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>> Recording in progress.

>> SECRETARIAT: Hello, good morning. Can we check with interpreters, please?

(Interpretations check).

>> CHAIR: Good afternoon, afternoon. We're ready to start the meeting. Please be seated. I hope everyone enjoyed lunch. Thank you for the excellent lunch Australia. We had a good time. The agenda for today is ADM 16. Like yesterday, we will not be putting any documents up on the screen. But I believe everyone can access the agenda documents and then the links to all the documents we're working on is available on the document.

So now, before we adopt the agenda item, I want to mention that as we did yesterday, all ad hocs and groups established by our committee and other committees now is on the document, ADM/17. So you can find information on that document. Also, there has been (Audio breaking up) by member states yesterday, that we need all the consolidated documents about Com 5. It's available now. So please look at those documents.

Now I'd like to propose approval of the agenda for today's meeting which is ADM/16. I open the floor for any comments on this agenda item now? I see no one asking for the floor, so the agenda is approved.

Yesterday we set five ad hocs and informal groups. I believe some of those ad hoc groups had a meeting this morning and discussions by themselves at the informal groups. I would like to get the report from them.

The first report from the ad hocs on Article 48 on the Constitution and on space policy issues. First, I would like to ask the Chairman of ad hoc of Article 48. UAE, you have the floor. I keep confusing these two chairs. US, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Chair, thank you very much. The Chairman of the ad hoc is sitting way back in the room. So I wonder if the mic could be assigned to him. But we made good progress. So if we could pass the mic to him, that would be fine.

>> CHAIR: I would like the technicians to assist us to give the mic to him. Really as to report to us about the estimated time they need for future ad hocs. So ‑‑ okay. The Chair of the ad hoc group, you can take the floor now.

>> CHAIR: The ad hoc group on Article 48 met this morning. We've had one meeting. You can hear me, I take it. Yes? We had eight documents assigned to the group. One from (Audio breaking up) and one from the Bureau and proposals from each of the regional groups. We got all but two of the proposals from regional groups introduced. And we had a very healthy discussion to identify where some of the difficulties with the topic may lie.

So I think it was a very useful and I feel like we did make progress. I know once we identify the issues, then we can start to solve them.

As far as estimation for additional meetings, we have another meeting already scheduled for Friday. I would think two or three additional sessions after that, then we take stock of where we are. That will give us the middle of next week. I can give a more accurate estimate after a couple more meetings.

>> CHAIR: So you need three or four more sessions. That information on Friday's ad hoc will be provided in the ITU web page if you're curious.

Now, I would give the floor to the UAE to report.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Madam Chair, good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Ad hoc group on Space Matters had held their first meeting today in the morning, second session. And we had five documents or five contributions submitted to the group regarding three different topics. One of the topics is modifications towards Resolution 186. And then there two other new topics which are proposed to be put into new resolutions.

Thankfully, we could, during this meeting, introduce all of the documents. And we had a nice discussion. And we received comments from different interested parties with regards to the proposals.

At the end of the meeting, we actually had some sort of directions on how we are going to tackle all of these matters. And we look forward to, I believe we might ‑‑ if it's possible, we are going to have another meeting on Friday afternoon as well if other things go well. After that meeting, we might as well need three, four meetings actually to conclude everything. It would depend really on the participants on how they would like to move forward.

If we could find good agreement, I think three, four meetings would be sufficient for us to conclude. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. You conducted your meeting this morning. You can have your meeting on Friday. I can jump to a conclusion now, but if this meeting this afternoon goes well, we might not need our committee meeting on Friday. Then I can give that meeting to both of you to have an ad hoc. Then you can have interpretations and then all the screens. So I will try to give you more time. I really appreciate that. You are taking this role, US and UAE. Thank you.

Next agenda item is informal discussion about the GSR resolution. I believe they had some progress. I will give the mic to Argentina. You have the floor.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you very much, Chair. Indeed today we did have a meeting. It was very unofficial with colleagues from UAE, Morocco, and the Russian Federation. We are at the next meeting able to present back a consensus text. There were easy changes to make, it was mostly to ensure there was consistency in the text and to ensure that we didn't repeat anything that could be in mandates.

We would like to thank everyone for their understanding and their cooperation. We hope that will be with us throughout the rest of the resolutions. We will be presenting back at the next meeting, the consensus text tool.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Argentina. You have some progress, that's good to hear. Thank you, UAE who are going to take part in this discussion. I appreciate Argentina taking leading on these discussions in consultations. So please keep working on this resolution. And I will look forward to hearing from you next meeting. Thank you.

