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>> CHAIR: Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen, can you take your seat, please? I'll start in a minute. Thank you.

Okay. A few announcements to make before we start. I just want you to, because of the technical difficulties that was faced on Wednesday evening, the Secretariat has published tips on information security and safety and safe use of the ITU infrastructure. Please go to them and read them carefully. A lot of delegations have been receiving Emails. So anonymous emails, so you need to be very careful. So please refer to that and read it.

Also, ad hoc working group 52 on security will meet today at 6:30, room E ad hoc working group 5.2, again that deals with security will meet today at 6:30 in room E.

And also ad hoc group on Article 6 will meet this evening at 7:30 in room B. Ad hoc group on Article 6 will meet this evening at 7:30 in Room B.

Okay. With that, we have the agenda, admin 15 E in front of you and submitted for approval. I see Poland's asking for the floor.

>> POLAND: Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, everyone. I would like to add one point the agenda of our plenary meeting, this concerns a proposal on general principles on Human Rights in the preamble that we already submitted to the Chairman of the meeting.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Poland. It's Document 44, so I'll give you a minute to locate it. It is published online. I'll give the floor United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: I'd like to add a new common proposal. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: You will discuss new common proposal. Can you clarify that, please?

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Yes, Chairman, I'd like to discuss this issue on your common proposal.

>> CHAIR: Is there a document? Or it's going to be just verbal.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Verbal.

>> CHAIR: I think you can take that under any other business when we reach 2, thank you.

Now we get back to the document 44, and procedurally, is there any objection to include document 44 to the agenda of the plenary? The fourth plenary? I see Algeria and Iran. Algeria?

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Chairman. I'd like to start with our apologies because I think we're going to need a little more time to have a look at the Document 44. There have been so many documents coming in over the last 24 hours and so many subjects under discussion, we've been involved in a great many ad hoc groups and I'm afraid we're starting to lose the thread a little bit, lose track of the issues being submitted to us. So could I please get your indulgence and ask you for a little extra time so that we could sort ourselves out a bit, have a look at Document 44, get a better idea of what it's dealing with, and then maybe we could move forward with the adoption of the agenda. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Just to clarify, interpreters mentioned 24. It's document 44. I'll give the floor to Iran and then I'll come back to Algeria in a minute. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, good afternoon to you and to all distinguished colleagues. Chairman, usually ‑‑ I say usually. The documents should have appeared in the agenda of plenary before the plenary in order to allow the Member States to have sufficient time and make consultations with the authorities if necessary. So I would suggest that perhaps we should be cautious about that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. The issue we have at hand is this document, although it came late, we tried, first of all thanks to the Secretariat, they produced it in no time. And the issue at hand is today on agenda item 7, we have the approval of the first read of the preamble. That's why this is coming, it's coming now. It's unfortunate, but that's the case. And we have to deal with. It has got one provision. And we are trying as much as we can, as hard as possible to provide it to everyone.

Bulgaria, and then I'll come back to it again. Bulgaria?

>> BULGARIA: Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity. Good afternoon, everyone. The proposal which Poland put is only one sentence in Document 44. And we support it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I also agree, it is one sentence, but Member States have a right to look at it. If there is no objection, it is one provision, inclusion of that Document 44 has to go in with the approval of preamble. It doesn't mean that the meeting agreed to inclusion of that and the preamble can be discussed at that time. It can be presented and then procedurally we can look at it at a later stage. So I just want to go back again. Is there any objection to include it to the agenda of the meeting subject to its discussion which I'm going to come to the preamble.

This does not mean that we are reopening the preamble at this stage. I'm going to look at that, the opening of the preamble because the preamble was approved in the first plenary. So when it comes to the preamble approval, I will ask the meeting for accepting to open up the preamble at that stage or not. Is there any objection right now with this explanation to include Document 44 in the agenda of the plenary? Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We need some time to discuss and digest this document, Chairman. I think the issue was discussed at the previous plenary, and it was agreed and the issue was completed. For this time, we have difficulty to accept this document, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Algeria?

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Chairman. I was just uploading the document as you were giving me the floor. I assume most delegates were using the Internet, which means it might not be responding as quickly as it might be. I don't have the document in front of me yet. It does seem to me, however, that you would be happy to include it on the agenda. Well, it is not my way to put obstacles in the way of the Chairman of the conference, so be it if that is what you wish to do, Chairman, then we will not stand in your way. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Jordan? Jordan?

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chairman. I would like to support what the delegates of Algeria and Iran have said. I have seen the document. But presenting it without its actually having been examined and discussed might lead us into a very lengthy discussion. I would therefore prefer that its presentation be deferred to a later meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: The reason why I'm asking for that, we have a preamble, first read, approval and this meeting. If we are going to ‑‑ if the meeting wanted to defer the preamble, first read approval, then I'm at ‑‑ the reason why I'm not bringing to a conclusion a discussion right now, we can give it a chance. Yes? It might have a lot of discussion. I don't want to open the debate that happened in the first plenary about the countries' respect to the declaration, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or not. That's not the issue.

The issue is we have at hand right now a first read of preamble which would go to the second approval. And that preamble, which is proposed by a number of countries, starting Brazil, Finland, Poland and so on. What I'm saying is if you can bear with me, include it without judging on opening up the discussion on preamble. Once it comes to the preamble, then we'll look at it. I have the floor from UAE, Mexico and Iran.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman. If you want to deal with this proposal without the preamble or with the preamble, Mr. Chairman, we have each. If we are going to deal with it with the preamble, I think we have already a text on the preamble and we're going to discuss it as the first read. And of course during the discussion of that first read, if administration has a different view, they can raise it without having to have a contribution in hand. That's the whole purpose of the first read.

If we're going to discuss it without the first read, Mr. Chairman, we have made a lot of debate in the opening of this document on the same issue. And as you are aware, Mr. Chairman, the Arab group was flexible whether we would like to include or not; however, we have even made a press release about this. We have made one, at least in this conference, we have one thing that we have agreed on so far. And I'm not sure if we're going to be looked at as we are fooling the media and we make press releases by the heads of these organizations and the heads of delegation saying that the issue has been dealt with and that's the outcome. And next day we reopen it. I think it will be very contradictory, at the same time not really constructive for the work of the conference.

So we agree on the essence. We agree on the principle. And we said we are ready to work on. But the issue has been dealt with at the very beginning of this conference. And I think it is not really appropriate to work with this spirit. It's not really constructive.

So we totally associate ourself ‑‑ actually the original proposal on this matter came from Arab. And we talked about it. However, there was no support and it was explained. I think no one who attended the opening ceremony of this, including ministers, distinguished and Excellencies who were with us, and I think some of them even went back just because they came to attend on this matter. So it will look very contradictory that they have to come back now and find out that this is an issue that reopened again.

With this, Mr. Chairman, we have a lot of sympathy for this proposal, but we seek your wisdom and we'd like to hear our Secretary‑General, we would like to seek his view on this wisely and how it will impact on our conference. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Mexico, Tunisia. We are almost 20 minutes and we did not approve the agenda. And then I will give the floor to Secretary‑General as well to say a few words. Mexico.

>> MEXICO: Thank you very much, Chairman. Mexico did previously mention the relevance of the issue of Human Rights in general. And in respect of telecommunications. As we see it, Chairman, our comments and our attitude have not changed. We don't have any strong objection to mentioning the issue because it's important. And I think we made that point, as well.

As the delegate of the United Arab Emirate said, we have released the press release on the matter; however, having said that, some people were more pleased with the way we settled the issue previously, and some people were less pleased. Generally speaking, we think it would be a good idea to postpone this part of the preamble. I apologize to those who have put this proposal forward, but I think that is what we should do and deal with the document later. The best thing to do now would be to get on with the rest of the agenda scheduled for this afternoon, I think, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, we are grateful to Distinguished Delegate of United Arab Emirates who very clearly explained what has happened at the first plenary meeting after the lengthy discussions, finally we agreed that we do not deal with this document at this conference at any level. Instead, based on the wisdom of the Secretary‑General, it was agreed that he proceed with the press release in appropriate way as he has always done and reflect the matter for the outside world the views of this conference with respect to the Human Rights, Chairman.

This Administration strongly opposed to reopening the discussion at any level at this conference, Chairman. It has already been discussed. And it has been decided as such.

Point 2, Chairman, if at any level, when the document comes from the committees to the plenary and then on the first reading there would be new contributions, then the issue should go back to the committees to discuss that.

It is not the plenary to open up something that has already been agreed at the committee, so on and so forth.

As the United Arab Emirate very clearly mentioned, when a document is discussed, any member state is free to discuss on the document but not in the contribution. To comment on the document, Chairman, we have to respect the procedures; however, for this issue, the matter is already closed at the first plenary meeting. And the press release was published and made available for everybody. Therefore, we are not in a position to discuss this document anymore. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Spain, Tunisia? Spain?

>> SPAIN: Thank you very much, Chairman. Spain would like to be able to consider the text submitted by Poland and the other countries, but we do understand that since it wasn't officially on the agenda as a compromise solution, and bearing in mind what has been mentioned already by the distinguished Mexico and Jordan, we could defer the discussion of the preamble for another session of the plenary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Tunisia?

>> TUNESIA: Yes, Chairman, thank you. I would simply like to draw the meeting's attention to one thing. There seems to be a certain amount of confusion around here somewhere. This is not the Tunisian proposal. The Tunisian proposal had two parts. The first was proposed for Article 1 and the second was proposed for Article 5. What was discussed in plenary was for the part of the proposal on article 1. What we have on the table in the current proposal is relating to the preamble; it is not the same proposal.

Since I have the floor, may I make the point that Tunisia approves and supports the proposal we have on the table now. Thank you.

