FINISHED TRANSCRIPT

WORLD CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS

DUBAI, UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

07 DECEMBER 2012

09:00

THIRD MEETING OF COMMITTEE 5

Services provided by:

 Caption First, Inc.

 P.O. Box 3066

 Monument, CO 80132

 1-877-825-5234

 +001-719-481-9835

 Www.captionfirst.com

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

This text is being provided in a rough draft 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.

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

 >> CHAIR: Good morning, Distinguished Delegates. We are going to start. As you know, today is Friday so we start at 9 o'clock. Could you kindly take your seats.

 Thank you.

 Hello. Good morning once again. And welcome to the third meeting of Committee 5.

 I'd like to check with the interpreters if they are at their posts and if all systems are working.

 Good morning. Good morning. Do we have interpretation for...

 Hello. Good morning. Do we have interpretation?

 >> INTERPRETER: Good morning, Chairman.

 Mr. Chairman, good morning. Can you hear me now? Can anybody hear me? If anybody can hear -- good. Thank you. Good morning everybody.

 >> CHAIR: Interpretation?

 >> INTERPRETER: Mr. Chairman, if you cannot hear me, I think perhaps somebody should check the Chairman's equipment, because everybody else seems to be able to hear the English.

 >> CHAIR: Hello?

 >> INTERPRETER: Now can you hear me, Mr. Chairman? Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Good morning. Thank you very much. I assume the other channels are also up and working.

 Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. If you would be kind enough to take your seats so we can move this meeting forward.

 Today is a short meeting for Com 5. And also we are starting early, so people need to adjust a little bit.

 So please take your seats and let's start.

 >> SECRETARIAT: Could you kindly take your seats. We are already nearly 15 minutes late. Please, take your seats. The meeting is about to start.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: So good morning, once again.

 And today's meeting, the agenda for the meeting can be found in document ADM/16E. So if you have it, we will work through that. And it's just the agenda of the third meeting of Committee 5 for today, Friday the 7th of December.

 And as I said, we are starting a little bit earlier than usual.

 The only three main items on the agenda, and I'll wait for your comments on the agenda before we accept it shortly. I see no comments, so the agenda, ADM/16E is approved.

 (Gavel)

 Now I call on the Chair of Working Group 5-1 to give us a progress report. So, Madam Chair, if you are available, give us a progress report on your Working Group. Thank you.

 >> TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO: Thank you, Chair.

 Since my last report to Committee 5, Committee 5-1 has held two meetings. On the 5th of December the meeting addressed the new provisions that could go under Article 6. And ad hoc group chaired by Brazil was created to look into the proposed revisions for International telecommunication connections, while India was tasked to consolidate the various proposals made under general economic and policy issues.

 The meeting ended prematurely, due to technical difficulties in accessing the documents on the ITU website.

 Yesterday, on the 6th of December, we did manage to achieve some progress on the following items: There was a general agreement that appendix 2 on maritime telecommunications should be kept and an ad hoc group chaired by Greece was created to agree on a final text for it.

 An additional ad hoc group was created to look into the new proposed revisions on roaming and to try to consolidate the various proposals for further consideration at the Com 5-1 level.

 There was general agreement to leave unchanged the provision 45 on taxation. The European countries requested time to make consultations and review the agreement for general text and report back to Com 5-1.

 Article 9 was discussed at length, without arriving to any consensus. And authors of the various proposals were requested to get together to consolidate them and bring them back to Com 5.

 The Steering Committee, I understand, has allocated more time to Com 5-1, in order for it to finish its assignment. The positions are varied and divergent. And, therefore, if they remain unresolved by Monday, the 10th of December, that is the last session for the meeting of Com 5-1, we would be definitely refer them to Com 5.

 Thank you, Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Madam Chair, of Com 5 Working Group 1. And thank you for all of those who participated in the various ad hoc meetings and the sessions that you had.

 I see with interest that India has worked on the consultation of the proposals on possible new issues to be added to Article 6.