So our next agenda item is Item 5, Resolution 136. We have two proposals one from CITEL. I will give it to CITEL first. Keep in mind we've been giving the principle to take three minutes to deliver your presentation. So who is the coordinator for this resolution from CITEL? I believe it's Mexico. Mexico, you have the floor.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. I'll be very brief. I'm simply presenting a proposal to modify Resolution 136 to update certain references in the recording part. We also propose section changes to emphasize the role played by telecommunications and ICT in disseminating information in case of disasters. We make certain references to land matters, to primary and secondary proposals coming from CITEL is to include and instructs the Secretary‑General to assist member states to establish early warning systems for emergency situations and help them to develop national emergency telecommunication plans. We include an extra point to encourage member states to consider the creation of comprehensive disaster risk management system. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mexico, for your presentation. Next contribution from CPT. So is there any coordinator from CEPT to present this document? Portugal, you have the floor.

>> Portugal: CEPT is coming forward with the proposal with a Resolution 136. The main purpose of our proposal is to include the concept that we really believe is quite informative and relevant in terms of disaster preparedness and relief.

The concept is the SMART cables which will allow warnings in the future, given the submarine cables can have sensors. It will allow to produce early warnings in case of earthquakes and tsunamis.

So Madam Chair, we are proposing these amendments in order to benefit the worldwide community through this new concept. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your presentation. Now I open the floor for everyone to take comments on these two proposals. The floor is open. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. First of all, we would like to thank the member states, CEPT, and the inter‑American proposal. We have a general comment as discussed related to SMART submarine cables at the previous WTSA and WTDC meetings. The only issue that was raised was that we agreed with you at the previous PP, the principle of streamlining of resolutions, in other words, the resolutions of Plenipotentiary Conferences that will be adopted once again will have a high‑level principles that will be addressed at high‑level conferences and assemblies unless another approach is planned.

In other words, there are such issues that must be clearly set out and addressed at the Plenipotentiary Conference. As far as this particular issue is concerned, the submarine cables at WTSA and WDTC, we agreed that this would be discussed at length at this conference. That was done. The relevant amendments were made to the relevant resolutions.

We're not against this proposal, not at all. We simply would like to draw your attention to the fact that we are basically copying the text off the resolution of WTDC and we're including these bits in these provisions in this resolution into the other one.

I have a question for the Office. Does it mean at the next WTDC provided this conference grease to adopt these provisions, does this mean that we will take them out from the relevant resolution of WTDC? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Your comment and question is noted. While there are no further comments, no further requests from the floor.

Mexico, you have the floor.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. Simply to comment on the part of CITEL, we do also have some comments on the proposal presented by CEPT, particularly with regard to the smart cable systems introduced into this resolution.

We believe as that as our colleague from the Russian Federation commented this matter has already been addressed in another conference. So we will be having substantial conversation with the proponents on that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mexico. I hear in the room that we might need more time to take consideration on this resolution. So while this one for ‑‑ I would like Mexico to take a lead on the inform consultation with the other parties interested in this resolution. If it's acceptable to you, Mexico, I give the floor to Mexico.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. Yes, with pleasure, we can carry out the informal consultations.

>> CHAIR: Thank you so much. It's going to in the same manner. The informal discussion will be put into the ADM documents so you can see who the focal point is on this. I will give the floor to the Secretariat to explain who will be the Secretariat on this.

>> SECRETARIAT: The Secretariat support for any requests from the members with respect to this area will be provided by Cristina (?). Thank you.

>> CHAIR: We will hear maybe from next meeting. Next agenda item is I mean number 6, Resolution 182. We have three proposals on this. I will give the floor to APT to present this document. While they are getting ready to get the focal point, I will give the floor to the CEPT to briefly present to the meeting. France, you have the floor.

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Madam Chair. Our folk the point is not here. So I suggest that I will say a few words concerning the proposals made by the CEPT, Resolution 182 to highlight the main resolutions adopted in the three sectors. ITU‑R, ITU‑T, ITU‑D, and climate changes in the proposed document reflect the developments that have occurred since 2014 providing updated information in a number of areas.

In particular the various ITU resolutions related to climate and observation. Instructions are given to the Secretary‑General and directors to make ‑‑ take prepared measures in ITU in order to continue contributing to reducing carbon footprint. All member states are invited to take all the measures to reduce the negative effects of climate change. The proposal without going into detail refers to the IPTC report and the use of ICTs to contribute to the implementation of sustainable development goals and to combatting climate change. The report also proposes to limit the environmental footprint of this sector by supplying low carbon emission energy and by ensuring a green approach. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, France. So now we will give the floor to the ATU. Any presenter from the ATU? I see no request for ATU. Uganda, you have the floor.

>> UGANDA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm presenting this on behalf of our coordinator with the aim to the proposed modifications to Resolution 182 and to streamline the resolution and among others to establish a climate change vulnerability index to assist the adaptive capacity of Member States and technological readiness to address the negative impact of climate change and to allocate a special fund within the budgetary limitations of the union to assist developing and list developed countries to use ICT/telecommunications for adaptation and mitigation of climate change. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, very much. I will try with the APT once more. Is there any coordinator from APT here? I see no request.