>> DR. HAMADOUN I. TOURÉ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is indeed a very delicate issue here. At the very first plenary we debated this issue and it was a very good proposal by Tunisia. To ensure that everyone send a clear signal from this conference, that this conference was not about freedom of speech. In the contrary, this conference and freedom of speech and one to ensure that it is in the work of this conference. That was the whole purpose because it was a media campaign over the past year criticizing this conference for that. So it was a very clear message that we were going to send.

I understand the frustration by some Administrations here who have supported that this proposal be put in the preamble of the document, and I understand the frustration because the very Administrations who are putting it now, some of them, not all of them, Poland and European Union, were opposed to this. And it's unfortunate.

And as a result of the plenary not approving this, the theory, the conspiration theory against the conference continued. We have had our first cyber attack by people on that. And they are preparing tomorrow, on the eighth, tomorrow, to again have a set of demonstrations. We all know that. And we know that the cause we're defending here is very good.

I would like to call on all of you to hear the voice of wisdom. I understand the frustration. Those who now are hesitant had proposed it in the first place. And those who refuse it in the first place now are bringing it back. Let's hear a voice of wisdom and bring this topic on the table. It will serve the cause of this conference, to make it clear to the rest of the world that indeed this conference will stand for freedom of speech and will strengthen, in general, universal Human Rights.

That's a very important signal we need to put. I hope when those people hear those messages, they'll calm down and come and join us in this room so that we can discuss the continued debates in a healthy manner.

So, really, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the indulgence. And the way forward could be that, yes, we have already had a first reading of the preamble. A second reading of it could go along, but whatever part of this document, additional one should be considered as first reading, as well. So as to give you all the chance to really clear it with your organizations so that the proper wording can be put there and agreed. And therefore by accepting it today will not be a dangerous thing for anyone who would think that he would have missed something in the second reading.

So the document will still be in two‑part. And we'll come back to another plenary for a debate, but I would hope that our delegation would understand that when we are defending issues here, we should be consistent. And this is why it is a real frustration, including myself, because I spoke ‑‑ I pleaded, really, you to really try and get this approved because it was a very important, it will set the right tone. But unfortunately our voices were not heard.

But, of course, this is a second and last opportunity. Please let's not miss that one. It will be unfortunate for this conference. So my plea is please let's save this conference by going ahead and revising, including this topic in the work of the conference. And I hope you can approve it because it's important.

Now let's give a chance for second reading of this portion on Monday. This is a way forward I'm proposing, Mr. Chairman.

[Silence.]

>> CHAIR: Thank you. The proposal is to defer the discussion on the preamble. I have a long list. I don't want to give the floor to the people to support or object or I don't know what. Please, if you don't mind, take out your request for the floor. I'm putting a new proposal to the table. I have 10 Administrations asking for the floor. I don't think that this is wise to go through them all and we have 30 minutes of plenary and we did not yet approve the agenda.

So the proposal is to defer the discussion on preamble today.

[Silence.]

So I will just repeat. The proposal is to defer the preamble discussion entirely and also Document 44 entirely to Monday plenary. And this will not be discussed any of the working groups or committees. This is a plenary discussion.

I have five Administrations insisting to have the floor. I'll start with Sweden. I hope I've said something, intervention. I'm going to repeat it again. We have wasted 30 minutes. Interventions should be brief and focused on the issue. I don't want to open the debate that happened in the first plenary. We don't need to repeat expressions or support or opposition, please. I would kindly ask you to do that. Sweden?

Nigeria?

>> NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have listened to this discussion with keen interest. After listening to the appeal of the Secretary‑General, we want to set aside our own position on this matter for now and request that the matter be ruled in favor of the appeal of the Secretary‑General at this point in time in order for the conference to progress. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Nigeria. Cyprus? I assume European Commission. Thank you.

>> CYPRUS: Yes, thank you very much. It's the European Commission speaking for the European Union behind the Cyprus plate. I think your proposal is excellent and we agree entirely with it. I just wanted to clarify something that was said at the beginning of this discussion, and not to open the discussion again, but to clarify that the European Union did not say that Human Rights had no place in the ITR. We were discussing Article 1. And I want to clarify that our specific comment was that the text that was proposal for Article 1 was not appropriate for the ITR. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, it's noted. India?

>> INDIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, everybody. While endorsing the intervention made by Secretary‑General himself, I would like to mention a few things. Mr. Chairman, India is the largest democracy and considers freedom of expression as one of the fundamental principles India believes in and is enshrined in Constitution. In fact, the freedom of expression is all types of freedoms are ‑‑ from the freedom of expression itself. Further, in the recent times, telecommunication flat form has become the most current needs to facilitate the freedom of expressions and therefore while appreciating the interventions made by Secretary‑General, India is pleased to support the perfection of the freedom of expression through specific provisions in the ITR preferably in preamble by drawing the necessary clauses from the spirit of the wishes principles that wishes principles ‑‑

>> CHAIR: India, you are opening a discussion. I'm sorry to interrupt you. You are opening a discussion. I see administrations asking for the floor. And we have somehow, looking at the Administrations here, we have agreed to defer the discussion to Monday plenary. If you don't mind, are you in agreement with deferring that to the plenary meeting?

>> INDIA: No. Thank you very much. I want it to be included. We support this document. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. With that, we'll defer the meeting ‑‑ sorry, we'll defer the preamble discussion. With that, can we go ahead and approve the agenda? I still see Tunisia is asking for the floor. Tunisia.

>> TUNESIA: Yes, Chairman. Just a clarification. You said all issues related to freedom of expression and Human Rights will be discussed at the plenary. There's a discussion currently before committee 5 group 2 scheduled to meet tomorrow. Therefore I'd like to know will this issue be discussed within Comm 5 working group 2 or will that no longer be discussed there? And will the discussion, instead, take place at the plenary level? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, thank you. With the discussions ‑‑ I've attended committee 5 today and with the discussion that's happening, it goes along the same principles that have been discussed in the plenary. And I really see that this is going to be adopted in the preamble, that's going to cover everything in the ITRs. So I don't see the point that this discussion is opened over and over and over again in all committees and all working groups. Thank you. With that, can we go ahead and approve the agenda? Thank you very much. No let's go to the report of the plenary ad hoc group 1, which deals with Article 8, dissemination of information and energy efficiency and accessibility. And I give the floor now to Mr. Sheriff from Egypt to present DT/31. Please? My apologies. DT/32, 33 and 39.

>> H. SHERIF: Thank you, Chairman. That was the numbering that had me confused.

We had several ad hocs on efficiency, and article 8. I'll start with document DT33 about energy efficiency. We have long discussion, and we came into texts can be read in Article 33 throughout the remaining few square brackets. Some are fundamental regarding ITU‑T and ITU, the views of ITU‑T 2 recommendations. Second is communication/ICT. And this presumably will be discussed globally these issues.

The second set of square brackets was regarding the e‑waste and the climate change, which are alternative texts. Some objected on including e‑waste, some object including climate change. One of these texts should be in the text.

And some non‑Member States and supported by very few said that the possible native impact on environment. So we have three square brackets, two to choose from one and the possible square brackets.

I think text is displayed on this document and need not be read and at your disposal, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Let's start with the DT32, article 8, dissemination. We have square brackets in the middle of the text on administration, cooperation, tariffs and we have the routes and I'll ask the group if there is an agreement to remove the square brackets first in the middle. If there is no objection? United States?

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And thank you and good afternoon to all. Mr. Chairman, as I understood, you were asking whether or not to remove the brackets. The brackets, as we see them, include the entirety of this proposal. And we would like to maintain those brackets. And we are prepared to engage in the discussion related to the brackets. But, Mr. Chairman, we rely upon you to let us know when that would be appropriate. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Yeah, I think the discussion can start. Please go ahead.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we have two principle concerns about this proposal. And clearly our concerns do not address the general problem that is introduced here; that is to say that all participants in this conference would have views and concerns regarding the environment and a commitment to maintain an environment in which we all can live with trust and satisfaction regarding climate and other elements that we may be facing.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is not the issue. The issue is whether or not this subject should be included in the ITRs. We have been made clear in the ad hocs ‑‑

>> CHAIR: Sorry to interrupt you. We are on Document 32, the dissemination of information.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Yes?

>> CHAIR: Can you put the headset? Sorry to disrupt you. We are on Document 32, not Document 33. And my question is: If we can remove the square bracket in the middle.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. I thought I heard distinctly that we were in Document 33. But I'm also prepared to speak to Document 32 or any document which wish to bring before the plenary.

[Laughter]

[Applause.]

I'm in your hands, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: 32, please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, with respect to Document 32, we have raised ‑‑ we support the continuation of this Article. We would, as we have indicated in previous meetings, however, wish to summarize administrative, operational and tariff into one statement, which is statistical nature concerning international telecommunications and so forth. That's our first point, Mr. Chairman.

We would also wish to focus on services and not on routes, which have been the subject ‑‑ which are the subject of other conversations before this Conference.

But my first intervention, Mr. Chairman, is to indicate that we would prefer use of the term "only statistical" because we believe that summarizes very well administrative, operational and tariff. It also has the other aspect, Mr. Chairman, which is that we may not be able to call upon information regarding those three items to provide to the ITU given reporting direction we have with our operators. But as far as to be retained, we would ask that "routes" be deleted and simply preserve services. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, I'll go back to Egypt, the Chairman of the ad hoc group.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. But now I talk not at the Chairman but representing African states.

I think the conclusion of administrative and operational is relevant, very relevant because Member States may want to release some information that other Member States would like to have this information. Tariff maybe it's not quit appropriate in current environment but it can be replaced by ‑‑ I think can be very easily. Remove the brackets and putting retain instead.