 In order to gain time, I would suggest that an ad hoc group be established as was done for the existing text of Article 6, to advance this issue over the weekend, and come back with consultated text, including square brackets on contentious issues. And as you rightly said -- so I think at this point I will ask India, would India be willing to Chair this proposed ad hoc group as indicated by -- requested or indicated in the report we just heard?

 So, India, your willingness, please?

 >> INDIA: Thank you, Chair.

 Thank you very much for being given the opportunity to consult on the clauses. We will take it up and we will inform for the time and schedule accordingly.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much, India.

 Madam Chair, as you indicated, the Steering Committee allocated a one and a half hour session for this on Saturday morning, for this extra work, so you can advance your work.

 All right. Comments on what has just happened from, first, Iran and then the United States. Thank you.

 >> IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to you and to everybody.

 Chairman, we understood that all existing Article 6 provisions were given to an ad hoc under Australia. And then we come back to the 5-1 or 5. I don't know. It depends who listens to the proposal. And perhaps you can kindly brief us on the matter.

 And now we understood that all provisions, new provisions for Article 6, were given to India as an ad hoc to operate or to function on Saturday. Therefore, the entire Article 6 is now in the hands of the two ad hocs. Consequently, 5-1 could concentrate on Article 9 and the remaining parts.

 Is our understanding right? And if that is the case, please kindly also maybe request the 5-1 Chairman or ad hoc group dealing with the existing Article 6 whether they -- the result of their work goes to 5-1 or comes to 5 as it is established under 5?

 This is a point of clarification. We wish the confirmation that now 5-1 concentrate on Article 9 and the remaining tasks given to them.

 And I thank you very much.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Iran.

 United States, you have the floor, please.

 >> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning to you and to all delegates here.

 The good news is that we're at Friday of a two-Friday conference, so hopefully we will be finished by next Friday.

 I wanted to raise an issue. I had some similar concerns as the Distinguished Delegate from Iran. But I also wanted to raise an issue which is that last night we made very little progress in the ad hoc group on Article 6, the existing provisions. And I'm a bit afraid that if we ended up with another ad hoc group on new provisions of Article 6 that didn't deal with the existing provisions of Article 6, that we may end up in the same, I hate to use this word, but impasse, that we were in before. You could end up with the same proposals that India has aggregated into one document.

 And so I'm wondering, and I would put this forward to you to perhaps discuss here, shall we have a place where both articles, the existing Article 6 as well as the new provisions of Article 6, get discussed together?

 I'm afraid by bifurcating them, we actually don't do ourselves any favors. But I'd like to hear what other people have to say.

 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

 Canada, followed by Portugal.

 >> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good morning.

 We would like to express our voice of support for the comments made by Iran and the United States in the sense of the amount of ad hoc groups that we already currently have.

 Mr. Chairman, also, we would like to ask you in the document that explains the current ad hoc groups, there should be an addition, which is the ad hoc group created to deal with appendix 2 that is supposed to meet on Saturday.

 Mr. Chairman, in regards to the last comments of the United States, we also agree that in the current framework of ad hoc group number 2 on Article 6, maybe we can have some consolidation of the issues, new and existing provisions, because otherwise as clearly articulated by the United States we would be having a lot of time that we could potentially waste in coming back to you again with no success.

 So we're looking for your advice, Mr. Chairman, as to how we can proceed more expeditiously.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Portugal, please. Thank you, Canada.

 >> PORTUGAL: Thank you, and good morning to all of you.

 Just to associate with the comments of the two previous speakers, Europe has always seen this Article 6 as a whole. We cannot separate the discussions on the old provisions and the new provisions. We have to combine them together and to see -- so that we are able to see the whole picture. So it is difficult for us to move forward without having an idea what is the big picture combining new and old provisions.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. I'll take Brazil and we will quickly move on to the other subject.

 Thank you.

 >> BRAZIL: Thank very much, Mr. Chairman. And good morning for all colleagues.