So now, I open the floor for any comments on these proposals. US, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. We would like to thank the African Asian and European groups for their proposals on this. However, we have a few comments and questions regarding the scope of these updates and language within them and would like to know if we can add this to an informal. It might make sense to add it with the emergency communications to make sure there are no duplication of efforts in these resolutions. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, US. That's a good point. I think we still need a bit more time to consolidate all these proposals. And a good way forward to create an informal group. But I still need who's going to take a leading role on this. I was going to propose one of the coordinator can take this role, but it seems like none of them are here. So maybe if they are willing to take the informal discussion. And then you can provide us with who is going to be the leading person later after this meeting.

So I will offer the floor if there is any volunteer on this. Since we do not have any volunteer to take leading role on this resolution, taking this advice from the US, maybe we can combine these two resolutions to discuss in the same time. So I will create ‑‑ I propose to create an informal discussion on Resolution 136 and 182 together. So, again, Mexico, if you're kind enough to take in these two resolutions, it can be done in your group. Mexico, you have the floor.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. Yes, with pleasure, we can take on both.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So it will be informal discussion, informal group discussing Resolution 182 and 136 together. Thank you.

Now we move to the next agenda item. It's agenda Item 7, Resolution 196. We have four proposals on this resolution. Before I give the floor to the coordinators for each resolutions, I want to propose since there are four contributions, the contents of this resolution might need to be considered further. So I would ask how the room feel about to create another ad hoc on this. Then I will ask the presenters for these contributions will be present at the ad hoc.

I will open the floor for any objections to my proposal. I see no requests. So now, we will establish another ad hoc on this resolution. In that matter, I would like to nominate Mr. Mihai from Romania for taking this ad hoc group. Romania, you have the floor.

>> ROMANIA: Thank you Madam Chair, it would be an honor to do this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your willingness to take this ad hoc group. It will also be published in the ADM it documents. And then Secretariat please announce who is going to support this ad hoc, thank you.

>> SECRETARIAT: Thank you my colleague Julia Parker will be taking care of the Secretariat support. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. The next agenda item is about the Resolution 100 and then a new resolution, draft resolution about MOU with financial implications. We have one proposal on Resolution 100 from APT. So I will give the floor to the coordinator of the APT to present this document briefly. Australia, you have the floor.

>> AUSTRALIA: This proposal to modify Resolution 100 honest MoU's. Firstly, gives power to the Secretary‑General to enter into MoU's on the ITU's behalf. Currently the Secretary‑General's role is characterized as a depository of MoU's. Secondly, it instructs counsel to adapt guidelines entering into MoU's that have strategic and financial immaterial applications. Niece guidelines will provide the Secretary‑General or the designee with clearly defined guidelines and encourage consultation with counsel prior to entering into MoU's. This would provide Member States with better oversight between the ITU and partner agencies. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia, for your presentation. Before I open the floor for any comment, I would like to suggest that Resolution 100 here, this is discussing the role of the ITU as a depository but not as a party to the MoU. If I look at the contents of the Resolution 100 that revised by APT is more about how ITU's role has to be as a party of the MoU.

So if APT agrees, I would like to ask APT to discuss their proposal with CITEL's new resolutions together. So if this is acceptable by the APT, I will ask ‑‑ this can be considered together with draft new resolution from the US.

Australia, you have the floor. Australia, you have the floor.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. To confirm that that does sound acceptable. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So now I will move to the next agenda item, 8.2, the new draft resolution on MOU proposed by CITEL. So any coordinator from CITEL is here? US, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. CITEL has proposed a new resolution on ITU participation in memorandum of understanding with financial and or strategic implications in order to ensure that such MoU's are entered into only with counsel's prior approval taking into consideration each member administrations. CITEL beliefs it should enter into MoU's following review and input from its member administrations. Greater transparency would allow overall financial and strategic direction of the ITU to be considered by counsel. This new resolution clarifies the role of counsel with respects to MoU's and ensures a participatory process for ITU to enter into financial and or strategic considerations. We put it forward for consideration. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, US. I will open the floor for any comments for those two proposals. Please be mindful that the proposed text from the APT on Resolution 100 will be incorporated to the new draft resolution, but you can make comments on both now. The floor is open.

Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I would like to thank the authors. Yes, we can express our views on both texts. We are convinced that the text of Resolution 100 and the amendments proposed to it change the very aim of the resolution. So your proposal that the changes proposed by the APT, of course they must be considered together with the proposals made by the CITEL region. Resolution 100 relates only to the issues related to the implementation of functions by the depository.

With regard to the document prepared by CITEL, indeed overall we suggest such an approach indeed Member States should have information concerning financial and strategic implications in such MoU's. At the same time I shouldn't forget the Constitution and Convention give the right to and the Member States trust the to‑do the work of the MoU's. At the same time we should have some sort of regulation or mechanism which can help the Council to evaluate various agreements. We stand ready to participate in the work on the new text of the resolution.