Regarding routes, maybe you can ask routes if practicable or if possible or something with the sense. But regarding the first part, I think it's very important to include administrative operational, maybe a third if agreed and continue the sentence. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Here the proposal. Just to start with, this is one of the texts that was there in Article 8 of document, exactly the same document. Any for the ITR is put forward for change.

So would the new proposal from the African group, is there any agreement to ‑‑ there is a proposal to strike out what is in square bracket. And there is a proposal to keep it and change the word tariff with "retail" and "routes if practicable."

I see Sweden, Portugal, Bahrain. I ask you to be very brief. We have a long way to go.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman, we have difficulties to include the word routes in this text, so we prefer it to be deleted.

>> CHAIR: Portugal?

>> PORTUGAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would still prefer to suppress the entire text or Article 8. But as a compromise, we could accept with the understanding that routes is surely suppressed because we cannot accept this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Bahrain?

>> BAHRAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Basically I'll just comment on the first square brackets. I think that keeping it just statistical to make the information too limited and not quite applicable. Therefore, I support the delegate from Egypt's proposal to expand it and perhaps change tariff to retail, thank you.

>> CHAIR: I think you will get more job to do. I'll send it back to you because it seems that there is still a lot of ‑‑ seems a simple issue, but it seems that there is a lot of opposition to this. So I'll send this document back to you rather than keep debating this in the plenary.

I'll go now to Document 33. I'll give back the floor now to United States since you have started this. And I am sorry to interrupt you at that time. United States you have the floor, and then I'll take the floor from others. There is a square bracket. There are square brackets within that. ITU‑E possible and the slash ICT and the entire square brackets. U.S.?

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, as we were indicating, we of course are very concerned as all colleagues are with the environment. And we wish for the environment to be preserved to the benefit of all citizens.

However, Mr. Chairman, in this regard, we have two concerns. First, the scope issue. Mr. Chairman, we do not see that this proposal is consistent with 1.1 of the ITRs, which deal very explicitly with international telecommunications services and their transmission and the underlying facilities supporting that transmission. We believe that this is a departure from that fundamental scope of the ITRs.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, we believe much work is being done already in this area, and we would note the world telecommunications standardization assembly resolution 73, which was revised and adopted just a week and a half ago. We see one also from the Standardization Assembly on e‑waste. We have further the development conference resolution 66 and the plenipotentiary resolution 182.

Mr. Chairman, it would be our preference to keep this issue at the technical level pursuant to those resolutions, and we would, as a result, conclude that it is not appropriate for this item to be included in the ITRs. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Japan?

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Japan direct associates with comments made by U.S. We also think this environmental issue is scoped of ITR and should not be included there. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Canada and South Africa?

>> CANADA: Yes, thank you very much. Chairman. Chairman, we had indicated in an earlier intervention that many of the resolutions that have already been adopted, including the two just mentioned at the standardization assembly, address many important issues associated with environment and climate change and on the issue of e‑waste.

In fact, the revision to Resolution 73 at the Assembly makes specific reference to e‑waste, as does of course the new resolution on that subject.

Chairman, for this reason, we do believe that it would not be appropriate, particularly in view of Article 1, to include a separate provision on this subject; however, we would be open to the possibility, if necessary, of a resolution from this conference on in subject.

So, again, Chairman, we do recognize the subjects encompassed under energy efficiency are extremely important. And we give our full support to them. But we do not think that a new article is feasible or necessary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. South Africa, briefly, please.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, Chairman. I think this is an opportunity for the ITU to show leadership. We talk about the scope of the agreement, but really this is just about being concerned about the environmental impact of what we do in the telecommunications sector. So I see it would be ‑‑ I think I'm strongly in favor from South Africa that we should include something like this, Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: UK, briefly, please.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank You, Chair. Good afternoon. I'd like to thank Dr. Ghanim for all his efforts in this matter and would like to associate ourselves with the comments from Canada, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Sudan.

>> SUDAN: Thank you, Chairman. We believe that all the installations and equipment used for telecommunications have an impact on the entire world, especially upon developing countries. Therefore, we think this treaty is the right instrument to contain provisions intended to protect developing countries.

>> CHAIR: Botswana?

>> BOTSWANA: Thank You, Chair. You know, the issue of the scope, what here we are asking for is basically to say as you deliver, you provide telecommunications service, take care of the environment. Really, the issue of the scope, the issue of environment is part of the ITR. We are asking for a provision which are trying to take care of the environment as we deliver our service.

I think we have would have to have our responsibility in place that we actually look into the issue of e‑waste. I do understand there are resolutions which actually are address the same issue, but this is very important that we have a provision in the ITR.

>> CHAIR: Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This issue is very important for many countries, including developing countries. The preference should be included in the ITR. However, if you could not have that consensus, the minimum would be a resolution, the minimum. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: The list is growing. And I just want to suggest something. We have a resolution as a compromise. Or we send it back to Dr. Sherif again. So is there any ‑‑ is the meeting in agreement to have at least resolution to this conference regarding energy efficiency and e‑waste? I'll give the floor now to Cameroon and I need you guys to be very, very brief.

>> CAMEROON: Thank you, Chairman. This resolution, energy efficiency, e‑waste, is of critical importance to many countries, including Cameroon. And that is why, although there are resolution‑type provisions existing on this issue, we think this should be in the treaty because of the high level of the treaty to give this the place it deserves because it is very, very important to us.

>> CHAIR: Netherlands?

>> NETHERLANDS: Yes, Chairman, to be very brief. We support your proposal to call for the resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Peru?

>> PERU: Thank you very much, Chairman. Peru believes that this is an opportunity and indeed a responsibility for all countries and all Member States to include some kind of provision either within the ITRs themselves or at least to have a declaration of some kind from the conference on environmental‑related issues. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. The list is growing again. And I have to send it back to Dr. Sherif to basically look at the possibility of having a compromise on this issue; and, if possible, having a resolution. If that's okay, I'll send it back to the ad hoc group for further discussion. If the meeting agree to have it as a provision, then that's great, but I'll have to send it back to you. Thank you. Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. Indeed in the ad hoc group, we make more than meeting, and we reduce the text from strong language to much, much, much lean language. And I'm afraid that we go to the stall position unless we see cooperation from those who are opposing this resolution or this provision. Otherwise, we shall come back to you with the same square brackets. So unless we have some sort of understanding, to have some flexibility, the ad hoc cannot reach any consensus. Thank you, Chairman. Already it is reduced to the minimum of simplification. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Can the group look at alternative issues, as well? Like having a resolution and come up with a text? Thank you.

Can we go now to Document 29 and accessibility? We have a text in front of us. No square brackets. There is only few square brackets. And I would ask the meeting if we can remove square brackets. There is in document DT29 two options. On the first line, "promote, between square bracket or encourage/OA to provide. And of course there is the famous slash ICT on the second sentence and the ITU‑T versus ITU on the third line. So let's start with the first one.

And let's start with "promote" if we can remove, encourage slash O8 since this has contentious issues. Can we remove with the promote? Is there any objection to that? Great. No objection to that. So we move to the second issue, the ICT. I know that is very contentious. Can we delete slash ICT? Iran and United Arab Emirates.

>> IRAN: Thank You, Chair. Because this text is proposed to be in the provision of the ITR, perhaps you should wait for the end of discussions of telecommunications/ICT. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I'm trying to make progress. I'm trying to see if we can delete ICT here in this particular point. UA?

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you. What I needed to say has already been mentioned. It is clear you are dealing with this issue as ‑‑ holistically with all over the text. So similar to ITU, ITU‑T and so one, this issue would be dead one I think for one and for all. Thank You, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So we'll keep the ICT between square brackets whether to be deleted or retained, that we'll come back to it at a later stage.

I will try the ITU versus ITU‑T is this the same thing? Okay. I see the same thing.

So, the text as I see it is approved with keeping the word "promote" and deleting slash ROA/OA and keep the slash ICT and ITU and we’ll come back to it when this resolves. United States and Spain. Spain?

>> SPAIN: Thank you, Chairman. Just a comment. I don't know whether it might be an editorial error somewhere, but I had understood that this part was going to be part of the article are is it a compromised proposal in terms of a resolution? I don't think any conclusion was reached in the working group, in the ad hoc group, rather, I'm sorry. When you say something's approved, is it approved as part of the provision or is it approved as a resolution? I'm afraid I'm not clear at the moment. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: This is approved as part of the provision. The text that is in front of us came from the ad hoc group 1 on accessibility. And I don't see square bracket here. The only square brackets is the ones mentioned in the first, second and third lines. We have dealt with the first one. And we kept the second and last when we get into and we resolve the issues that are related to slash ICT. It might be deleted or might be retained. Or ITU versus ITU‑T might be retained or might be deleted. With that explanation, can we approve the text with the exception of the ones between square brackets? Spain again.

>> SPAIN: Thank you, Chairman. I see you can see in DT29 the second paragraph says that this was supported by some participants. Some suggested a resolution instead of a new provision. That indicates the fact that there was no consensus. I wonder whether the Chairman of the ad hoc group could just shed some light on the situation for us, please. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Chairman, can you elaborate on this, please?

>> Yes, Chairman. This had been raised in the discussions and that's why we put the statement in the second paragraph. Because there was no special request to put in square brackets but it was just mentioned the course of the discussion in the meeting.

>> CHAIR: Let's try that in terms of provision to start with. Is there an agreement to keep it as a provision? Since this is a very important issue that deals with persons with disabilities, Spain, United Arab Emirates.