 And it's just a question for clarification, Mr. Chairman. The proposal, and Brazil also thinks that we are still working on the new provisions in Article 6 in the ad hoc group 2 of Committee 5, but our question is about the -- we really didn't understand the proposal just to put all new provisions of Article 5 -- pardon me. -- Article 6 to the new ad hoc group chaired by India. And, for instance, we have in Working Group 5.2 an ad hoc group on International telecommunication connections that handles new provisions in Article 6 also, and we have also described brackets in some provisions.

 So the question is, Mr. Chairman, are we going to put altogether or we are going to work only on the ad hoc group number 2 of Committee 5, charging and accounting?

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

 I hear the concerns being expressed. I think at this point I'll let the Chair of the ad hoc group on Article 6 give her report and then we will take it forward. But just before that, I would like to listen to Iran. Quickly, please.

 >> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

 We have no difficulty, in fact, with pleasure we will listen to the report of the ad hoc group on existing Article 6. But, Chairman, at the early meeting, at the very beginning, we raised our concern that it may not be productive to divide the work of Article 6 in two parts; existing one group and the new one to other group. Chairman, they are interconnected. The new Article is -- or provision relates to existing provisions. They are relating to each other, chairman. And we believe that both of them should be dealt with in one group.

 We have no difficulty, the group established by Australia now you put India, both collaborate together and they have one single ad hoc group regarding Article 6. And now that is established under Committee 5. So it will be taken from the 5-1, totally, and would be established under 5. So 5-1 is just committed to Article 9 and part of Article 2. And we need confirmation of that by yourself.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much, Iran. That was a very useful contribution and thanks for the advice.

 I will now call on Madam Chair of the ad hoc group on Article 6 to give her report.

 Thank you.

 >> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chairman.

 The ad hoc group met last night to discuss an approach to the existing Article 6, which could include principles for dealing with that Article. Document DL/12 on the principles was discussed, and that was based on an intervention from Australia at the suggestion of the chairman.

 Comments were sought on whether there was support for the approach used in that document. There was support but no consensus on those principles. Therefore, the group agreed to stop that discussion and to move to document DL/13, which had been prepared by the Secretariat and was a compilation of proposals for modification or suppression of the existing provisions under Article 6 on the basis of that Secretariat document.

 Delegates who supported maintaining the provisions were asked to indicate whether they could accept those provisions moving elsewhere, either to appendix 1, an annex or potentially a WCIT recommendation. The group moved through the document, discussing each of the provisions. This was no support from countries or regions who had proposed modifications to move to the provisions of an appendix 1, an annex, or a WCIT recommendation.

 Among some of the countries or regions who had proposed modifications, there was an indication of willingness to merge some of their proposals and there is an indication of where that might be in the report.

 Considering that some Member States and regions have not indicated that they have shifted from their preferred position for suppression, that issue remains unresolved.

 Thank you, Chair.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia.

 So, in principle, Article 6, from what I'm hearing, is to be kept. But what goes into it is the issue that we have to deal with.

 Members don't want two separate Article 6s, from what I'm picking up, or that needs to be confirmed further, a 6A and 6B, perhaps.

 So once we agreed to keep the old Article 6, the Article as it exists now, then perhaps the contents are to be varied or modified to accommodate the views that have been expressed. And I think here comes some of the work that I referred to earlier, that India should assist in getting us there.

 So I think I will open it up for a few minutes to listen to your views on this, but there will be an ad hoc group that will have to carry this work forward, under the existing arrangements.

 So any comments from the floor?

 Sudan, please.

 >> SUDAN: Thank you, Chairman.

 I think the terms of reference for the new provisions is just to consolidate the different proposals. To stick on that, just to consolidate the different proposals forwarded to the other ad hoc groups.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you.

 Portugal?

 >> PORTUGAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 Sorry to insist on this, but it's very important these terms of reference of this group. First, we cannot support the creation of an ad hoc group just to consolidate proposals on new provisions. That could give an indication to this room that we are able to accept them, which might not be true.

 And again, sorry to insist on this, but I think the ad hoc group should cover both the new and the old provisions.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Portugal.

 Iran, please.

 >> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

 In line with the comments made by Portugal, we believe that one single ad hoc is sufficient to cover existing and new provisions for Article 6. We have no difficulty that this ad hoc group be chaired by Australia and India. Two heads putting together, they help each other. It would be good, efficient and so on and so forth.