So we think that Resolution 100 could be left in its previous wording, so unchanged. And the proposal could be moved to the new draft resolution and work on that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Yes, as I said earlier, so APT's proposed text on Resolution 100, the text is mostly like annexed at the end of the resolution. So it can be taken out of Resolution 100 to the new draft resolution. And then we can look into it together as one resolution. And then APT will agree on it. I hope this answers your question.

About the other comments we took note of your comments. And then, yeah, maybe we will create ad hoc groups. But before I propose anything, I will give the floor to Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have a comment on 8.2 regarding the new draft resolution on MoU's. We agree with the preface and basic idea of in proposal. However, we have just one concern. So we think that approval of MoU's at the Council means in principle that it happens only once a year, which may affect the speed and timing of projects.

So we would like to further discuss this point to enjoy the flexible activities of member countries. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan. We took note of your concern. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just assume there's going to be an informal group or ad hoc created of the we will be more than pleased to participate. But we would like to pose a question in anticipation to this working group, which is related to some of the provisions that already exist in some MoU's. Because it's going to be a question for clarification.

Let me briefly read one of those provisions that appears in several MoU's already signed. It reads as follows, the relevant terms and conditions concerning the details of corporation including, without limitation, those related to financial, legal, and operational matters as well as to the respective rights, roles, and responsibilities of the signatories, if any, will be set forth in one or more legally binding written agreements, project document, and or other instruments which will be separately negotiated, agreed to, and signed by both signatories in the future.

So the question we're going to pose in advance, which is how do we ensure whether it is in the new resolution or in the existing 100, that no decisions are taken in the implementation of MoU particularly relevant to the resolution without the necessary consultations with Council. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Allow me to have one moment to take your questions into consideration.

(Pause).

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada, for your willingness to take the ad hoc groups. For your question, it can be either way. I was suggesting to taking out text from the Resolution 100 to put to new draft resolution, but it's all up to the Member States. So it can be discussed ‑‑ this can be discussed at the ad hoc first. And then Secretariat will be there to provide further assistance.

So I think we definitely need ad hoc groups on this matter. So I propose to create ad hoc groups for this MoU issues. If there are no objections, I will propose ad hoc Chair. I open the floor if there are any objections to creating ad hoc groups.

I see no requests for the floor. So we would create ad hoc groups on this issue. I would like to nominate Mr. Daniel Caruso from Australia to taking this ad hoc groups, Australia. Is it agreeable to you? You have the floor.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Daniel would be happy to take on that role. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. This also will be announced on the screen, on the web page and ADM as well. Secretariat, please provide the information about who is going to support this.

>> SECRETARIAT: Thank you very much. The Secretariat will support this ad hoc group through Julia Parker and hose Maria Batanero. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Item nobody 9, Resolution 146. This is an important resolution we have to deal with. We have four contributions on this resolution and one report from the EG‑ITR expert groups. I would like to give the floor to EG‑ITR. I believe he's online. So please give the mic to him to present his report, document number 35.

Secretariat, could you please check to see if he's ready to present his document? Otherwise, we can come back to him later.

>> Madam Chair (Audio breaking up).

>> CHAIR: UAE, online, you can present your document. Thank you.

(Silence).

>> CHAIR: Sorry, I was told it's UAE. It's Zambia. Mr. Lwando Bbuku, you can present your document number 35.

>> Zambia: (Audio fading in and out).

>> CHAIR: Go ahead.

>> Zambia: In my capacity as Chairman of the EG‑ITRs in case of challenges of connectivity I have asked my Vice Chair to be on standby to assist with any technical difficulties.

Document 35 is the final report of the EG‑ITRs submitted to Council at the last session. As you recall at the 2018 Plenipotentiary Conference Resolution 146 resolved at the IR (Audio fading in and out) and to the review of the ITRs with the view of achieving consensus in the way forward. In Council 2019 reconvened the expert group which I had the honor and privilege sharing along with following members, Mr. Santiago Reyes‑Borda, Mr. Xiping Huang, Mr. Aleksey Borodin, Mr. Simon van Merkom, Mr. Ahmed Al‑Raghy, and Shahira Selim.

With the specified Council resolution of 1379 the EG‑ITRs carried out the work over the course of six meetings using an agreed work plan as long there was a provision‑by‑provision examination of the ITRs. Earlier this year the group concluded the work and a report of this review, the examination table and any related discussions is set out in this report.

Broadly speaking, two sets of divergent views were essentially expressed by the members while conducting this provision compositional examination. Some feel they continue to be relevant as they are applicable in fostering the provision and the development of network and services and flexible to accommodate new trends and emerging issues.

