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>> RICHARD HILL: Kindly take your seats and put on your headphones. We would like to start. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Dear colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, let's start our final session. I hope it will be fruitful and we can give a good result to Committee 4 for endorsements.

The agenda is in Admin 25 as has been posted. I request you to approve the agenda. It's not sure that I will treat in point 5 in the order, but according to the availability of the documents in priority, but we'll deal with the many Resolutions.

First I will ask you to approve the report of Working Group 4A as appears in TD13, Revision 5. In particular, the one to be approved is the part dealing with yesterday's session. I don't think it appears on point 6 and 7, particularly 7.

I have no requests from the floor. So we can approve the draft report. thank you. We can pass ‑‑ we notice the list of contributions as usual.

We can pass to the result of the Ad Hoc Groups. And if you allow me, I will start from Resolution 65, text which appears in TD52, Revision 1. Egypt, you want to introduce this document or to say something, 52, Revision 1? Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. We held an Ad Hoc Group meeting this morning regarding Resolutions 65 and 61 found in document TD52 and 51. Rev 1 is output. Start with 52 Rev 1 about the Calling party delivery, and have reached the consensus. However, there was a mistyping maybe or miscapturing of some part before the resolve ‑‑ it was reaffirming ‑‑ that it is the sovereign right of each country to regulate its telecommunications and as such, regulate the provision of CLI, CPND and OI, taking into account the Preamble of the Constitution.

It has been debated and there was a proposal to delete the part "as such regulate the provision of CLI, CPND and OI" and just refer to the Preamble of the Constitution and the first part. Other items have been agreed by the Ad Hoc Group.

If clarification needed, I can clarify that. The captured text was, the text captured in the meeting was taking into account the Preamble of the Constitution. However, there was text that was discussed but not well captured which I have read previously. The sovereign right of each country to regulate its telecommunication, as such regulate the provision of so on, so on, as taking into account the Preamble of the Constitution.

>> CHAIR: So my understanding that you have nothing further taking into account the parameters ‑‑ there is some further text to be added with respect to TD52, Revision 1?

>> EGYPT: Yes, it is a simple matter. It is not very controversial but maybe this can be done very easily with informal consultation, the document can be approved but the essence of the critical part has been agreed on. It is more or less like an editorial rather than ‑‑

>> CHAIR: The fact is, this is our last meeting and we have really to approve the text so we need to have the text in front of us. I have United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Maybe I could assist. When we were in the meeting this morning, text was read in and typed into the document as has been read by the Chair of the ad hoc, reaffirming the National rights. That was added to by adding, taking into account the Preamble of the Constitution. That text I thought had been agreed, and drove some further changes and compromise in the rest of the text. I think that text needs to be reinserted into TD52, Rev 1, making it Rev 2. Because that was the basis of subsequent agreements. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Discussion of this morning was around that whether or not we include a sentence borrowed from Resolution 29, saying the reaffirming the rights of Member States to do so and so. We said at the meeting that is a part of the Preamble of the Constitution. It is better not to include that in the report ‑‑ in the Resolution, but simply says, taking into account Preamble of Constitution, which says exactly the same thing, but in the more broader matter.

So that was our suggestion and it was agreed. I don't know why we have to after that again bring the issue taking into account Preamble of Constitution and quote part of that. That Preamble has a lot of other elements in that, so our preference is not to go to a specific text but only refer to Preamble of Constitution.

We are totally lost and confused why we need to again add that one. The proposal to refer to the Preamble of Constitution was to refrain adding a part of that Preamble, but referring to the entirety of the text of Preamble. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Canada?

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair. I was in the ad hoc this morning, and we had reached consensus, and I believe the text as read out was on the screen, and we would like to see the text reinserted. I think that would help progressing the document. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Can I ask the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group to read where the text should go, read at dictation speed in order to allow the Secretariat to insert and prepare the immediate Revision? Please, Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank the Chairman. The text appears just before resolves. It will read, "reaffirming, new line, that it is the sovereign right of each country ‑‑

>> CHAIR: Sorry, at dictation speed in order that the Secretariat can take note.

So start again.

>> EGYPT: Reaffirming that it is the sovereign right of each country to regulate its telecommunications, and as such, comma, regulate the provision of CLI, comma, CPND, comma, and OI, comma, taking into account the Preamble of the Constitution.

And since I have the floor, Mr. Chairman, and putting the hat of the Arab group, we see that referring specifically to relates to the provision of CLI, CPND and OI is redundant information, and it's suggested we keep all the text, but deleting from "and as such" to "OI." Thank you, Chairman. This would be a compromise between the two texts. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Again, the Secretariat has not taken your suggestion. United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, indeed. That is the language that was agreed at the ad hoc meeting this morning, and we would ask that it be included into the Resolution as read out. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So Chairman of Ad Hoc Group can you agree with the text you just read out?