 I suggest that we have one single ad hoc group to look at Article 6, existing provisions and new provisions, and try to have a consolidated document and bring it back to Committee 5, Chairman, and the two distinguished colleagues, Australia, Madam Greenway, and Distinguished Delegate from India, together they work, and I think it contributes to the successful work of this. And that one single ad hoc is sufficient to look at that because of the interrelations of articles. We could not deal with them separately.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran, for your contribution.

 Now I'll call upon China to give their views on this.

 >> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

 We gave our support to Iran. I think Iran's proposal is appropriate. And it can save time. It can also improve the efficiency. And we will have sufficient time to discuss Article 6.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

 Cameroon, you're next.

 >> CAMEROON: Good morning, Chairman.

 I think that the proposal of Iran is an excellent one, particularly that this ad hoc group be an ad hoc of Com 5, directly.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

 I'll take Turkey and it looks like the consensus is building towards what Iran has suggested.

 I've seen the list growing. If you have any comments contrary to what Iran is saying, please stay on it. But if it's in line with what Iran suggested, being corroborated by others, please release.

 Thank you.

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

 We associate with you and also the other States, which you support to Iran. I think Iran's proposal is an excellent one.

 Thank you very much.

 >> CHAIR: Czech Republic, please.

 >> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I thank you for the floor.

 We are not opposing. On the contrary, we support your proposal and suggestions of Iran, Portugal and other States.

 But I would like to use this opportunity to ask for the floor in the matter of the taxation, because there was no time during yesterday's discussion and we were promised to have the floor here at Com 5. So I would like to ask you to give us some guidance when we can put this forward.

 Thank you very much.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Czech Republic. The agenda has been approved, as you can see, and we don't have that on the agenda. But I think perhaps the best place for this to be discussed would be at the ad hoc group dealing with these matters.

 And with that, I think I would like to call for -- we have to rule on the progress report that has been given by Working Group 5-1, and also the report on ad hoc group on Article 6.

 And I think it's looking like Com 5 will set up just this one working group -- I'm sorry, ad hoc group, and that there will be a joint Chairmanship of Australia and India to look at both the issues for the old and the new Article 6. Hopefully that will make us -- we will get some progress out of this.

 Look at the old and the new together, because there is so much interrelationship. And under the joint Chairmanships, if one helps the other with consolidation and the other gets into the details, I think we can have some positive results coming from that ad hoc group of Com 5.

 So that will be the case and I think we will elaborate further on the terms of reference. The time and place will be indicated shortly.

 Thank you.

 Now I'd like to move on to progress report from Working Group 5-2. Brazil, please.

 >> BRAZIL: Yes. Thank you, very much, Mr. Chairman. Two seconds.

 Just to clarify that the new ad hoc group with the previous and new provisions on Article 6 does not include the discussions on International telecommunications connections and roaming that we already have ad hoc groups in 5.1. It's just to clarify this to the plenary. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: I believe you're correct on that. Thank you.

 Canada, please.

 >> CANADA: Yes, thank you. Briefly, Mr. Chairman, it was along the same lines as Brazil, and probably to suggest a mechanism by which the work of the ad hoc group of Com 5 on Article 6, the ad hoc groups on roaming and International telecommunications connections could in any way report back to Article 6 in order to speed up our process and reach conclusions as fast as possible. Otherwise we see that there is going to be spinning around and coming back to your Committee for further clarification.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. I think for now let's agree with this ad hoc group that has been set up under the co-chairs of India and Australia, and let them look at the issues Saturday morning. And I think we will come back to how we deal with the roaming issue that you've suggested, if it cannot be accommodated at that level. So we have noted that.

 Iran, you have the floor, please.

 >> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

 In line with what was said by Canada or Brazil, I don't know, maybe both of the colleagues, Chairman, I think it is usual, and you have done it in the ITU before, we could slightly add the term of reference of ad hoc of International telecommunication connections and roaming to liaise with the ad hoc group on Article 6 existing and new, in order to make your job easier.