>> SPAIN: Thank you, Chairman. We'd just like to say that in the course of the meeting, several participants said that they did not want to see this text within the provision. What we would like to suggest is a compromised solution was that it be put into a resolution as I believe was done with the efficiency.

The reasons are basically the same as those put forward with respect to energy efficiency, to wit, despite the fact that I agree this is a very, very important issue, it is perhaps a little bit tangential when it comes to the scope of the ITRs as defined in 1.1. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: UAE, Egypt, Costa Rica, Uganda and then I'll conclude because I don't want to take also a long time on this. UAE?

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman. Responding to your question, Mr. Chairman, yes, we are in favor to put this issue in the provision of the ITR since this is very important issues and we believe that if we put it in the ITR, that will reflect as articles binding, not as a resolution which resolution shows as nonbinding to the government.

Similarly, Mr. Chairman, because I have the floor, because you asked the floor before for the energy efficiency and our position also for the energy efficiency to be put in the provision, just to state that because we have asked the floor previously. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. And I think this proposition is very related to telecommunications. It's dealing with Telco equipment for people with disabilities may be different than the other articles we have been talking, but it is very relevant to telecom and you have to talk to some who have sons or father who are disabled and see how they feel about that. If you want to send the message to the community and to the world that you are taking care of people with disabilities and making access to telecom equipment and services is available to them with ease. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Costa Rica?

>> COSTA RICA: Thank you, Chairman. We support Spain's point of view on this one. It does not seem to us to be appropriate that this be included in the specific of the ITRs. We think dealing with as Spain has suggested would give some uniformity to the way in which we are treating issues because it would follow the pattern that we took when we dealt with energy efficiency. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Mr.Sherif, I'm afraid I have to sentiment back to you. There is more discussion.

And number 2, this will also be sent back to the ad hoc group. I truly believe that giving people with disabilities a chance is extremely critical for all of us. It's important. It's a humanitarian issue. And I think we need to consider that very much in our discussion.

I would now ask ad hoc group No. 2 of plenary on the binding nature of the ITR recommendations to give its presentation on the document. South Africa, you have the floor.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank You, Chair person. The ad hoc group did meet and the views that were expressed in the discussions were similar to what had been expressed in plenary. The text under discussion really falls into two parts. One is whether there's a need to reference the possibility of recommendations being binding in any of the articles of the regulations. I think for this part, it's probably better to review this text whilst the substantive discussions on the provision of the regulations have taken place. Because if there's no need to reference any of the recommendations as having a binding nature, then that text and that portion of the square brackets can be removed.

There's also, then, text that relates to whether we call the recommendations ITU‑T recommendations or ITU recommendations. Once again, I think there's a substantive component to this debate in the sense that if there's a need to reference any particular recommendations that are not ITU‑T recommendations, such as those in the ITU‑R recommendations, then we could use the broader text, that being ITU‑T recommendation ‑‑ I mean ITU recommendations.

So it really depends if there's a need to reference anything outside the ITU‑T recommendations. So I suggest that we come back to this text once some of the more substantive discussions have taken place, chairperson. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So your recommendation is to defer the discussion of this item until we come back to it at a later stage, once we have looked to the ITRs provisions in more details?

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, yes, that's correct, Chairperson. The question is in square brackets.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We will defer this item. We move now to ad hoc group 3, draft new resolutions for special measures for land lock, developing countries and DT28. Paraguay, you have the floor.

>> PARAGUAY: Thank you very much, Chairman, and good afternoon to everybody. The group held a meeting. The purpose of that meeting was to consider the contributions which each region had made in terms of relevant draft resolutions.

We reached consensus, Chairman, and we are now submitting for your consideration the text of the draft new resolution. We would hope to get plenary's approval for that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. The text is in front of you in DT28, draft new resolution. Is there any comment on this resolution before we proceed on approving it? Afghanistan?

>> AFGHANISTAN: Thank you, Chairman. Afghanistan is fully strongly support this proposal.

>> CHAIR: Papua New Guinea?

>> PAPUA NEW GUINEA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Speaking on behalf of the Pacific Islands in particular, this particular resolution is of great interest to us. We are very pleased to see the outcome led by group 3 particularly led by Paraguay and we would like to fully, fully support this resolution. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Bhutan?

>> BHUTAN: Thank you, Chairman. Bhutan would also like to join Afghanistan and Papua New Guinea and like to extend full support to this.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Uganda?

>> UGANDA: Thank You, Chair. Chair, Uganda being a landlocked country, we also fully support this resolution. I thank you.

>> CHAIR: Nepal?

>> NEPAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't see any country raising hand against this proposal. I thank all the delegates from the other countries who, by silence have approved this and Nepal fully approves this new proposal for access to international fiber. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I have long lists. If it's for approval, Administrations, please remove the request because I think we have a lot of approval on this issue. Thank you. I still have few countries. Thank you. We do not see any objection. Thank you. Do you still insist on having the floor? Okay. Thank you. So the resolution is approved. Thank you very much.

Do you know, Paraguay, you have a treat tonight. We'll send you a cake.

[Laughter]

Okay. We shall now go to agenda item 5, the use of the term "recognize operating agency, operating agency and the basic telecommunications/ICT. And you have in front of you DT30 rev 1. We had several meetings. I took the responsibility of chairing this meeting. Just to recognize that the group of countries prefer to use the word "ROA" in the implementation of the ITU‑Rs, others prefer OA. And the Chairman of the conference, or the Chairman of the other group proposed a number of options. You will find them towards the end of the document on Pages 3 and 4. Sorry, even Page 2.

So just to go through it very quickly, one of the options is to put a footnote and refer to CS38. So the understanding of the operating agency is within the general understanding of No. 38 and the scope of the ITRs as contained in No. 1.1, that's one of the option.

Second option is to include the actual text on the provision itself. And that's option 2. Again, when we refer to the operating agency, we put a footnote or an asterisk and we say "duly authorized or recognized by Member States to establish and operate telecommunications and which engage international services to the public."

Option 3, which was presented by Brazil, is to remove OA and ROA completely.

And the last option, which was proposed by Iran, on the Page 4, is to have an asterisk when we read "operating agency in the provision" and the text would read on the footnote or the asterisk "operating agencies authorized by Member States consistent with No. 38 within the context in which these agencies are established and operate a public responder service."

Now, some of these options have been newly put to the ad hoc group, and I don't want to open the discussions right now because a number of administrations asked for more time to look into the different options and to think about it and get back to us. And some administrations still wanted to insist that they I don't the term "ROA"or "OA." So I don't want to open the discussions into this. I see Portugal and Iran. I'll give you the floor, but please briefly. I don't want to open the debate here in the plenary on this. You will have some time to talk about it. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, the issue of ROA and OA was discussed at APT coordination meeting this afternoon. And the initial suggestion of Iran was further explored and now is replaced by a preliminary position of APT that I could communicate to you if you so wish, or I could read it just for if information the whole line. But we now have preliminary position of APT. The reason of preliminary is that the people at the late hour this afternoon, they wanted to consult the capital and come back. But just as a preliminary position of APT Chair now support the whole APT countries as a position, preliminary positions. I am at your disposal.

>> CHAIR: Can you read it, please?

>> IRAN: Yes, Chairman. The preliminary position is as follows: In the future ITR or draft ITR that we have now, we introduced ROA/OA in the relevant provisions and then referred that to a footnote. And the footnote text reads as follows: "Operating agency and/or recognized operating agency authorized by Member States, within the context in which these agencies are established, to operate international telecommunications services offered to the public, taking into account No. 38 of the Constitution."

This would replace the initial proposal made this morning by Iran. Now, it is preliminary position of APT. Hopefully, maybe, become a position of APT, hopefully. So if you want, I could read it quickly if it is okay I won't read it anymore. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I would prefer we have it in writing and could distribute it to the rest. I don't want to open the debate here into this because, again, I know that I will be hearing, some might say we still prefer this or that. And we'd enough time.

Mexico and Japan, do you still insist to have the floor? Mexico? If you are in support or against, I'm not opening this for debate. So Japan?

>> JAPAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Very briefly. Upon consideration of the proposal made by Iran, Japan at this moment is not in a position to accept with that preliminary proposal made by Iran. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Mexico, again, if it's in support or opposition, please, I'm not opening this for debate. The issue is still under discussion. Mexico?

>> MEXICO:  thank you, Chairman. No, I don't want to open the discussion. It's just that I think I heard use of the words "recognized operating agency authorized by Member States" that particular phrase has confused me a bit. If we can get some clarification on it now, it would be helpful; if not, we'll look at it again when we get it in writing with everybody else.

>> CHAIR: I prefer we get it in writing and then we can pass it to you.

And I will conduct the informal meeting Monday morning at 8 and I will dispatch the room number. But thank you very much, Iran, for your work and for this. And I hope that it will be helpful for all of the meetings ‑‑ or all the regional groups.

I will now give the floor to the Chair of 5 to briefly give his report. Briefly, Chairman?

>> JOSHUA PEPRAH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I will be brief. Committee 5 has had a total of three meetings, first to allocate work and also form some ad hoc committees to look at certain things and also to review the reports that have come from the various working groups.

Our first ad hoc was on Article 10. After preliminary discussions, we set up another for Article 10 to be discussed, and they will meet on Monday. So we don't have a feedback from them yet. Monday the tenth of December.

We had broad discussion on principles on Article 6, and an ad hoc group was set up to consider whether it is kept or suppressed. And they reported back after meeting Thursday night chaired by Australia that in principle it be kept; however, what must go in is yet to be discussed in another ad hoc meeting this evening co‑chaired by India and Australia to discuss the old and the new items that must be considered.

So we will have feedback on it after tonight. And if they don't finish, they probably will be able to continue on Saturday morning.