Some members were of the opinion that the provisions of the ITRs are not relevant as they are no longer applicable in fostering a provision and development of networks and services or flexible to accommodate new trends and emerging issues

On the matter of the way forward in respect to ITRs, members similarly expressed different views. Some members suggested that the group consider identifying specific areas for revision and future development of the ITRs as well as also consider taking next steps such as preparation of technical reports, et cetera, related to the application of the ITRs.

On the other hand, some members proposed based on the examination tables, members should identify difficult provisions in the ITRs and provide concrete suggestions in the report for revision or amendment for consideration of Council and PP 22.

Some members stated that the provision‑by‑provision examination conducted by the group has repeatedly demonstrated that the ITRs are neither applicable or flexible in today's communications environment. And the work and results of this group highlight a continued impossibility to reach consensus in respect to the ITRs.

Finally, some members noted that the members who were of the opinion that the ITRs are no longer relevant needed to make proposals on the way forward.

In conclusion it was agreed that there was a lack of consensus within the group on the way forward with respect to the ITRs. This report was therefore noted by Council, and it was agreed to be transmitted to this Plenipotentiary Conference for consideration in order to take any necessary action as may be appropriate.

That brings me to the presentation of Document 35. I would like to take this opportunity to express my profound gratitude to the management team of this group for their invaluable advice and support.

To the members of the expert group for the spirit of cooperation which allowed us to finish a significant task despite the limitation of meetings and the Secretariat for their support and efforts throughout this process. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Zambia, for your presentation. We've heard the presentation on the expert group on the regulations of the ITR. Like he explained, there are still divided opinions on this. And we have four contributions on this resolution.

I assume everyone read the documents b but there are still divided opinions on this. Before I give the floor to anyone, I would like to say we deal with these contributions at an ad hoc level. So you can present your documents at the ad hoc. So I now open the floor for any comments.

Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Madam Chair. Let me just for clarification, will you allow us to express our view and discuss the report at this meeting?

We think that we should consider the report, because this work has been completed. And we must assess it. Now, contributions are related to future work and the views of Member States as to how we should proceed.

If you can, could you please discuss the report in this meeting? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Since the report is related to the Resolution 146 and then all the contributions from regions, I was going to propose to discuss it at the ad hoc level. But if you're insisting to discuss it here, we can do that. But my initial proposal was to take this to the ad hoc groups as well, the report as well.

So Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: For further clarification, it is my understanding as Canada and a former Vice Chair of the group that the report was shared by each of the Vice Chairs of the expert group with each region and that the report we have in front of us is a consensus‑based report. And there was no discussion on the content of the report during the course of consultation that apparently it took twice to be consulted until the final publication.

But maybe either the Secretariat or the Chair can educate if my understanding is not correct. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. As I'm aware, your indication is correct that has been circulated and it has been considered by regions. While we hear that we need to discuss this report, but now we can do it in ad hoc if members wish to.

Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I have listened to your proposal. We are very grateful. I guess you're trying to optimize the process. But I'm looking at Resolution 146 and PP 22 and the section instructs to consider the report of the expert groups and to take the necessary measures.

Since the issue of consideration of the report is separate area of work, we suggest that the report should be discussed now while the contributions that are related to future work possibly, revision of resolution of 146 or other areas, it's different work that we will do in ad hoc.

I don't remember cases where we discussed reports at ad hocs. This is some sort of new approach. Could you allow us, please to implement Resolution 146. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. The report I spoke with the Secretariat, the report can be discussed at the ad hoc level. But if you're willing to discuss it here, I will open the floor now for the comments only for the EG‑ITR reports in the agenda item.

Now, the floor is open to everyone to make comments on this report. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Yes, we would like to express our view on this report. We held discussions in our regions because, as my colleague from Canada rightly said, and he in fact represented the Americas region in the group. We have views in Resolution 146 under resolves instructed the group to conduct comprehensive consideration of ITRs in order to reach a consensus concerning further work in relation to the ITRs. We heard the Chair, his work was very complicate the. We can state the group has not fulfilled its mandate. Because the report of the Chair does not contain a consensus‑based decision concerning further work.

For this reason we cannot draw a conclusion that we have done everything in our power to understand how we should proceed with regard to ITRs in future.

As the coordinator of my region and the Vice Chair of this group, I would like to report to the meeting that our region supports efforts to reach consensus on ITRs. And at this PP we must do everything in our power to ensure this. I thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Now I open the floor for any comments further. I see no requests from the floor. Thank you for your comment, Russia. But while ‑‑ if I hear correctly from Chair and you and other Vice Chairs, I think it's also part of the discussion whether we have to continue or not for this ad hoc ‑‑ the EG‑ITR chairs and any ITRs. That's still a discussion. We cannot ‑‑ we can take note of this report. But you can express your opinion on the ad hoc groups, because that is still related to the Resolution 146. There are four contributions about this. But I hear your opinion is also relating to those four proposals. So I strongly suggest you to take your point to the ad hoc groups. So we've heard your opinions, but you can still continue your discussion at the ad hoc groups if it's acceptable to you.