>> EGYPT: As a concession maybe it can be agreed. Although there's nothing either way, so to be more malleable, maybe can agree with that. To be clear, I now ask the Secretariat to further read noting further out all the paragraph will read.

>> RICHARD HILL: So with my colleague we're not sure. So this is what I have and please correct us. So the document as you have in front of you remains and there is an addition. The document has noting further and there's some text, then it says, "taking into account the Preamble of the Constitution," that remains, and then what I have is a new italics section starting, "reaffirming," and then under that, "that it is the sovereign right of each country to regulate its telecommunications and as such, comma, regulate the provision of Calling Line Identification, CLI, Calling Party Number" ‑‑ sorry ‑‑ "Calling Party Number Delivery, CPND and origin identification, OI, taking into account the Preamble of the Constitution."

My colleague is saying maybe we don't need "taking into account the Preamble of the Constitution" because we have it there, so I believe she is correct and we need to eliminate that so it will just be noting further, and then reaffirming, and we end with, "taking into account the Preamble of the Constitution." Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: United Kingdom?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: That is indeed correct. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Our preference was not to refer to the specific text only refer to Preamble of Constitution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: But I understand you can accept as a compromise this text that's been discussed this morning and I thank you for your cooperation. So Chair?

>> RICHARD HILL: Just an editorial: My very sharp eye, the colleague has noticed that sometimes it says origin identification, and sometimes origination identification. We presume that is a type graphical error and we should use only origin identification everywhere so we will correct that editorially if the meeting agrees.

>> CHAIR: I see the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group nodding so that means this is correct. So with that, can we approve the Resolution 65 as amended? United Kingdom?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Can we just have one moment, please? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United Kingdom, you are still consulting? Or you have ‑‑

>> UNITED KINGDOM: No, Chair, we're fine. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So can we approve the revised text to Resolution 65? It seems so. Thanks for your spirit of compromise. First, thanks to the Chairman of that group. We'll keep on going with the other Resolution. Please go ahead.

>> EGYPT: The other Resolution is Resolution 61 appearing in TD51, Rev 1. There was only one square bracket, although it is a critical square bracket. This is in Article 5, item 5, of resolves further. There was some trial to capture discussion of the last day discussions and we came to the Article 5, which reads, "to request Study Group 3, in collaboration with Study Group 2, to develop definitions for fraud and description of fraudulent activities related to misappropriation and misuse of international numbering resources," which is found in the relevant ITU‑T recommendations. The text was agreed except between square brackets "for fraud and description of fraudulent activities." And this has been brought to the Committee for discussion. The time was very pressing and we have some technical difficulty so we have not time to discuss this thoroughly but we have some slight talks about it, some informal discussion about this issue.

>> CHAIR: So the simplest way is to delete the sentence in brackets, because in any case, the Study Group 3 is acting on that. so I always prefer the Australian way, to have shorter texts if there is still a problem, let's say.

So in point 5, delete the text on square brackets. In any case, Study Group 3 I was told by the Secretariat is acting on that so it's redundant if I can say. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. In fact, it is not redundant. It is a Resolution of the Assembly that instructs if Study Group 3 is already doing that so I don't think it's no harm to retain that. Chairman, this is guidance for Study Group 3. And in order to remove the difficulty of colleagues there was a footnote added to that and footnote covers the concerns of some of the colleagues that some issues relating to fraud and fraudulence activities contained in the footnote cover the position. So Chairman, I think we need to retain that. We're not in favor of the simple solution. Simple solution may get some difficulty in Study Group 3 that would not have any clear guidance from the Assembly. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Mr. Chairman, indeed I should have read this part also the footnote, because we have some concerns of some Member States in the informal consultation that the term Fraud is very wide and is criminal action in some jurisdictions, so inserted the footnote which reads, "for the purposes of this Resolution, the term Fraud does not refer to criminal law or to crime under national laws." And this is the response in responding to the concerns of some Member States.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, if I change the word, the term fraud is already under work item for Study Group 3 as indicated in our last meeting, and fraudulent activities is part of the work in Study Group 17, supplement A already ‑‑ supplement A16 as far as I remember, and already endorsed, and is appearing in the studies of the ITU‑T, so it is not like a new term or new definition. But it is relevant to the context that you are talking about and including it with the classification of the footnote I can't see any difficulty in adopting this text. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: I have the ‑‑ I think Korea or the Chairman of Study Group 3 who is asking for the floor. Chairman of Study Group 3.