 They could liaise to each other, Chairman. It might be good that they have some communications and bring the things more clearly to your Committee. Otherwise, you will receive two things that might be in contradiction or inconsistent, and perhaps your job will be complicated. Perhaps you ask them to liaise with the Article 6 ad hoc group in order to have a better and a smooth output to your Committee.

 It's just by way of suggestion, Chairman. You may agree with that or may not. But it takes care of the concerns of Canada, and I think nothing can prevent the people to collaborate with each other before coming to your meeting. So that is one way to do the job.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran.

 What do the Members think about this suggestion? I'll ask Brazil quickly on this.

 >> BRAZIL: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

 Just to propose that, it's a more simple way to move. So we divided already the job and we put the things together in Article 6 in ad hoc group 2 of this Committee 5. And, also, we have two specific topics in International telecommunications connections and the other in roaming. So in my opinion, I think it's -- everything's done in these two groups, roaming and International telecommunications connections. Finish the work, send it to Committee 5. Then after that, the Article 6 in charging and accounting are working.

 So in my opinion, it's not necessary to liaise or to put altogether, because we have different items, we have different topics, and each topic can be decided in each ad hoc group and send it to the plenary Com 5 on the site.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Liaison doesn't mean putting altogether in one box. It's just touching base with the other group to see what is happening to the extent practicable and how one affects the other.

 So I think that sounds like a good idea, so there should be some liaison work, if possible, as they discuss those issues in the other group.

 So without much ado, I think we need to listen to the report from Working Group 2 of Committee 5. So, Mr. Fabio Bigi, if you are around, please, let's have your available report.

 >> FABIO BIGI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 We have had our meeting. We have made some, as you already reported previously, some text for agreement still at the level of my working group on quality of service, on provision of facilities, on call-in line identification, and I am pleased to announce that also the work of the ad hoc group Chaired by (?) of the United Kingdom has completed its work. So we have a text that will be examined here altogether possibly next week with the agreed text.

 Let's say I start with the good news. On the side of less good news, I tried to tackle the problem of routing. But there was such a difference in opinion that I left Member States time to think over, and I reserve to come back very lightly, either today or during tomorrow's session.

 On security, we have just started the work, but all the positions of various Member States have been clearly outlined. I gave the floor to numerous Member States, sometimes repeating. So it's my intention to go forward also in these aspects. The meeting will start immediately after you, giving the floor only to limited Member States. One was requested specifically plus one other Member State has not presented his position. But after I go to the debates, I will try to have a way forward and a solution.

 It remains various aspects need to be treated. For example, other topics in Article 5, other topics in Article 4, and the question of combating spam that I have to deal very lightly on the next Saturday meeting. Because we are supposed to be meeting immediately after you and on Saturday at 3, a quarter of the way. The other one is being reserved for working party -- Working Group 4-1.

 So this is the report of the group 5-2, Working Group. I am at your disposal for any further requests or clarifications or comments.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Chairman of Working Group 2 of Com 5 for the extensive work that you have done so far and what you plan to do over the weekend.

 At this point, it looks like we will just leave you and perhaps give you more time by finishing our meeting as quickly as possible, so you can continue your work.

 But do we have any comments from the report of Working Group 2 of Com 5 at this moment?

 Czech Republic, you have the floor.

 >> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you, Chairman. We didn't want the floor.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Iran, you have the floor, please.

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

 We appreciate very much the efforts of Mr. Fabio Bigi, although the work was given to him a few hours before the start of this conference, but he is well prepared, thanks to his long experience in the ITU and so on and so forth. So he is quite in good positions to progress very well.

 However, Chairman, I foresee that he might be in a difficult position with respect to the security. It is a very, very complex issue. Complex in nature and complex in item and complex in importance. There are discussions, whether we talk about security, whether we talk about cybersecurity, whether we talk about network security, whether we talk about the other sections, or the layers of the security, and so on and so forth. There are many, many dimensions and so on and so forth.