So I see no requests. Let's go back to agenda Item 10.1, I was proposing to create another ad hoc group on this. So I would like to hear opinions on this ad hoc, if anyone object to have ad hoc groups on this issue. I see no requests for the floor.

So we will create ad hoc groups on this important issue. So I would like to propose Ms. Caroline Greenway to lead this group. So PNG, you have the floor. If this is acceptable to you, if you can provide us an estimated time. I know it's difficult. I will try it anyway. PNG, you have the floor.

>> PAPUA NEW GUINEA: I certainly accept this opportunity. I have been trying to reach out to members of the regional focal points, being partially successful there. So I think some of them are not available.

So the earliest I think would be Monday next week. But I could confirm that possibly tomorrow whether that would be possible. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, PNG, for taking this important role. And then I advise everyone to ‑‑ especially the regional coordinators for those four contributions to reach out to the ad hoc Chair, because ad hoc Chair's information will be published soon. So then you guys can discuss how it's going to be before even ad hoc starts.

So I will take note that you will start working on this ad hoc groups next Monday. Thank you.

Next our agenda item is I mean 10, resolution 188 and Resolution 189. There are a good number of contributions for resolution 188 we have four contributions and for Resolution 189 we have three contributions. But these contributions are talking about combat and deter and mobile devices. I think these resolutions are related. So it's easier to discuss in one ad hoc, if this is agreeable to everyone in the room. I would open the documents here, but if we are agreeable to set the ad hoc on this issue, we will ‑‑ you will be presenting your contribution at the ad hoc. So I open the floor for any comments for my proposal.

We will set an ad hoc on this issue. I ask Brazil to take a leading role on this. If Brazil is agreeable to this, Brazil, you have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Madam Chair. Yeah, Brazil agrees. My colleague confirms that he's willing to help. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. We took note of Mr. Zhao that he will lead this ad hoc group. I believe he will be here this next week. This ad hoc group can start next week. With that we can move to the next agenda Item 11, new draft resolution proposed by Russia.

I will give the floor to Russia to explain this contribution. But please keep it short like I've been giving three minutes to everyone. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Yes, it's a very simple proposal. So I don't think that it will take much time.

The essence of the proposal is to define more clearly the rights of Member States and representatives of Member States when they're appointed to posts in the ITU.

And the results are only two points. The first one states that no Member State, Sector Member, Academia or any other member of the Union admitted to participate in work shall not be deprived of rights on any grounds except provided by the Constitution and Convention.

The second states no candidate from a Member State which has been put forward by a Sector Member or Academia to any post which fulfills the requirements of PP resolution and the Constitution and Convention shall not be discriminated against in line with fundamental declaration of human rights. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia, for the presentation. Now I will ask, is there any support for this contribution since this is the contribution proposed by one country, we need support to discuss it.

(Silence).

>> CHAIR: PRK, you have the floor.

>> DPRK: Madam Chair. We consider ITU as the UN agency should respect the rights and sovereignty of all Member States. We (Difficult to hear) the activities of the union. So we support this document. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you DPRK. Belarus, you have the floor.

>> Belarus: Good afternoon, Madam Chair, ladies and gentlemen, the proposal proposed by the Russian Federation the rights of ITU and respecting the Member States and is designed to prevent discrimination. Leading the post to consider the draft resolution is in line with the Constitution and other vital fundamental of the ITU. The document will allow us to keep a nonpublicized status of key international telecommunication organization to help strengthen pragmatic foundations of its work aimed at uniting rather than dividing the world. I support the draft resolution. I thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Belarus. UAE, you have the floor. Sorry, US, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. The Russian Federation is making under the guise of a resolution a proposal that strikes at the heart of the ITU sectors. Member States at WTSA and WTDC were not comfortable supporting nominations from a country engaged in unprovoked and unjustified war. The Russian Federation now seeks to erase portions of WTSA and WTDC because it does not accept the consequences of its actions. The considered decisions of Member States to support the Chair's determination and the decisive votes of the Member States at the WTSA and WTDC held just a few months ago in Geneva and. The programme is precluded article 20 of the ITU convention which specifies the process for ointment of study group chairs and Vice Chairs in the interval between two assemblies or conferences of the sector. Resolution 208 extends this to the chairs and Vice Chairs of advisory groups. Further, to accept the proposal would not only be unprecedented, would cast out the relevance of all sector conferences and assemblies moving forward.

If the Russian Federation were to succeed wiping away the sector outcomes on the pretenses included in this resolution, no sector outcomes would ever serve as a dependable basis for advancing the work of the Union. Less obvious though potentially problematic the proposal of the Russian Federation is predicated on an incorrect notion on the relationship between Member States and the union. The those who supported the chairs of must have been motivated against its nationals is simply not correct. Member States are obligated to consider only criteria when voting.