>> KISHIK PARK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Not the Delegation of Korea, representing Study Group 3 as the current Chairman of the group. I support the Iranian intervention and also Dr. Guinena he agreed to follow that way. It will be helpful to the Study Group 3 in the next study period, I believe. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: United Kingdom?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. We have discussed this and made our views known. We're not convinced that the footnote helps one bit. We don't object to the study of the activities involved, but the activities in Study Group 3 which refer to fraud do not refer to looking at what may be fraud and fraudulent activities, but at looking at ways that operators can minimize fraud, so it's looking at it in a different way.

I really don't think that ITU should be in the business of examining what under U.K. interpretation of fraud is, is a criminal activity and it adds nothing to the text other than raise issues which are sensitive.

As in the spirit of compromise, I'd accept to develop a definition and description of activities related to misappropriation and misuse, but the words Fraud and Fraudulent have connotations which I do not believe it's appropriate for Study Group 3 or ITU to take a view on and investigate. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United States?

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, we would support the U.K. position on this, and we, in fact, were about to say much the same thing. It's absolutely unnecessary here to refer to the definition of fraud, when the title of the Resolution is about misappropriation and misuse of international numbering resources. If you're going to define anything, that's what you should be defining.

There's no need to get into the issues of fraud, which raise serious concerns, and which are a National matter.

I would just add that the supplement that was referred to in Study Group 17 is another case where we agreed only to this document as a supplement, and not as a recommendation for this reason, and in addition, it's not about the fraud by operators against administrations or other operators, that particular supplement is about subscriber fraud, and how to mitigate it.

So in short, we would strongly endorse the U.K.'s proposal to delete the text in square brackets as unnecessary, and possibly misleading, and just talk about definitions of activities related to misappropriation and misuse of resources, as following the title of this document. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Iran, second intervention.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, in order to reach a compromise, perhaps we could delete fraud and fraudulent activities in the text of the resolves but add a footnote, indicating that the term or the concept of fraud and whatever you want to add is currently being studied by Study Group 3. We at least confirm that, Chairman and that might be some solutions in light of the very little time that you have available. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Australia, you have the floor.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Australia strongly supports the proposal from the U.K. to use the terms "misappropriation and misuse." Additionally, if this Resolution goes ahead, we find it rather odd that in terms of referring to developing definitions for Fraud, the footnote itself is, in fact, a partial definition of Fraud, and one which we don't necessarily agree with, so we think the footnote is inappropriate to be used in this context. Therefore, Chair, once again I stress we strongly endorse the U.K. proposal to use the words "misappropriation and misuse."

>> CHAIR: Now the Secretariat will make a trial to find the text and I will give the floor to the Secretariat.

>> RICHARD HILL: Yes, thank you, Chairman. Picking up on the suggestions made by the U.K. and Iran, we would like to propose the following. So we would delete the text that is currently in square brackets, including the footnote. That would be deleted.

However, then, at the end, we would add, after, in the relevant ITU‑T recommendations, comma, and to study methods to combat fraud and fraudulent activities, which is something that is being done in Study Group 3, as was mentioned.

>> CHAIR: Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman, and maybe can consider this proposal but with some amendments, to add, when removes the square brackets to replace it with, inappropriate activities, including those leading to loss of revenues, and continue with the sentence as spelled out by the Council and to study methods to combat fraud and fraudulent activities. And this goes in line with activity already running in Study Group 3. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: United Kingdom?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. I find myself taken back by the Secretariat's proposal because it adds a new element. If it would help matters, although I thought that the Australian method was the best method, to refer to loss of revenue, but I thought we were reaching to removing the reference to fraud and fraudulent activities, and therefore, I cannot accept the proposal by the Secretariat. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Can we have an in‑between compromise adding the loss of revenue and deleting the last addition from the Secretariat? I think that is really a compromise to be reached.

So Richard, please.

>> RICHARD HILL: Yes. Then it would read as follows, to request Study Group 3, in collaboration with Study Group 2, to develop definitions for inappropriate activities causing loss of revenue, comma, related to misappropriation and misuse, et cetera. And then it ends as it is now, no addition at the end, and the part in square brackets including the footnote would then be deleted.

>> CHAIR: The proposal is clear. Egypt, is okay for you.

>> EGYPT: Mr. Chairman, maybe some modification to the text spelled out by the counselor is to continue study regarding fraud and fraudulent activities.

>> CHAIR: I am afraid that that is something that having a clear objection, this addition from the intervention of the United Kingdom before and others, so if you can bear with the text of the Secretariat, it will be a compromise, really.