 Either we continue to have discussion at this meeting or he may need some little guidance from the Committee 5. But I think that that is an area that he would have considerable discussions. He is a very able and capable person. I hope that he will come up. But that is something that I consider very, very difficult.

 Spam is not so difficult. I think you find the solutions, one way or the other, whether you put them in the provisions or in the resolutions.

 And with respect to routing, I don't think that would be a difficult job, a little work. But security, Chairman, it's important. I just tell you and draw your kind attention to that, that many, many Member States are really concerned that this issue needs to be addressed by this conference in an appropriate manner, whether it's security or whether it is security of network or network security. We're not dealing with the cybersecurity. That was dealt with at the plenipotentiary conference. We already have resolution of that. We are dealing with network security or security in an appropriate manner to cover the telecommunication services.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. I appreciate your concern and I think you make the point, and it's not lost on anybody here, that security is very important. And none of us here would would want to do anything that rolls security back. We want to go forward, knowing that the networks are very well secured, whether physically or at the software level or whatever. And I don't believe that any actions we take will be less than desirable. Everybody wants to move this forward.

 So let's wait for Mr. Fabio Bigi to come back with all the reports on the many issues that he is dealing with, and then we note how we're going to deal with the security issues.

 And, members, I think we all are here for one reason only, and to make something that is working well even work better. And the necessary compromises will have to be made so that we can build consensus around a better way forward. So please examine your positions, and see how you can positively contribute to making the systems that we have and the solutions that are being proposed even better, and not to block or grind it to a halt. It would be a shame for all of us and a waste of time for everybody that has been here.

 So with that, I will like to bring this meeting to a close, and ask for any other business.

 Cuba, you have the floor, followed by Ghana.

 >> CUBA: Thank you, Chairman.

 I wanted to raise two issues. One is in the previous meeting of the Committee, Com 5, we waited on document 12/5, nondiscriminatory access to Internet sites. And I wanted to know whether that was going to be discussed here or whether it was going to be discussed in plenary. In fact, Cuba wished it to be discussed in this Committee, Committee 5. We have not had a response.

 I have a second point, and that is before the end of today we would like to have the detailed timetable of all those ad hoc groups which will be meeting over the weekend, on Saturday and Sunday, so that we can plan our participation in those groups.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Cuba.

 Egypt, you have the floor.

 >> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman.

 And I should recognize the excellent work and progress that has been done in Com 2 chaired by Mr. Fabio Bigi.

 However, there are other issues about (? Collecting parties), number delivery and CLI. In the meeting there was informal consultation and came with some texts, and then I raised the issue that origination identification or ISO should be added. However, this was not taken into consideration and was raised to the plenary of Com 5. So now I just reserve the right that we revisit this provision on CLI to insert the OI in addition to CLI.

 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't know if that is the proper time for that, but I just wanted to suggest that.

 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Your point is noted. But I believe this may not be the proper time at this point in time.

 But let me give the floor to Ghana. Earlier I called on Ghana but we rolled back on you. Sorry. Ghana, you have the floor now.

 >> GHANA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 Just a clarification from you. If you look at document DT/20 on Article 6, also it has new resolutions and there is one that Ghana also proposed. Mr. Chairman, I would like to find out from you that the new ad hoc group has been set to discuss or deal with that, and they are also going to deal with the new resolutions that were proposed. Because for now we don't know where the discussion is going to take place.

 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Ghana. I think you'd do well to participate in the new ad hoc group, the ad hoc group. And as the new issues are being discussed, perhaps that would be the area for you to submit your proposal.

 Thank you.

 Now on the issue raised by Egypt, I think I'll hold off on that and wait for the comprehensive report that will come from Committee 2 -- I mean Committee 5 Working Group 2 Chair, next week, and we will -- if that has not been dealt with, then we would make sure we handle it then.

 Iran, you have the floor, please.

 >> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

 Sorry to come back again, Chairman. The question raised by Cuba is very important. This nondiscriminatory access to the Internet using resources of Internet is an important issue. And that we said and we once again confirm that it needs to be discussed at the level of Committee 5, but not ad hoc. And that's -- not 5-1. This is a Committee 5. It's an important issue, we have to debate and discuss when all of the colleagues are here.