It is not the case that once a nomination is brought to the Plenary floor the Member States are bound to support it unless they can articulate a reason for voting against the nomination. To believe otherwise misunderstands the relationship between the Member States and the Union they established. We do not support this resolution going forward, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, US. Before I give the floor to anyone, I just want to make it clear, since according to the provision of the general rules of this ITU, because there has been support from two countries DPRK and Belarus, discussing the document. US contribution has been taken note of ‑‑ your presentation has been taken note.

Now, Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. We also have the same concern provided by the US delegations. The commission to describes the WTSA and WTDC should appoint the vary and Vice Chair and then in 2022 to appoint the Chair and study groups. So we should respect the WTSA 20 and WTSA 2022. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan. UK, you have ‑‑

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you very much Chair. United Kingdom supports the statements of the US and Japan. This seeks to unravel decisions which were taken fairly according to correct ITU procedure at previous conferences. To reverse decisions of the membership in this way is incompatible with the ITU Constitution. It would set a dangerous precedent for the ITU. And it will cast into question progress we make together at this conference.

This Plenipotentiary Conference should be looking forward to the future of telecommunications and connectivity worldwide, not seeking to reverse decisions which have already been taken.

Human rights is clearly outside the mandate of the ITU and should not be discussed in this forum. But furthermore, despite its title, this programme has nothing to do with human rights. And its intention is not to protect the interest of all ITU members but to advance the interests of one member only.

The UK does not support this resolution. Going forward and I hear your point, Chair, that we are discussing this.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UK. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Very briefly, the Canada authority associates itself with the previous statements made by Japan, the United States, and the United Kingdom. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Canada. Australia, you have the floor.

>> AUSTRALIA: Good afternoon, colleagues. Australia echoes the sentiments of the statements from United States, United Kingdom and we disagree with the sentiment and detail of the proposal. It would set a dangerous precedent by overturning the outcomes of sector conferences that have been held by the membership. We should respect the decisions taken by the WTDC and the WTSA conferences. And we cannot support this proposal going forward.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia. Ukraine, you have the floor.

>> Ukraine:

>> CHAIR: Please proceed.

>> Ukraine: Just to brief we support the positions made by US, Canada, Australia, and Japan and we do not support this resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Ukraine. France, you have the floor.

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Madam Chair. France would like to support the comments of the USA, Japan, UK, Canada, Australia, and Ukraine on this resolution. The protection of human rights seeks to question the decisions made by the chairs of the two conferences of Member States in the sectors. The purposes of the Russian Federation as mentioned (Audio fading in and out) this would be very dangerous and must be (Audio fading in and out) thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, France. There is no other requests for the floor. But I hear the room. There is no consensus on this resolution. Before that ‑‑ Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I would like to thank all those who have taken the floor and also the Member States who criticized this proposal. Of course, I'm not disappointed but I'm very surprised. I would simply like to ask which point in particular is there contains a request for annulling decisions? There are only two points, very simple points, namely, that we must comply with the Constitution and Convention in guaranteeing the rights of Member States and the second point refers to the human rights of candidates of these Member States.

There's no request to reconsider, to annul anything. We're looking towards the future. What happened, happened. We can assess this in different ways. This draft resolution, in fact, seeks to look toward the future in order for us to guarantee the rights of all representatives of all Member States in a changing world, regardless of which region they are from. There is no instruction here or reference to any administration in particular. So I can conclude that we are once again bringing politics where it should not exist.

Moreover, I'd like to draw your attention to the fact that the PP is the highest decision-making body. So we need not to refer to the decisions of the WTDC, for example. We are trying to cover‑up the unwillingness to work on documents submitted to this committee. Yes, we see there's no consensus. And we are suspecting that there will not be any desire to work ad hoc or anywhere. It was enough to hear these statements in order to understand that those Member States who have chosen the path of politicizing the Union will continue to do so. This is very sad.

But we do hope that in the future the situation will improve. I thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. I need a clarification from you. So are you willing to withdraw your contribution since there is no consensus? It wasn't clear from your comments. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. No. We are in your hands. We're not only carefully listening but also hearing other colleagues taking the floor with the opposite point of view. We will, with pleasure, discuss this text. But we're not withdrawing it. We're ready to work in an ad hoc. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Since this is one contribution, I wouldn't create an ad hoc. Like you said, Russia heard different views from the room. I will give Russia time to consult with countries who expressed their concerns and then opposition to this resolution. You can try to talk to them in informal consultation. Then you can come back to us next week on this issue.