>> EGYPT: Mr. Chairman, we are stating effect to continue studying issues related to fraud and fraudulent activities. This is already running in Study Group 3, so this is a statement rather than a new addition of text, of concept.

>> CHAIR: Does United Kingdom agree with this proposed addition?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Well, absolutely not. I admire the persistence of the Delegate from Egypt, but the study which is referred to is an entirely different study. It's not relating to these issues, so it would be misleading and wrong to refer to it here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, let's read the last time from the Secretariat, and after we pass on this point, because really is minor.

>> RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. So it will read, to request Study Group 3, in collaboration with Study Group 2, to develop definitions for inappropriate activities causing loss of revenue, comma, related to misappropriation and misuse of international numbering resources specified in the relevant ITU‑T recommendations.

>> CHAIR: Egypt?

>> EGYPT: This was the previous proposal. Still we miss the last part, and to continue studying issues related to fraud and fraudulent activities. And to continue studying fraud and fraudulent activities related to misappropriation and misuse.

>> CHAIR: I think we are not going towards a compromise, because the problem is to use this terminology in the text of the Resolution.

So really, we can say to continue study in the matter at the end, and so if it's studying, will continue studying the matter, without precisely quoting the terminology that's causing problems. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, to great extent you are right, because we have difficulty to ‑‑ not we ‑‑ colleagues have difficulty to accept fraud and fraudulent activities, but loss of revenue, to some extent, address that issue, to some extent, not to all extent, to some extent. Perhaps, Chairman, as a way forward at this late hours of your Committee, perhaps that would be a compromise with something you have added at the end. So not to refer directly to these two terms that some colleagues have difficulty. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Secretariat?

>> RICHARD HILL: I believe the Chairman's proposal was to add, at the end, "and to continue to study such matters." "And to continue to study such matters."

>> CHAIR: United States?

>> UNITED STATES: We were asking for the floor to support the proposal by the Secretariat, the original proposal. We noted ‑‑ we were going to note in that regard that resolves further number 6 does talk about to studying in an appropriate context and we think that is sufficient. We agree with the ‑‑ and we could also support the Chairman's intervention ‑‑ additional language at the end. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Fine. Let's go for that. Egypt, do you agree with my proposal?

>> EGYPT: If you want to make a compromise, we come up in the considering, and recognize the work done by Study Group 3 regarding fraud and fraudulent activities.

>> CHAIR: I really want to have my proposal as final conclusion. And after you as possible candidate for Chairman of Study Group 3, you carry out ‑‑ 2, you will carry out the study in collaboration with Study Group 3.

So if there are no other objections, is my text that will stay, and will say that ‑‑ the United States, you want to intervene?

>> UNITED STATES: Just to request that you read out the final text that you proposed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Secretariat, please. Because as usual I think I'm never right.

>> RICHARD HILL: I will read the entire text just to be certain. So this is resolves 5.

"To request Study Group 3, in collaboration with Study Group 2, to develop definitions for inappropriate activities causing loss of revenue related to misappropriation and misuse of international numbering resources specified in the relevant ITU‑T recommendations, comma, and to continue to study such matters."

>> CHAIR: Egypt?

>> EGYPT: For inappropriate activities including those leading to loss of revenues. For inappropriate activities, including those leading to loss of revenues.

This was my proposal.

>> RICHARD HILL: The Secretariat will read out again the sentence as it finally is, and after, we'll approve this text. Go ahead.

>> RICHARD HILL: Yes. So the first part is unchanged, to develop definitions for inappropriate activities, including those causing loss of revenue, comma, related to misappropriation, et cetera.

>> CHAIR: Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Yes, that's what I have said almost, provided that we add in the "considering" part, reference to work done by Study Group 3 related to fraud and fraudulent activities.

>> CHAIR: I see that is out of ‑‑ we'll re‑open the debate. No. Thank you. Thank you for your compromise, and to accept this text. United Kingdom?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. It's difficult to follow. We agree the compromise. I think the wording might need to be changed around in the sentence, so that you're looking at the misappropriation and misuse of international numbering resources, "leading to loss of resources." Could we just see the text again so we can just be ‑‑ or have it read out again so it's clear.

>> CHAIR: I think the Secretariat will read the entire text again.

>> RICHARD HILL: To request Study Group 3, in collaboration with Study Group 2, to develop definitions for inappropriate activities, including those causing loss of revenue, related to misappropriation and misuse of international numbering resources specified in the relevant ITU‑T recommendations, and to continue to study such matters.

>> CHAIR: United States?