 Secondly, I'm not very sure what Ghana said. The resolution of Ghana, if it is the one relating to the revision of the ITR, it's an important issue and at the minimum should be discussed at Com 5 or at plenary but not at ad hoc. It's a major and important issue and we are grateful to Ghana to bring this important issue to the conference if it is about the revision of ITR. So it has to be discussed at the level of Committee 5 at minimum but not at ad hoc and not 5-1.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran, for calling my attention to that.

 These are two major important issues, of course, the issue by Cuba and for Ghana. Unfortunately, we would note it for the Committee 5 level treatment, as you suggested, but we don't have time to do it now. So points taken on both accessibility and the origin of the ITRs. We will find time to slot it in for the Committee level discussions.

 So I'll call upon Algeria right now to -- followed by Canada.

 >> ALGERIA: Thank you, Chair. Just to be brief, I don't want to use up your time. What we wanted to say has already been said by Iran. So we could just like to endorse what he said.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

 Canada, and United States.

 >> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. As a follow-up to Cuba's intervention, and the specific question as to DT/25, Mr. Chairman, it is Canada's understanding that you relayed this document to the plenary. Is this correct and could you please confirm it? Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: I thank you, Canada.

 I think I confirm that you're right. The last time it was moved to conference plenary, and that issue I believe is being handled there. Members should perhaps make sure to follow whatever the specific group that is handling it. But we moved it to plenary and I think plenary has also set up some Subworking groups to look at it I believe.

 So I'll take a note and track it and find out where exactly it is and where it needs to be treated and get it back on track as quickly as possible.

 United States, you have the floor.

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

 In the first place, I'm glad you just confirmed what you did because we had the same question as Canada.

 And then the other issue is that we have edits to resolution 4. Like Ghana, it's a resolution. But ours specifically deals with the issues that are dealt with in Article 6. So we were just trying to confirm that, in fact, that would be included in the Article 6 ad hoc.

 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: I thank you, United States. I believe the feeling is that what you propose in your resolution, I believe, 4, and what is coming from Ghana deals with ITR revisions, and as such perhaps the proper place for it is Com 5 plenary. And we will have time, we will make time to deal with it at the appropriate -- perhaps at next plenary for Com 5.

 Cuba, please.

 >> CUBA: Thank you, Chair.

 Sir, I apologize, but I need to ask my question again. With regard to the way you want to deal with this document, I'm referring to DT/25, i'm wondering what has happened to it. Now, we didn't discuss it in the group, and we said it would be discussed in plenary, and then we decided that we would discuss it here in Com 5. And you said that we would find out about it and then discuss it again in Com 5.

 And now you said that it will be dedicated to the plenary or an ad hoc group. We want to know what's going on. We weren't aware of all of this. Why weren't -- why aren't we going to discuss it in Com 5 or will it be given to an ad hoc group, especially since this submission was presented on time?

 Now, I must say that we're having a little bit of trouble understanding what is going on with this document, and we're not absolutely sure that we're giving it the same treatment given to other documents here. So we really want to understand why this decision was taken on this particular proposal.

 Thank you, sir.

 >> CHAIR: Iran, you have the floor, please.

 >> IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are a little bit loss, Mr. Chairman, of the issue is now turning around.

 The document of Cuba, and also resolutions relating to the same topic here, was assigned to Committee 5. We have not discussed that. If you would have discussed that and we come to the conclusion that this matter is not an issue to be resolved at Committee 5, and we decide that under your leadership that is an issue to be discussed at plenary, we have no difficulty. But the document is assigned to you, to your Committee. Therefore, I think it should be discussed here. And I don't understand why all of a sudden some discussion made that this is plenary.

 We have no difficulty, Chairman, to discuss the document at plenary, but the document is assigned to Committee 5 and from the procedure aspects it should be discussed here.

