Plenary, thank you.  
 >> Chair: This is exactly what I'm intending to do. So Sweden, then Armenia. Very briefly.  
 >> Sweden: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To be brief, we associate ourselves with statements from Portugal, France, United States and Canada. This is an important issue and needs to be discussed in the Plenary before it gets sent to any other group in the conference structure. We are worried that any discussions in an informal group may be reopened again in the Plenary since we think this is so sensitive and so difficult that there'd be no possibility to reach a final agreement in the official, in official discussions, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, I'll bring it back to the Plenary for discussion as well to see the conclusion of the informal discussion. Armenia?   
 >> Armenia: Thank you, Sir. Because it's so important, this topic, and it's a fundamental and crucial topic, indeed, therefore we support your proposal and will take part in this meeting you're proposing, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. Now, we are coming to the conclusion of, had our agenda and I'm having other business, is there any other business? Thank you, I will ‑‑ Algeria? I'm sorry, for Algeria, just to go back to the issue of Article 5, I forget to mention that since that was a request from the Arab Group to include Article 5, but Article 5 already been part of Working Group 5.2, there'll be a substantial discussion on 5.1, or 5.2, the remaining proposals coming to the conference. Algeria?   
 >> Algeria: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It may perhaps be very difficult for you to summarize all the discussions of the informal group, ad hoc group that you have established, if the Secretariat could perhaps prepare a document they could put on screen. Perhaps we'd be rather clearer. We haven't been able to, to take note of all your announcements, so perhaps the Secretariat could summarize all your decisions, including those made yesterday. Because you also referred to informal groups yesterday. I think you'd agree to that Mr. Chairman.  
 >> Chair: I can do that, thank you. I have the floor from four administrations, we have one minute. We have Nigeria, Costa Rica, India and the United States and I have announcements to make. Do you still really need the floor? If not, please can you cancel the request. I have Nigeria, Costa Rica and India. Nigeria, do you still insist on having the floor? I'm not looking for support or, not support to these documents, I've put a proposal, I'm going to conduct consultation with the relevant parties, I'll get back to the Plenary with this issue. Do you still need the floor, Nigeria? You have the floor.  
 >> Nigeria: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's not that I'm insisting on having the floor, but I requested for this floor even before you closed the request for the floor, but I was not given the opportunity. However, I would not waste the time of the meeting, but I think each administration have its own right to be heard. However, I had wanted to speak on the Russian proposal, but I'll just, allow you to implement your decision the way you had already proposed. Thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, my apology, but the list was too long to even consider taking it. It'd take hours. Costa Rica and Uganda? Costa Rica, we're exceeding time with interpreters.  
 >> Costa Rica: Thank you, Chairman. Quite simply, that we wish to understand exactly what the procedure will be. Will it go to Com 5? What we, a number of countries are really not clear in how we're going to go forward on this, thank you.  
 >> Chair: I'll conduct an informal discussion on this issue and come back to Plenary to not go to Committee 5, thank you. I wanted to remind everyone that Committee 5 will start at 6:30, the same room. And, and then, Working Group 1 and 2 will convene after that. I want to remind the meeting, that ad hoc group that will deal with Article 8, will meet tomorrow at 8:00. By Egypt, I want to also remind the group that in room B, sorry, I wanted to remind the meeting as well that the same room, room B will meet, an ad hoc group will meet at 1:30 to discuss Article 1.4 and 1.6 headed by South Africa. I'll be taking the issue of the definition of Telecommunications/ICT along with ROA/OA. I want to also mention that document, DL document on a proposed compromised draft, compromise on ROA/OA which is, which was discussed today in the morning and it will be put forward for consideration by the informal meeting and we'll be convening again tomorrow at 5:30 in room B. Thank you very much for all the work, we are coming to the end of the Plenary session, looking forward to work with everybody in order to progress on the, on the conference. I thank you again, 6:30, Committee 5 will start. The meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

[Meeting concluded 17:44 p.m. local time].

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

This text is being provided in an edited format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*