>> UNITED STATES: We would request that the word "those" in what was just read out be changed to repeat the phrase "inappropriate activities." Otherwise, the word "those" could be potentially misread to include activities which were not inappropriate so we would like to see the word "inappropriate activities" replace the word "those."

>> CHAIR: Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We support the suggestion read by the Secretariat. By the way, you have one of the most competent persons sitting with you. He has been the Secretary of Study Group 2 and 3, has continued to be that, so what is proposed reflects what is currently being done in Study Group 2 and 3. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Finally, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group, or Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. I support the last intervention to keep the text as read finally by the counselor but still, sorry for that insisting that reference to the fraudulent, fraud and fraudulent activities, the work of Study Group 3 included in the considering part.

We already make a compromise, and I support that other Member States consider that in accepting this compromise solution. Thanks, Mr. Chairman. That is the position of the Arab group.

>> CHAIR: United Kingdom?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you Chair. I think we might need another ad hoc on this if Egypt is going to wish to have a resolves especially when you've already made a ruling that is not going to be taken on board. I've already said that the investigation of fraud which is taking place in Study Group 3 is in a different context and looking at it from a different angle and we've also heard that in relation to Study Group 17. It would be misleading and wrong to include a reference in the resolves. Thank you.

[ Off microphone ]

>> CHAIR: Iran, the 5th intervention, please go ahead.

>> IRAN: I just want to help you. If you don't want I won't help you. I said perhaps the views of Egypt could be in the considering but not reference to fraud and fraudulent activities relating to the loss of revenue. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I think really we have no time to have this as drafting group so let's try and I say the work we continue and I'm pretty sure the Chairman of Study Group 2 and 3 will act on this purpose so let's approve the Resolution as is presented, and go to the next, because we have quite a busy schedule.

Egypt?

>> EGYPT: As a compromise we can accept the discussion by Iran, and with Study Group 3 Chair we can find the proper text describing these activities. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: We need to have a text before approving, so we approve like that, and eventually we come up with some text at the Com 4 because we cannot delay the meeting.

So we approve, with the understanding there will be no situation of the two terms, the word before and the recommendation, and loss of revenue or something like that, until some study can be eventually added but the text we approve is the one presented and read out by the Secretariat, as amended by the U.S.

Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since we are coming with this issue to the Com 4 Plenary, in terms of the Arab States we preserve our right to come back to the issue of fraud and fraudulent activities as appropriate in this Com 4. Thanks, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Each Member State has the right to come wherever he want but I plea not to open major discussion for a problem that can paralyze the Assembly who is finally not of primary importance in my eyes. Thank you.

Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. A simple considering, considering that loss of revenue is an important issue to be studied, as simple as that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, that is if Egypt will accept this considering, it will ease the approval of the Resolution, I'll give the floor to Richard.

>> RICHARD HILL: If something like that were acceptable to everybody, then I believe we could insert it after recognizing A. Sorry, no better, after recognizing B after recognizing B, we would say, that the loss of revenue may be a significant issue. Well, actually I'd ask Mr. Arasteh to repeat the sentence but I would put it after recognizing B.

>> CHAIR: Can you repeat the sentence so Richard can take the sentence as new C?

>> IRAN: Yes, Chairman, certainly, that the loss of revenue is an important element to be studied, or important issue to be studied. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: That is no one can contest that? Egypt, are you satisfied with that? By consequence little C will become little D. Okay, you did already. Egypt?

>> EGYPT: I think we can go that, but can borrow the sentence that we have used that, inappropriate activities, thus causing loss of revenue is an important issue to study, taking the text you have just agreed on and adding, is an important issue to be studied.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your useful addition. I think the Secretariat will read again the sentence.

>> RICHARD HILL: So we would now have a new recognizing C, that inappropriate activities causing loss of revenue are an important issue to be studied.

>> CHAIR: So we can finally approve this Resolution. And I thank all of you for the spirit of cooperation, and good luck for the study in Study Group 2 and Study Group 3 as to come.

Now let's move to the next document I want to take is Resolution ‑‑ the one with one pending brackets. Resolution 69. Within TD54, Revision 1. There was some consultation going on on that respect and that is the reason why we have held this Resolution.

Can I ask if the ‑‑ Sudan?

>> SUDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. According to the last informal consultation, we now propose to the meeting the consensus change. Instead of "and resources," we propose, "and use resources," to be read as different, "to refrain from taking any unilateral and/or discriminatory actions that could impede another Member State from accessing public Internet sites and use resources, within the spirit of Article 1 of the Constitution of the WSIS principles." Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: So use of resources. This is the text. Any objection ‑‑ and use resources ‑‑ any objection? Sudan?