Now, one issue that came up during our earlier meetings was the nondiscriminatory access. And that, the Working Group 5.2 had requested committee 5 to have an informal discussion with the Chairman. And obviously it slipped us earlier. But after this afternoon, we had that informal discussion. And it has been agreed that it will be brought back to Committee 5 on Monday for discussion. This is Document DT25 for discussion on nondiscriminatory access.

So Working Group 5.1 has been working. They worked on agenda items that were on ADM/8 as discussed, charging and accounting provisions, new provisions on Article 6, provisions relating to maritime, 2, new provisions on roaming, new provisions on taxation, special arrangements, Article 9. Various ad hoc meetings have been set on this. Ad hoc on roaming was chaired by Japan, had a meeting on Thursday sixth December, and they're finished. Their work is finished. And the text on roaming has been posted as DL17. Ad hoc on international telecommunications connections was also chaired by Brazil. They had their meeting Thursday December 6th. Their work is finished and text on international telecommunications has also been posted as DL16.

The ad hoc on maritime telecommunications, which is chaired by Greece, will meet Saturday, that is tomorrow. And their output will be communicated accordingly. Or deliberated at the committee level on Monday and communicated accordingly.

Working group 5.2 have had about 4 meetings. And they have had the following agenda items to work on: Quality of service, article 3.1, 3.4 and 4.3, provision of facilities, article 3.2, new provision on misuse on article 3, new provision on common line communication on article 3, routine or routing under article 3.3, and new article 5 A on security.

So far, this is the status. Ad hoc on misuse chaired by UK, they've had one meeting on Thursday the sixth of December. Completed its work. And text posted as DL15. This proposed text on misuse has some square brackets.

The ad hoc on security, also that is chaired by Brazil, will meet this evening. And obviously their outputs will be deliberated at Comm 5 level on Monday and communicated accordingly.

Mr. Chairman, in brief, this is the status of the work of Committee 5 and its working groups. I must say that there's a lot of work in this area. And everybody is applying themselves quite well. We just ask that at this point people will begin to look at moving away from their entrenched positions so we can get some compromises that we can build consensus around to make the work a little bit easier for all of us.

Mr. Chairman, I'll rest here. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. And I wish that more progress is reported and especially the next plenary meeting, we're expecting some substantial work to be presented to plenary for approval. But I thank you. And I thank the working group chairs for the work.

I move now to ‑‑ is it the Chairman of committee 3 or Canada? Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It would be Canada. And I'd just like to thank the Chairman of committee 5. We would like to ask a question for clarification in regards to DT25. It was our understanding that a decision had been taken by the plenary to deal with that document at plenary, and that based on that decision the Chair of Committee 5 had sent the document to the plenary. Could you please clarify, Mr. Chairman?

>> CHAIR: I'll come back to that. United States?

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, we were seeking the same clarification as Canada. It is our understanding that this issue was sent to the plenary. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Yes, I remember just now the issue. We discussed it internally and we said we'd bring it to Monday plenary meeting. This is the proposal. Or this is at least the aim to do. Thank you.

Now let's go to Document 43 and agenda item 7, the series of texts coming from the committee 4 for approval? And I'll go to the first page, without the preamble in its entirety. So Page No. 1 without the preamble submit for approval. Cuba?

>> CUBA: Chairman, thank you. I shall not be referring to Document 43. I requested the floor before the conclusion of the previous item. I'd like to come back to Canada's question and that of the United States.

In Committee 5, the document was examined in a fair amount of detail. And we discussed when the discussion would take place. We didn't discuss the substance. And we were told the discussion would take place in plenary. And as we understood it, the document would be examined on Monday at the plenary of Committee 5. But now we are being told this will be examined in plenary, that it is the outcome of an agreement. We don't understand what is happening with this document. We don't understand why it was not examined within the body to which it was allocated. We were in group 2, Comm 5, now the plenary. And the explanations haven't been clear. Maybe we've become lost or maybe we've forgotten the explanations. We don't understand what has happened with this document.

Please, could you explain about this document exactly where and how will it be examined?

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I recall Committee 5 Chairman said he will take it on Monday in the morning session and then he will bring it to the plenary on Monday evening. That is the plan.

Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We have the same question. You have mentioned it has been discussed internally. We are not aware of any internal discussions, internal in the Steering Committee? Internal in what? The document was allocated to Committee 5, and it should be discussed at Committee 5. And whether it comes on plenary on Monday, that is up to the discussion. Hopefully it should come, but I don't think that we should try to move the document from one committee to other committee, and internal discussion, Chairman, is not known to us. We would secret clarification that we have total transparency of the situations. Any decision of the Chairman of the conference that you have full right to say you wish that the document be discussed here and there, we fully abide to that. But I don't think we should say this is internal discussions three times this morning at Committee 5 it was mentioned that plenary, committee 5, plenary and it was agreed that that should be discussed at Committee 5 and I secret your confirmation that the document is allocated, assigned to Committee 5. Once discussion is completed or if there is any problem, then it will come to the plenary. But currently it is at Committee 5. And I need your kind confirmation of that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: And I just said that the document will be discussed in Committee 5 and then there is no resolution, it will come to the plenary.

The discussion that I had is just before the meeting with the Chairman of Committee 5 on the issues that ‑‑ on the progress of the issues and what I'm expecting to have in plenary so that I can plan for the plenary on Monday. Thank you.

Can we go to the document 43 now? And the first page on the approval of Document 43, first page without the preamble. Thank you, Page 2. That starts with telecommunications and ends with Article 7. Thank you.

Page 3? Which starts with the Secretary‑General and ends with resolution 3. Thank you.

Page 4 starts with the suppression of 5 and ends with suppression of recommendations 2. Thank you.

Page 5, which is suppression of recommendation 3 and opinion 1. Thank you very much.

I now go to agenda item 8, article 3A, which is the proposal from Russia on the Internet. And I just wanted to inform the meeting that discussions still underway and has not finished. And once it's finished, we will report back to the plenary. But until now, I have nothing substantial to present to the plenary for consideration by the plenary on this issue.

And now we come ‑‑ Germany?

>> GERMANY: Yes, thank you, Chairman. Just information also other discussions with European colleagues because as far as we know, we have not been invited in these kind of discussions, thank you.

>> CHAIR: The official spokesman of CEPIT has been informed about the status. So if you please can coordinate with that on decision. I'm coordinating the CEPIT representatives here on this issue. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We fully agree with you that you may need to be engaged in consultation; however, in APT, there is no formal and official representation, Chairman. The view is divided. The few countries that have one view, majority have different view, Chairman. So, please, kindly, I request you kindly to involve other countries, Chairman. No one represents APT, Chairman. Unless they fully agree on the matter, Chairman. It is quite different from other regions. Vast region and different stages of the development and so on, so forth. And I request you kindly to consider that.

We have suffered from this issue in WRCT 2012 that countries that represented us were as they didn't have any interest in that issue and the set representative of IPT, that issue was not connected to them at all. So please kindly consider that is a plea to you, Chairman. And I hope that you will afford possibility for us to be included in any discussion, particular on this very important issue of Internet. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Is there anything to be add? I see requests coming from the floor from many, many, many administrations. I'm emphasizing that still discussions is not yet concluded and there is nothing substantial to be reported to the plenary. If you don't mind, I have Saudi Arabia, Algeria, Australia. Saudi Arabia. Algeria?

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, if you please, could you help me? I have DT4 Rev 1, which isn't in chronological order. Could you please help us? For Article 3A, please could you tell me the page in this DT4 Rev 1 which has Article 3A so that we can address this issue correctly. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Document DT4, Rev 1, Page 93 or 94. It was presented in the last plenary and has had a lot of discussions. And I took it to have an informal discussion between the regional group. And as I said, there is not much to add right now. And I will report back the results in the next plenary.

Australia?

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank You, Chair, Australia would like to strongly associate itself with the last intervention by Iran. As my Iranian colleague indicated, there is no single spokesperson for the APT on this subject, so we would ask that we could be included in the discussions which you have described as ongoing and of which we have had no visibility. Thank You, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I will. Canada?

>> CANADA: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would like to associate ourselves with the comment by Australia as it applies to CITEL. We would like to have further discussions on this issue, of course. But there is no single spokesperson on this issue from CITEL. And to that extent, if there are any discussions CITEL needs to be involved. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Algeria?

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Chairman. And thank you for explaining the page which gives the proposal from the Russian Federation. And now ‑‑ and this is concerning the proposal to add an Article 3A. Chairman, if you will recall, Algeria made a statement immediately after the presentation of this document by the Russian Federation. So we are very well acquainted with this document. And we know what the subject is.

Of course, we must respect the opinions of each country, the countries which spoke wish to have more consultation and coordination at regional level. And that is wish we respect.

As for ourselves, we're speaking only on behalf of Algeria. We do have the right to speak on behalf of our country. And we would like to reiterate and to express to you our interest, our very strong interest, in this issue. This is the second time that this issue is being submitted to the plenary for consideration.

Chairman, I would like us to have an exchange of views on the proposed new article 3A whilst awaiting, of course, consultation between regions and countries at regional level. But for those administrations which so desire, we would like there to be an exchange of views on this proposal from the Russian Federation, which I repeat we find extremely interesting. For our part, in any event, without going so far as to say that we support it in every detail, we do support the general principles it ‑‑ (audio disruption).

>> CHAIR: In between the regional groups, which I understand there are some which have no singular representatives, and I have to involve much more than I was expecting, which I will do. But I don't see opening the subject right now for even general discussions will help the discussions. I will kindly indulge you to wait until we have at least went through some rounds of consultation between the region groups on this important issue.

Algeria?