 But should you after discussion arrive to a difficulty and you raise the question in the Steering Committee that discussion for Committee 5 would reach or has reached no result and there is no consensus, then you ask the Chairman of the conference to take up the matter in the plenary or in any other way. But I don't think that the document should move from here and there. It is assigned to your Committee and must remain here.

 We don't remember, please refresh our mind, at what meeting of Committee 5 did we decide not to discuss these documents and send it to plenary? Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you Iran.

 I think the error was on my part. We will go through our notes. And if the discussion should take place here in Committee 5, we will find time to do so, accordingly. So we will check on the details later on. But as I said earlier, we need to give this place up for Committee 2 of Working Group 5 to continue their work.

 So I'll got quite a few on the list. I'll take Algeria, Burkina Faso, and United States. Thank you.

 >> ALGERIA: Thank you, Chair.

 We were very brief during our first intervention. Now, you just said that you have been going through notes and have found the date when a decision was taken. It's perhaps we have a memory failure, but we don't have any memory of this decision. So, sir, if you will, if we have a choice we would prefer to consider this question, which has to do with the sovereignty of the Member State which presented it, and this question does fall within Com 5's purview. It does seem appropriate, thus, that the issue be discussed first in Com 5, sir.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

 The point is noted. And I did indicate that the earlier statement was an error on my part, and we would make sure the right thing is done. I will review the notes accordingly.

 It has not been discussed here, as you quite rightly said, and I don't think I did -- anyway, I'll leave it at that.

 So Burkina, please.

 >> BURKINA FASO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

 It seems that a lot of documents have been reallocated among the ad hoc groups, and it's not entirely clear which documents are being discussed here in Com 5 or plenary or in ad hoc. We would ask the Secretariat thus to provide us a list of the clear indication of where the documents are being discussed, so that we can organize our presence in this or that group. And if we could have that as quickly as possible, we would be very grateful.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much. The point noted to the Secretariat to do that and that would help us all.

 United States, you have the floor.

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

 I'm sorry to bring you back to our Res 4, but it's an alternative for some of the text that perhaps would -- some countries would be suggesting to put into Article 6. So we would just like to have that opportunity at the meetings to give it to the delegates as a choice that they could make.

 And on the issue of the Cuba document, I think that the plenary is, in fact, that they have a group that is very much looking at these issues, and so their document should be, in fact, addressed in that particular group. And so I think that that very important issue is being addressed by the ad hoc to the plenary.

 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

 Sudan, please.

 >> SUDAN: Thank you, Chairman.

 The issue of the nondiscriminatory is very important for us, for Sudan. And we have been following and tracing this document DT/25, and we are looking for it here in this Committee 5 so that we can discuss it here.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Point made.

 I'll take the last submission and really must give the room to Working Group 2 of Com 5.

 And I'll call on Iran to make a statement. Thank you.

 >> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman.

 We are very grateful to you. And we do not share the views of the United States that there is a Working Group of plenary, anything should be that group. That group is established for dealing with particular issues, and I don't think that any decision has been made whatsoever that that group would be an area that everything goes there. It should be decided by the plenary that which issue would be there. Consequently, the document of Cuba and resolutions of APT with respect to nondiscriminatory access will be discussed first at Committee 5. Document of Ghana, document of USA, if they want to discuss at Committee 5, for Ghana I fully agree should be discussed at Committee 5. Document of USA I leave it up to them to decide; it's not up to me.

 But I'm much in favor of the document of Ghana to be discussed at Committee 5 and later at Committee, and I hope that your secretary would reflect that appropriately in the document.

 Decision was made at Committee 5 that the nondiscriminatory access will be discussed at Committee 5, including the document of Cuba and document of APT, plus the resolution of Ghana. Remaining I leave it to the United States to decide or propose for resolution 4 and this is not my actions and I have no comment on that. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Iran.

 I'm sorry, we really have run out of time for this morning's session. We will do the research to find out where the documents are, and the Secretariat will help with that. And what needs to be discussed here at the Com 5 level will be done, to everybody's satisfaction.

 So with that, I'd like to thank you for your participation. This meeting is now closed.

 (Gavel)

 ((Applause)

 (End Of meeting, 10:15 local time.)
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