>> SUDAN: And use resources I mean. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, use the resources. That is the text. So that is the text. No objection. So United States?

>> UNITED STATES: I think the correct readout should be, use of resources, not use resources. It's use of resources. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Secretariat?

>> RICHARD HILL: Yeah, it's just a grammar issue. The sentence reads, that could impede another Member State from accessing public Internet sites, and so I think we have to use the same tense and say, using resources, from accessing public Internet sites and using resources I think is the grammatically correct version.

>> CHAIR: Cuba?

>> CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. I would request that the Delegation from Sudan could read the text once more because we were unable to understand it and we'd like it to be clear what is between brackets and how item or point 1 of resolves ends up. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. The text read by Secretariat seems to be agreeable and should represent the consensus, Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Can I ask the Secretariat to read again at dictation speed so Cuba can follow the translation?

>> RICHARD HILL: Yes, I will reread the entire sentence, but before doing that, it's simply the part that you now have in square brackets, which says, and resources. The square brackets would be removed, and the text that would be retained would be, "and using resources." So the entire sentence would read ‑‑ it's resolves 1 ‑‑ "to refrain from taking any unilateral and/or discriminatory actions that could impede another Member State from accessing public Internet sites and using resources, within the spirit of Article 1 of the Constitution and the WSIS principles.

>> CHAIR: So is clear, the text. So we can finally approve Resolution 69. Done. Thanks or your cooperation. Cuba?

>> CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. Now, if we asked for the clarification in order to find out what was being read out, it was just to make sure we were sure on this point. We don't understand the reason for the use of the word "sites, public sites," which has been used up until ‑‑ so we agree with it being, and we talk about adding in accessing in public sites and the use of public resources, but we don't know why we're taking out "sites."

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Secretariat, I don't think "sites" has been taken out. Read again the sentence.

>> RICHARD HILL: I think perhaps there was just an issue with the interpretation. The existing text remains unchanged, and after "Internet sites," we add, "and using resources." I'll read it what I think it will be in French.

[ Reading in French ]

Just an addition into there. There's nothing that's been taken out. We are just adding "and the use of resources," utilization of resources.

>> CHAIR: Okay, so Cuba?

>> CUBA: Thank you, that's clear.

>> CHAIR: We have approved the Resolution 69, as I said. Now we have the last piece and we have only 20 minutes left, is Resolution 64, and this is in TD48. I know that the Chairman of that group has worked continuously and has had several meetings so I give him the floor to introduce the resolved in TD48. Jordan, please. Thank you for your hard work.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chairman. Please allow me first of all to thank all the representatives of the Regional Groups and Member States of the ITU for all the efforts that have been made., as well as the spirit of cooperation in order to arrive at this final wording for this Resolution.

Chairman, there are many amendments in most of the paragraphs of this Resolution, and we have come to an agreement on these amendments. Apart from one Section under considering and that is under small f on the third page of the document.

There were different views expressed, and some countries approved keeping this paragraph, and others were against that. That's the only area where there wasn't consensus. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: General, thank you for the work. I see there is still a pending item in little f on page 3. I open the floor for general comments to the Resolution 64, and to also specific to the point. Iran, you have the floor. You didn't ask for the floor? No, it seems no. So no comments.

So let's try to solve the little f. This is little f, is read that many developing countries want ITU‑T to become an additional registry of IP addresses in order to give the developing countries the option of obtaining IP addresses directly from ITU. So I understand there is a splitting of opinion. Can I have voice from the two camps, if possible? Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. As you have rightly mentioned, this is expressed the views of many developing countries. Who could prevent these countries to express their views, Chairman? That's all.

>> CHAIR: So let's try, can we accept the text as it is? Are any observations? .

It seems that there is no observation, so in this case, can we approve the text of Resolution 64 as presented in TD48?

I see no requests from the floor. United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Coming back to the sentence in f, that many developing countries want ITU‑T to become additional registry of IP addresses, we'd like to propose a text that would go under "resolves" Section, which we believe that an action now is basically required for such an application.

We'd like to have a text under "resolves" as the following: "To process and submit the application for ITU‑T to become an additional RIR to the relevant concerned organisations in order to give the developing countries the option of obtaining IP addresses directly from the ITU." We believe that this is a legitimate request. It's coming from the Arab group, and we believe in our last meeting there was some kind of support from other developing countries, so we would like to urge the developing countries attending the meeting in this room to come forward and show the support for both texts.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: You read the text rather quickly, so I understand that you are for both maintaining the text in little f, plus adding an extra text in "resolves." Am I correct in understanding?

Further instructs Director of TSB, something like that. United Arab Emirates, can you clarify?