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, we participate in conferences, plenipotentiary conferences, sectoral conferences, at the global level. We do participate as a member state. This idea of regions only comes into its own when we have to elect the members of council. And indeed there are regions ‑‑ there are regions within the meaning of the regulations. But of course the countries are absolutely free to hold consultations at regional level; however, a member state without necessarily pushing for a given decision, has the right, whilst awaiting consultations on the part of those who so desire at regional level, a Member State can as such and on an individual basis express an opinion. And this after all is the second consideration of this proposal. So of course, Chairman, we do not wish to your object to leading the work, but this is a desire which we expressed. We do not think that this should be subject to a regional decision. For our part, Algeria, we would like to have a discussion. I didn't say this discussion should last several hours. Perhaps you could limit this discussion to 10 minutes or 15 minutes. But we would be interested to know a little more about what opinions are on this proposal from various parties.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And I think at the last plenary meeting, we spend enough time when this proposal has been presented. And we came up with lots of disagreements. And we don't want to engage into a series of objections and support.

And as we did with the other proposals today, rather than expanding the discussion in the plenary, we at least limit. And I will invite you to the discussions that I will have with the concerned representatives and you will be part of these discussions and have an informal discussion. But I really don't see opening it up right now for a further discussion that what happened in the last plenary meeting. We'll take hours in order to reach to any conclusion, if any will happen.

Algeria.

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Chairman. Of course we will abide by your decision, but I would simply like to draw your attention and the attention of all members participating in this conference in this plenary to the fact that this day is the end of our first week. Unfortunately we only have two weeks. So half of our time has elapsed and we are still at the preliminary stage. So our question to you is: When will we really go in to the substance of the various issues put before us for our consideration? I simply wanted to draw your attention to this. And I have a question to ask you. When do you think, Mr. Chairman, that this issue ‑‑ when do you intend to put it before the plenary for examination? And when do you think that the time will be right to examine it in depth in such a way as to achieve a conclusion? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Right now, it is put on the table of this plenary to report on it. And I hope that well do something towards tomorrow and the day after tomorrow; and on Monday plenary, we hope that we come back with something that will be agreed by at least, in principles, some parties rather than open discussions and get into drafting or debate that will not end.

Mexico, Korea, Iran, Iraq and United States, if you please can be brief, we are coming toward the end of the meeting. Mexico?

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chairman. I will indeed be extremely brief. However, I did want to reiterate what has been said already by my colleague by Canada. CITEL does not have a regional stance on this, and therefore, Chairman, we must ask you for the informal consultations to be as inclusive as possible so that all those countries who are interested by this debate can participate and be consulted. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. It's noted. Korea?

>> KOREA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This issue is very fundamental. As Article as Mexican delegate and ‑‑ delegate. There is no from APT reason so Korea wishes to associate with this and we want to participate to be consulted. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, sorry to come back again. I ask you kindly to call this group ad hoc committee of the Chair of the conference. There is no representation, Chairman. We put it to plenipotentiary conference to totally abandon this, Chairman. This has not served its purposes, Chairman. Please kindly call your meeting ad hoc group of Chairman. We have full confidence on you, your capability, your competence and your neutrality. But call them Chairman of conferences committee on Internet.

>> IRAQ: Thank you, Chairman. I thank you for having give men e the floor. Yes, of course I agree with our colleague from Algeria as regards examination of important issues. As our colleague said, 50 percent of the conference time has elapsed already. And of course we must agree on the way in which we are to examine important issues. Thank you.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we have listened to colleagues. And in particular we have listened to our colleague from Algeria.

Mr. Chairman, we of course are supportive of your approach and you do need consultations on certain issues, and we wish to participate in your consultations.

Mr. Chairman, we would wish to propose for your consideration, through perhaps this weekend, whether or not we can proceed on Monday to plenary sessions. We suggest this, Mr. Chairman, because of a concern we have that we are beginning to lose the thread of this conference and the interconnection and interrelationship between many issues. And we would prefer, therefore, to bring these issues to the plenaries to give relief to colleagues who have been meeting in so many ad hocs. And we appreciate very much the chairs of those ad hocs. We know that they are very tired. But they have also served so well.

But, Mr. Chairman, we believe that we have reached the time in the conference, as colleagues have indicated that time is running out, that we move to plenaries under your able leadership so that we all can understand the true thread between all issues and we can come to some conclusion on the essential issues of this conference. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And we are planning plenary on Monday in the evening session so that we can at least ‑‑ it was not planned before, but in the last Steering Committee, we put it forward so that we can have another try in trying to resolve issues.

UK, briefly, please.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chairman. I will be brief. I think that in the interest of making progress and trying to move towards a positive outcome for this conference, I think that the representative of the United States has spoken wisely. And I would also urge you to move us towards plenary sessions in support of the proposal made by the United States.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And that's why we are putting plenary on Monday. Thank you.

Now, can we come to the other business? And UAE, you want the floor? Please go ahead.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, looking to the time that we have spent till now, which we are on the fifth day now, five days have passed. We are in the middle of the conference. However, we still move anywhere, we haven't moved anywhere. Still that proposals are just going discussion, and many times that we have been hearing in different groups in the plenary or Committee 5 and working groups that every time there is a proposal or something like that, this is within the scope of ITR or would like to expand the scope of ITRs or not, Mr. Chairman, that would like to put as statement here and administer the meeting from United Arab Emirates and also for some Arab groups clearly stated that the scope WCIT is clearly defined if you allow me to read it. CS146 our world conference on telecommunication may partially or in exceptional cases completely revise international telecommunication regulation and may deal with any questions of a worldwide character within its competence and related to its agenda.

And we know that within the competence of the ITU, we have agreed that in the first time that to be in competence with preamble and Article 1 of the Constitution. And all the proposals which have been submitted here, it's already within the competence of ITU has been studied carefully. I can say that not only in the council working group but also for the preparation of this conference which started in 1998 in plenipotentiary for the first time. And from that time till now, the preparation was going on on the issues that were submitted here is important for, or not was ‑‑ or important for the Member States. All the issues which have been discussed till now, spam, cyber‑security, other issues, the current ITR ROA/OA, but, still, Mr. Chairman, we are not moving anywhere. And we are really afraid that coming to next week, we are still not moving, having some problems. Some administrations or regional groups agreeing to compromise, others still, and on discussion on starting that one just on general matters again.

And I think that on the first day of the conference, two days we took that one, general principles and we agreed on that one.

We have many issues here to be discussed and until now nothing happened. Many times Arab group also in their meetings always saying that in their proposal, it's very important to them. And the eight elements that we have always referring to it, which has been discussed all the time, in all council working group and other things, that summarized in the eight items that says Human Rights access to communication, security and the use of ICT, protection of critical national resources, international framework, conference, conformance and ‑‑ convergence, quality of service, enforcement measures, charging and accounting, including taxation. And our proposal, it's all aligned on this one. We're always saying that content is not part of it. Because sometimes still some people will say that the content or censorship is part of, no. Mr. Chairman, I would like to request you based on others really to use your wisdom and to encourage all the Member States to really work together and to serve this conference.

The worldwide are really looking to this conference. We didn't come here to just editorial changes or small changes to the current ITR. There are some critical issues, very important issues have to be reflected. After 24 years, the whole world has been changed and we'd like to really put ‑‑ reflect the reality.

And now, Mr. Chairman, based on this one and discussion with our ‑‑ some of the regional groups and Member States, we have prepared a new multi‑regional common proposals that I would like to submit to you today, Mr. Chairman, to Secretary and to be published on Monday and to be discussed and published for the plenary meeting. This document is ready. It has been discussed by some regional groups and Member States which shows new proposals for the whole ITR as the new ITRs. We would like to submit it to you today. And we'd like to discuss it and publish it by Monday for the plenary session.

With that, I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I see Bahrain, Iraq and Russia. Please be brief. Bahrain.

>> BAHRAIN: I would like to express. We are halfway through the conference and still we are getting questions and concerns raised to the basic principles of what this conference is trying to achieve.

I thought we had addressed those on the first day. So why we are guessing discussion on certain points with the argument they are outside the scope of the ITRs is, frankly, beyond me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to request that if there are still concerns about this, that they be addressed so that we do not waste time in matters that should have been concluded on day one and allow us to achieve the lofty goals that we had set for ourselves in convening WCIT. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Russian Federation, please, briefly.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. We fully endorse the words which have been expressed by our colleague by Bahrain and by our colleague by the UAE. Various states of the RCC are also acquainted with this document, and we also believe it is now high time to get moving because 50 percent of the time of the conference has already passed. We need to prepare a document which will respond in full to today's requirements and demands, which will respond in full to expressing the rights and duties of Member States when it comes to the implementation and observance of the rules applying to this sector.

Chairman, we are of the opinion that the world has changed. The last Century was the last Century. We are now on the verge of a completely different era. And we therefore have to express new features of that new era in our documents. We support the document that will be submitted to you by the group of countries to which reference has been made. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Iraq and Sudan, I don't know if you are supporting, I don't see the point of taking the floor. If you still insist, I'll give you the floor. But I don't see a point that we will go through this list and do it. Iraq?

>> IRAQ: We are really the statement come from our colleagues, we would like the Arab Emirates and Bahrain. We see the members coming from WCIT qualify on discussion and get placed on the revised ICRs. Thank you very much, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Do you still insist on the floor?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. I'm not going to take very much of your time. I just wanted to emphasize the importance of what was said by the representative of the United Arab Emirates. Saudi Arabia supports.

>> CHAIR: Philippines.