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's exactly what has been just mentioned, the two texts, the text which is under "considering" and the other text which basically takes the action forward to process and submit the application for the ITU‑T to become an RIR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. What was proposed by the distinguished Delegate of the United Arab Emirates is right, for the following reasons: If you have something in the Preamble of the Resolutions here considering, you must have a reply, or you must mirror that in the resolve part so putting in a considering without any action has no real meaning so we support the proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Can I ask ‑‑ Cuba?

>> CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. We wanted to support the United Arab Emirates' proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United Kingdom?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Having listened carefully to what's been proposed here and specifically the remark from Iran, the United Kingdom would have to object to the inclusion of the text in small f if this additional action is going to follow. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Nigeria?

>> NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Part of the celebration and from our previous experience we would establish our Internet exchange, I very much support Saudi's proposal and we also agree with the follow‑up action. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United States?

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, we also feel that if that is, in fact, the sequence, that if you have something in a considering you must have an action, then we would object to the considering text.

We think it's inappropriate to propose at this late date a resolves which has such far‑reaching implications. It would certainly need to be further studied and we could not agree to it at this time. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Canada?

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. This is very late in the meeting and this is the first we've heard of this proposal. And I would like to align with my colleagues from the U.S. and the U.K., that we could not support f if this text were to go forward, to be proposed and we do not support the addition of an additional resolves. Thank you very much, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: I request first the interpreters if we can allow me 10 minutes more. I didn't take profit yesterday but maybe today I'm afraid I will take profit.

>> INTERPRETER: Yes, sir, that's fine.

>> CHAIR: I have a long list. I close the list and read out who requested to speak. Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Russia, Australia, China, United Arab Emirates, Sudan and Jordan, and I close the list. Jordan will be the last. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. First of all, we'd like to thank the Chairman of this group, and we think that what was said by the representative of the United Arab Emirates is important, and should be taken seriously.

We approve the and support the addition in here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Sweden?

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In order to be brief, we fully support the views expressed by the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States.

>> CHAIR: Russia?

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, it seems to me that a very interesting proposal was put forward by the Arab group, and we fully share their view and the view of developing countries is one that has to be taken into account. Certainly in our Sector, we do a great deal in seeking to satisfy the ICT requirements of developing countries, and that being so, we also have to take into account the request from developing countries as to how to meet their concern in this regard. For that reason we fully support the proposal that has been put forward here by the Arab countries and that has also been supported by a number of other administrations.

We're really not happy Chairman to see this polarization of views between the developing countries on one hand and the developing countries on the other. We should listen carefully to one another ands specially those countries that are in need of development.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Australia?

>> AUSTRALIA: I'll try be brief as well. This is not meant to be a polarizing view. We're somewhat taken aback and surprised by this late and substantial intervention which frankly we're not in a position to consider very closely at this point in time. So consequently Australia does support the proposal by the U.K. and also the proposal supported by Canada, U.S. and Sweden. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia. China?

>> China: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The f in the part of considering does reflect the needs of the developing countries. Therefore, you should ‑‑ we should give enough consideration to the needs of requirements of the developing countries. Therefore, we support the addition in resolves of relevant contents in order to reflect ways of means to satisfy the requirements of the developing countries.

However, the exact wording can be discussed in order to reach a compromise. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United Arab Emirates?

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to thank all the countries who have taken the floor to show the support on taking actions, and specifically the text under "resolves." I'd like to remind our colleagues in this room of Resolution 180, where there is a text in number 4, I believe, to assist those Member States which in accordance with the existing allocation policies require support in the management and allocation. And the text goes on.

Basically, what we are adding in the resolve is satisfying the requirement, and again I would like to emphasize this is a legitimate request from Arab group, from the countries which have already shown some support over here, so the text definitely can be discussed further and thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: The problem is that the text is not in front of me, in front of the meeting, and has been added at the last minute. I think that really there was a group to discuss that, and I have the text in front of me. So really the point of discussion is the little f in square brackets.

Furthermore, the proposal is far‑reaching, it's going outside the power of my Working Group, I am afraid. Maybe outside of Committee 4. Maybe it's a question for the Plenary or for other foreign arena. However, before concluding, I give the floor to Sudan.

>> SUDAN: Thank you, Chairman. We fully support the text in considering in little f, and also support the additional text from UAE regarding the resolve, and that will be obvious since we have it in considering. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So I close the list with Jordan, but I have requests from Portugal, France, Iran, and Jordan. And now this completely no more additions and I give the floor to Portugal.

>> PORTUGAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Portugal supports the concerns expressed by countries such as Australia, U.K., U.S., and Sweden, and we also share their position. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: France?

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. We cannot ignore the requests from the developing countries. We have to be realistic about this matter. We haven't got a text available on what would take place if we were to add in this extra text, so we are reticent to accept the changing to the considering and then the addition as well for the moment.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, France. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. The Delegation of France was very logical, saying that we need to reply to developing countries. It means that we accept the principle of proposal of United Arab Emirates, but the language and the text may be further discussed. Let us take that course of action and I don't think that we should pass the issue to the Plenary. That doesn't help. Let's try to do something either here or Committee 4 but not at the Plenary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Last word to the convenor, Jordan. Can you solve the problem?

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chairman. Despite the fact that the proposal presented by the United Arab Emirates has not been ‑‑ was not submitted at the Working Group meeting, we as the representative of, we would like to support this proposal. At least in order to move forward with the treatment of this question, I would propose that we translate the proposal from the United Arab Emirates in the text, and that we keep it in square brackets.

Chairman, we haven't been able to arrive at wording which everyone is in agreement with, but in terms of paragraph f under considering, so that is my proposal.

>> CHAIR: Is not clear to me what is your proposal for paragraph f. You propose to have the bracket deleted and the new sentence eventually added at Com 4 level? Because we have no time to have the sentence here. What is your proposal, Jordan? And you are the last speaker because Nigeria, sorry, but I close the list.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, some countries have voiced objections, and those countries have said that they do not wish to keep f, considering f. They've opposed the idea of retaining considering f in this proposal. And they have said that they would be opposed to that if the UAE proposal was to be included also.

So I think we have to bear that in mind, but we also have to bear in mind what that proposal was about an inclusion of text in the body, in the operative part of the Resolution, and perhaps the representative of the UAE could repeat the proposal that they have for text to be included in "resolves." Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So let's try to find a compromise. If we have f without square brackets and no added text, that will be a reasonable compromise? Any objection? United Kingdom?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Following the discussion that we've just been through, the U.K. is unable to support the inclusion of f.

>> CHAIR: United States?

>> UNITED STATES: Yes, we're of the same view. This is an entirely new proposal. It wasn't in a contribution, it wasn't in an ad hoc. It wasn't in a Working Group. It's coming in at the 11th hour at the Committee level. We think it should not be considered at all. We should take the f out, as well.

>> CHAIR: Now, the proposal was to have only f and not have any further addition. That was my compromise proposal, to have f, but no further addition.

I see that there is a lot of people requesting the floor, so that means that we cannot ‑‑ we can send the present text of the Resolution 69 as has been presented to us, with the square brackets in f, directly to Committee 4, because I don't think we have time here to solve the problem.

I can only request if that's a help, the Chairman of the group to continue his informal consideration during lunch break to try to solve the problem in order to arrive at Com 4 with some compromise proposal on this particular point. Apart this item, can we have the rest of Resolution 64 endorsed? United Arab Emirates. No, it seems not so.

Can you agree with Jordan to my proposal to continue informal consultation to try the advance in this item before the meeting this afternoon of Com 4 or not? Iran, you want to speak on that?

>> IRAN: Yes, Chairman. Simply, the United Arab Emirates made the proposal supported by the Delegation, at least put that in square brackets in the resolves part. That is proposal that was mentioned. I don't think ‑‑ Chairman, please allow me to ‑‑

>> CHAIR: Sorry, I am always for proposal. I want not to re‑open the debate. I charge if Jordan is agreeing to have the informing group at lunch break and to continue to discuss the matter, and to come at Committee 4. Jordan?

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, I accept your proposal. I accept your proposal, Chairman, thank you.

>> CHAIR: So Jordan, good luck, and try to find a good compromise. I will try to follow your work, if possible. If we go with the present text of Resolution 64 to the Com 4. There is an announcement before closing the meeting.

>> XIAOYA YANG: Please be informed that the Head of Delegation meeting planned for today at lunchtime is postponed to tomorrow, same time, 12:45 tomorrow, Wednesday, instead of today, Head of Delegation meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So the meeting is adjourned. Since it's my last ‑‑ sorry, I want to thank all the Chairmen of Ad Hoc Groups, informal groups, consultation groups. I thank all you for your cooperation. I thank the Secretariat, Richard and Xiaoya, I mistake in pronunciation. And all the back scenario support, and I thank the interpreters for staying with us and helping us in understanding each other. You should be always present. So maybe we can find easy compromise solution.

And finally, good luck to Jordan to find the Resolution to Resolution 64. The meeting is adjourned.

[ Applause ]

[ End of meeting ]
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