>> PHILIPPINES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just for posting emphasis on the statements made by delegation from the Emirates and Bahrain we should go to rules and procedure. One of them is to effect that once an agreement has been definitely agreed upon, then that agreement is deemed forever closed. More so in one case or in fact the agreement had not only been perfected but it was in fact consummated ‑‑ executed.

Anyway, there must be reconsideration of that, but motion for reconsideration must be kindly made in the very same daytime of the meeting where a final agreement has been made. This is not foreclose making changes in our decision. It is just that we want that if at all, there are motions for reconsideration, it must be timely made. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

>> Thank you, Chairman. We would like to support the speakers who took the floor before us and especially what was said by the delegate of the United Arab Emirates. He has emphasized something very particular to wit that we've been preparing for the revision of this treaty for a considerable time. We must adopt ‑‑ amend the treaty at this conference because it is no longer fit for purpose given the changes which have taken place over the last 24 years. We therefore urge everybody present here to spend to modify the treaty appropriately so that it does reflect current realities. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Oman, United States and I will close the list. And we need to finalize and finish the meeting.

>> OMAN: Thank you, Chairman. The delegation of Oman supports the delegation of United Arab Emirates. We support their document. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United States?

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we look forward to seeing the proposal as indicated by our colleague from the United Arab Emirates. Unfortunately, though, Mr. Chairman, we would wish to emphasize to the conference that in terms of the general rules of procedure, Rule 40 in terms of time limits and conditions for submission of proposals and reports to Conferences, there is a very clear statement that immediately after the invitations have been dispatched, the Secretary‑General shall ask Member States to submit at least four months before the start of the conference their proposals for the work of the conference.

Mr. Chairman, as has been described, this sounds like a substantive proposal to the conference, which is comprehensive to the international telecommunications regulations.

Mr. Chairman, we would expect, as a matter of courtesy, that all members of this Conference would have seen this proposal on August 3rd of this year, four months prior to the Conference.

We would indicate, Mr. Chairman, that the United States of America submitted its proposal August 3rd to the conference so that all colleagues could review it in time to prepare national positions.

As the final acts need to be prepared by at least Thursday so that they can be reviewed by heads of delegation in consultation with capitals, in order to receive instructions to sign the final acts, we believe that a proposal, as indicated by our colleague from the UAE that appears to be as comprehensive as he has indicated does not seem to be a courtesy to those of us who have prepared conference proposals in line with general rule 8 paragraph 40. We would wish, Mr. Chairman, for that to be indicated on the record and you to give consideration to this concern. Thank you. Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: ‑‑ then Iran.

>> Thank you, Chairman. We have listened carefully to the discussion during this plenary and during the last working groups and committees.

And actually to be transparent and very clear, we have certain issues and principles that is still under debate. And we see the problem clearly that Member States do not agree 100 percent on the scope of ITU and whether these principles are within the mandate and scope of ITU or not.

Our proposal, Mr. Chairman, is to secret the advice of the legal adviser of ITU on these certain issues. I give you example. The discussion about security. It included cyber‑security. And some Member States understood that these within the mandate of ITU, however others have not the same understanding. So, again, our proposal is to seek the advice of the legal adviser on these key issues and whether these issues are within the mandate of ITU or not.

And I align myself with our colleagues that we'd like to know the content of the cross‑regional proposal. This will be very good for us. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. There is an ad hoc group, Working Group 2 on security that will be held, it's working at 6:30. I hope you take care of that there. Thank you. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I do not get into the detail of the substance of the multi‑regional proposals. We leave it to distinguished United Arab Emirates. But point of procedure. What the delegate of the United States is right about the proposal before the conference. During the conference, Chairman, we have received many, many proposals. The last one of which is WRCT2012. At the third week toward the end of the third week still going to see proposals. Even two days before the conference, we see proposals. So it is up to the Conference to establish a deadline beyond which no proposal will be accepted. This deadline has not yet been established.

However, the plenary is totally legitimate for plenary to establish a deadline for beyond which proposals will not be accepted. Since it is not without knowing the content, it is legitimate to be submitted to the conference. I thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Portugal and then Russia.

>> PORTUGAL: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we heard the UAE statement. And we are concerned with it. We have been prepared, preparing for this conference in Europe for the last, let's say, two years at least. We are in positive spirit trying to cooperate with regions to discuss, to open our meetings to other regions so that everyone can join us and see what we are doing.

And we also prepared our contributions to the council working group which are quite similar to the ones that we are submitted to the WCIT. And so we think in the spirit of good faith and collaboration that between each other, this is the spirit that should preside the WCIT to move forward. Last‑minute contributions that were, I guess, prepared in closed groups between I don't know which Member States can somehow, in my opinion, be negative for the whole flow of the conference.

And just comment. I don't share the idea that this conference is not making progress.

We have just approved a resolution. Some work have been developed on issues, roaming. So we are making progress. And I'm not sure if with this sort of arrangements that we have listened, we are able to make such a good progress in the future. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And I hope that everybody works together and work hard together and try to get to a consensus on all issues regarding the conference.

Russia?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. Chairman, perhaps I could offer some reassurance to our colleague from the United States of America to Qatar and Portugal.

On behalf of the United Arab Emirates and other country, there are no pleasant surprises. There's nothing new. It's a compilation of the proposals which were made and which were presented on time to the conference. Therefore, it's a compromise document. It's a compromise document prepared by some countries because the Conference appeared to be heading towards a bit of a dead end.

As we heard about 20 minutes ago, it's been suggested that we look at all the crucial problems in plenary. That would lead to a polarization of opinions. It would also lead probably to voting. We're prepared to do that, but we'd prefer a compromise. And that's why this document is being submitted. It's a document that almost fully reflects the consensus of countries on all articles of the ITR, therefore I suggest that we look at it carefully, make our comments on it. And we think it would be a good basis on which to build a compromise. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Secretary‑General, you have the floor.

>> DR. HAMADOUN I. TOURÉ: Secretary, so I see that the conference is moving very well because people are tired. This is fun.

[Laughter]

[Applause.]

I'm serious. Some people see the first week is over and this is the issue of glass half full and half empty, you know? We have a full week ahead of us. So how come you're worried? We have plenty of time. Let's take our time. But seriously, I think the problem is that the proposal of the UAE is coming at least in a way that could sound like it is being ‑‑ it has been already cooked, one area, one side of the kitchen and the other side would be worried about what ingredients have been used in there.

I was brainstorming with the Chairman for days now that him and I would at one point in time take all of the issues that are on the table here and bring them to together and put them as a package because we see positions coming from different parts of the house ‑‑ it's the same house ‑‑ and positions that are not really far from one another. I see many low hanging fruits here. And I see many parts of the discussions going in exactly the same direction, but some looking at what should be in the document and some looking at what should not be in the document. That's talking the same thing. And therefore I believe that there is a way to reconcile those positions.

But if it comes from one group, it will sound suspicious from another. So that's really what brings the difficulty here. So I would suggest that we give time over the weekend and especially the night brings more wisdom. Many of us come here without our spouses, otherwise I would have thought about the old African saying that when the wise man meets and they can't find a solution to problems, they say "let's sleep on it." And what they do, they go and ask their wives at home. And the wife gives them the solution and they come back the next day ‑‑

[Laughter]

‑‑ with the solution.

[Applause.]

Where I'm sure most of us came here without our spouses, so we won't be able to come back to you tomorrow immediately with the solutions.

But let's sleep on it. I think that the weekend will give us time to debate more. I think debates are healthy. People are making points here of things that are very relevant and important for them and their constituency. Let's hear them all.

There were some people that we haven't heard from. I intend to meet with the civil society that is present here in this room, in this Conference. I intend to meet with them on Monday, I'm exchanging views with them, to see whether some of the things we're saying are relevant to them or not and how those can be addressed.

These are important issues, and we must not just make it in a way that anyone will feel having lost something in this. It can be, again, win/win. Again, I repeat, this is the true spirit of ITU. This is not the most difficult conference we have had. Some people talk about the WRC just during this conference here. WRC was difficult in general, but I think we came out everybody winner. And I still believe the same way. And I believe that the discussions are healthy. Let's continue debates and try in good faith to come with some solutions. I believe that they are there.

So, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to suggest that we really are ‑‑ give it time proposed for the current proposal. And I would kindly contact you if necessary. I will avail myself to try and pick some of the things that I think are low hanging fruit that could be here that could be harvested quickly and see by Monday how we can move and will therefore propose something that could be seen as neutral by all parties. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And I want to also reiterate one fact that we have a weekend, a long weekend, that it's our weekend, but it's your days and nights of work. But I think it's very important, it's very critical that you work together, collectively, trying to reach, again, to a consensus and having something concrete for next Monday to look at and consider for approval.

Yes, it's half of the conference. We have achieved something, but we also have also gotten through a lot of things. And hopefully it will come. It will come. But the spirit has to be there. The spirit of working together, trying to reach consensus, trying to take steps forward is very, very important and critical.

I have five Administrations asking for the floor. Please, we need to conclude and give some time for you guys to rest before the working group meetings, the other group meetings tonight.

I have Bahrain, briefly, and Sudan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Canada and Jordan. And there is no proposal yet on the table. I would love you guys come together and work together before we enter into this unnecessary debate.

>> BAHRAIN: I'll try to be brief.

First of all, I would like to support the point made by my colleague from Russia. The document that was referred to by the delegate of the UAE is, indeed, a consolidation and compromise document. It does not include any new proposals, but reflects the consolidated position of many Member States. Instead of submitting 12 positions on a point, we thought it would help this conference's work to put them all into one document.

I would also like to point out that earlier in this very plenary session we were considering a new proposal on human rights, one which was not raised at the beginning of this conference. So therefore there is a precedent for such a proposal.

Last but not least, I would like to thank the Secretary‑General for his wise words. I think indeed we will have time over the next two days to consider all of our positions and where we can go.

Furthermore, I would like to take this chance to reaffirm on behalf of the Arab Group that we are fully committed to working together, to seeking a solution that will make everybody happy. I think we can do it. The next week, hopefully, will bear these words out.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Sudan.

>> SUDAN: Thank you, Chairman. I would like to thank the Secretary‑General for his wisdom. I'd also like to thank him for the very positive and encouraging words that he addressed to us. They do a little bit to wipe away some of the fatigue that has accumulated over the last few days.

Chairman, we have participated in all the main meetings of the committees and the Working Groups. We have, while so doing, noted that there have been differing and sometimes contradictory positions taken and expressed. That seems to us to be perfectly normal. However, what we have also observed is that this time, during this conference, there seems to have been a certain lack of transparency. We seem to have lost sight of the win/win principle. The proposal made by the United Arab Emirates, is, we think, a positive proposal, one which should enable us to make headway. And we think it will bring us to consensus. We therefore support it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Uganda?

>> UGANDA: Thank You, Chair. We appreciate the wise counsel of the Secretary‑General. We think we should also appreciate the efforts by the UAE and in the spirit of the win/win situation, we want to encourage them to now take these various issues that they have consolidated to the various ad hoc groups, ad hoc committees and other committees so that we work through the mechanism that is in place. We don't lose out completely on what they have. Let us ‑‑ bright ideas come through the mechanisms that are already in place, so we move together as one. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for these words. UAE?

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Also would like to thank Dr. Hamadoun Touré, the Secretary‑General, for his wise words. And I'll tell him and assure him that we are still strong, we will fight, we will continue to fight. And this is the fun.

And as we are from UAE, we are here, we are here with our family sometimes. So also when I ask my wife sometimes, I give her what is the problem and how is the solution, and she give me some kind of tips that we have to do this kind of document. So I'm bringing this from my wife also.

[Laughter]

[Applause.]

I am always sometimes my work with my family and sometimes get good wisdom.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure everybody that the document that we have made here is exactly what my colleague from Bahrain has mentioned. It is a conciliary document that is taking the proposals from all region groups. Along the way we found there is a consensus at least from those regional groups and have similar position, we put it in this document. And we concerned, and we coordinated with them and then developed this document. We didn't bring any new thing because we have heard that maybe this document is as a new proposals. No, it is not a new proposal; it is what has been submitted till now.

And lastly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure everybody that the Arab groups really would like to cooperate with everybody here. Since we start preparations for this one, for this conference, we have been opening our hand to everybody, listening to everybody, attending meetings, other groups and they were attending with us, and till now we are seeing our hand is open. We'd like to work with everybody and coordinate with everybody in order to come to consensus. I'm sure that at the end, we will come with a consensus on those issues. Simply what we have done is that they have taken all those proposals submitted here and put it in one document, especially for those regional groups who are having similar positions.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Canada, Jordan, Egypt, Mexico. And I'm closing the list so that we can conclude for this meeting. Canada?

>> CANADA: Yes, thank you very much, Chairman. Chairman, we do appreciate the efforts of the United Arab Emirates in trying to develop a document which could serve as a basis for consensus. However, as a matter of practicality, Chairman, we are concerned that this document would not be available until Monday. And we do need to engage in coordination regionally and of course within our own delegation, as well.

Chairman, if we could get some clarification as to when exactly the document will be made available, I think that would facilitate our efforts in trying to ensure that we have close coordination on the contents of the document so that we can make some progress. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I don't have an answer to that. But I'll get back to UAE or to give us guidance on what the document ‑‑ when the document's going to be submitted and what's it going to contain? You explained what it's going to contain but when the document's going to be submitted.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Mr. Chairman, it will be submitted after the plenary today.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Jordan?

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chairman. I requested the floor for clarification. I would like to know whether we will be taking a decision concerning this document. We've heard many delegates say that this proposal presented by the Emirates is positive and is an endeavor to bring about a convergence of the various positions. Consequently, Chairman, I would like to propose that we adopt a healthy basis in order to deal with this proposal.

What I mean by this is that Committee 5 and Working Groups 5‑1 and 5‑2 have to coordinate together several of the subjects presented in the document. That's why I think it would be difficult to deal with the document from the Emirates within these three bodies.

I propose we set up an ad hoc group of plenary to examine the document from the Emirates and then to submit it either to one of the groups or to Committee 5 on Monday or on Tuesday morning. And the subjects which are agreed will then be able to be taken off the agenda.

>> CHAIR: It's not even submitted, so it's really premature even to consider anything in this document. So I wouldn't even comment on and even prejudge what would happen. And I thank you for your words, but it is left for the conference and to the plenary to decide on any document, whether from UAE or similar to what happened today from the group of countries to look at. Thank you.

Mexico, lastly.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chairman.

Chairman, firstly, I should like to thank the United Arab Emirates for the efforts they are making and ask for some explanations. You mentioned ‑‑ and I believe I heard other people mention ‑‑ what proposal we're talking about. I believe I heard it said that there's no proposal to be discussed, first of all.

Secondly, the Distinguished Delegation of the United Arab Emirates have said something about consultations having been held with the regional groups. Well, in the case of CITEL, I, as coordinator of the preparatory group, was not aware of our having been consulted by our ‑‑ I mean, our organisation.

So I don't know what support would have been given by us since we don't appear to have been consulted. I'm a little bit concerned that we are still discussing a document which we haven't actually seen yet, unless we are going to be consulted again. Is there a proposal on the table for discussion now, or is there not? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Exactly. And I think it's time for us to close the meeting. There is no proposal to the plenary now. It's the right of every Member State and Administration to submit whatever proposal they have to the plenary and then only the plenary will consider these proposals.

So I have four requests from the floor: Portugal, Egypt, Burkino Faso, Australia. Do you really insist to address the floor? We really don't have anything to discuss further. I mean, if you don't mind, Portugal. You still insist on having it. Burkina Faso. I will close the list and close the meeting because it's close to the end of the meeting. Portugal.

>> PORTUGAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sorry to take the floor, but I am a bit lost now because as far as I understand, this is an important document, let's say, a relevant document, which in our region, we don't know the wording that is there. So until Monday, what we will do until then? Is it necessary to keep on Working Groups while we know that a substantial submission will be offered to us on Monday?

So I would like to know how this is working in practicality because we will be there in good faith and principle to discuss during the weekend in several Working Groups to try to reach consensus and negotiate this, but knowing that something new will come on Monday.

So I need some assistance and guidance how to ‑‑ what I tell to my European colleagues that we should do in the meanwhile. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And I think I said it very clearly that all Administrations participating in the Working Groups should meet and should work together to reach to consensus.

And I don't know what's in this document. It has taken a lot of debate. And some Administrations even suggested how we deal with it. And I really encourage you to work together, try to find consensus. We have meetings on Saturday, Sunday, Monday morning, Tuesday and so on, so forth. And that's the spirit that we need to work. We need to come to conclusion of this conference with consensus. And I hope we continue to do this. And I hope the spirit is there, and I hope that Administrations move from their original position one step further and compromise.

Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and taking the route away from this discussion I can just make an announcement, but take into guidance Secretary‑General and the spirit you have inspired us that there will be the ad hoc's group on routing and Article 8 and 8A just after this plenary. So I urge the interested parties, in particular from developing countries, to join this meeting. First routing 5:30, and after an hour for eat, and then about the environment and energy efficiency and e‑waste.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Burkina Faso?

>> BURKINA FASO: Thank you, Chairman. In principle we were going to support the proposal of the United Arab Emirates as step to give us a stocktaking. But it is true some people have said that some work has been scheduled for this evening. And if we are to use this consolidated document, it is important that we should have a deadline as of which Saudi Arabia will update its document using the work done this weekend because there will be work done by certain groups.

We're glad that there is this work done because the results are scattered in various documents, and this should help us to follow. But we should agree on a deadline for this document to be updated so that it can be useful to follow the work of our meeting.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Australia? And then I'll conclude. Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank You, Chair. Like Portugal and Burkina Faso, our question was of a practical nature, too. I'm the co‑chair of an ad hoc group that we're meeting tonight and possibly tomorrow, and we will be going through proposals and trying to negotiate consensus text. And I'm just wondering how that work will then ‑‑ what the outcome of that work will be if we have further consensus text or further consolidated proposals to consider on Monday? So it's just the intersection and the connection between those two areas of work that I'm unclear about. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And I just want to repeat what also I said is that you continue your work as normal and reach consensus on the issues that you have at hand. And any proposals coming to the conference are going to be decided by the plenary.

So I really encourage you to work together in order to reach conclusions. Move from your original position, at least with others. And I hope everybody move from their original position and reach to a consensus.

That's the spirit. This is how we should continue. And we will continue to do that. We had a good example of what happened today with a new document. As with the procedure, it will go through the same procedures. And we should not stop all our work just for one document and declare the end of the world.

I think it's very, very important that you work together. You have a lot to do. And move on with the work so that we can have consensus and text that will come to the plenary next week.

With that, I really thank you very much. And I hope next plenary meeting we'll have some text to approve. And we'll move forward on what we have discussed today. Thank you very much.

And all the best for the Working Group, the ad hoc group on security that will meet at 6:30 in Room E. And there is another group on Article 6 that will meet at 7:30 in Room B. And there will be informal discussion on routing that will be at 5:30 in Room F.

Now, for guidance, the list of the ad hoc groups is reflected in Revision 2 to Document ADM/14. It is on the Web. And also please look at the screens to look at the timings of these ad hoc groups.

Thank you very much. The meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

[Applause.]

(end of meeting)
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