China, you have the floor.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Delegates, good afternoon. Respect of rights of Member States and sectors of ITU is of great importance. Not long ago different views were expressed. However, we have also noted that some Member States have expressed their support. Therefore, we hope that this proposal, just as mentioned and suggested by you, that could be discussed through an informal group or an ad hoc group. That is our position. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China. If there is no ‑‑ before that, only there is one contribution, my proposal was to create informal discussion of ad hoc. Please be mindful of that before you make any comments. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Madam Chair. To facilitate your job, I think there is a very clear agreement that this should not go forward. So it is a very simple decision that you can take. But I can anticipate that we are not going to participate in any informal group or any ad hoc on this matter. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Canada, your point has been taken. Cuba, you have the floor.

>> Cuba: Good afternoon, Chair. I've followed the discussions that have arisen with regard to this new resolution. Often at conferences where we have participated we have always put forward the fact that United Nations bodies technical in nature cannot be politicized. The Constitution stipulates that we all have the right to be heard and to participate in each of the activities of the Union.

We therefore ask that we are able to evaluate, revise, and do everything that we are instructed to do as a Union. We all have the right to participate. We as members of the Union of a Union that we see as a body that is always seeking cooperation, that is always seeking to find a common understanding of how we should move forward, a complete system of the United Nations where ICTs are a central element on which all states should cooperate, we consider that we all have the right to be heard.

Furthermore, as the Constitution states, we are all entitled to take part in each of the bodies under this Union. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Cuba. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. We see that you are in a difficult situation. However, at the same time I would like to ask you to help us to organize the consideration of this draft resolution. I heard a series of statements which are very categorical and not based on the rules and procedures. And they're saying that the document will not be considered by them at all.

So they directly say that they refuse to work on this. We're all sending contributions. We're not refusing to consider anyone's proposals. Therefore, we appeal to you to find a good method for everyone to participate in this work and where we can obtain constructive substantial statements we stand open for any work, constructive work. This is not a solid inflexible proposal.

I think we need such an instrument for the future. We all need it. Therefore, I think it's a very good proposal for the work of our conference. This is the level of the Plenipotentiary Conference. I thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia.  ‑‑ you have the floor.

>> Czech Republic: Thank you, Madam Chair. We not only speak on behalf of the Czech Republic but also on behalf of the European Union and its 27 Member States. We are of the opinion that the sector conferences have taken their respective decisions, and these decisions should be respected.

The EU does not feel the need to engage in further informal discussions on this topic because we think that the situation is quite clear. Therefore, we support also the previous speakers from the United States, Canada, Japan, and others. But, of course, we are in your hands on how it is decided to continue with this topic.

I hope the opinion has been made clear but if necessary, I'm ready to provide further explanations. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Czech Republic. Everyone is (Audio fading in and out) so I will take, one, I will follow the rule that I have been presenting in meetings from yesterday. Because this is one contribution. And then I'll call a drafting group. Then it's going to be informal consultation. But it's not like ‑‑ I explained there is two informal consultation. One is announced and then on the screen, and then there will be a Secretariat advised, and then the room will be announced. But the other informal consultation is as a small group you can take a decision or continue your discussion.

In this case, I will give time to the contributor and also on this contribution, Russia, to try to find a way to convince the members who expressed their concerns and then objections. I will give it time for you to come back to us next week. Then we will try to consider it again.

So we can have an informal consultation with members who expressed their concerns. Please report back to us the next week. Brazil, you have the Chair.

>> BRAZIL: I think it's wise we have opportunities for discussion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. I propose this way to move forward. Then we can continue with our agenda items. If no one is asking for the floor, I will ‑‑ UK, you have the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you very much, Chair. I wanted to clarify a large number of members have made clear, they do not believe this resolution should progress at all. So I wanted to understand clearly from you that these consultations will be a consultation on whether or not this progresses but not on the substance of the resolution; is that correct?

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Yes, your understanding is correct. I will give a chance to Russia to convince the members who expressed their concerns whether we proceed with the resolution or not. And then I will have an agenda item for the next meeting. If there's any progress if we can discuss on the contents. But it's still a discussion whether we have this resolution or not, anyway. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I'm trying to understand. We're thinking of new formats of work. That proposal has been put forward by the Russian Federation, which was supported by a number of Member States. We heard a proposal to call an ad hoc group for us. It is enough to receive the support in order for this document to be considered on the substance. Instead of following the procedure, you are suggesting that we take a step back and replace with our informal work your official ‑‑ your formal task.

I would appeal to you to set ‑‑ schedule a time for the consideration of this issue and also to provide us with an assistant from the Secretariat. The thing is, I don't know how we should move forward if our document is receiving support.

We heard the opposite views, but at the same time you also heard those who supported the document. And I believe that we cannot ignore the views of the other parties. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. As I explained it earlier, I'm not creating a new procedure. I've been following this procedure. Since there is one contribution, I am not going to create ad hoc groups. I will try with informal consultation. So Russia can approach to the members who expressed concerns, but we can still announce the time and location if you wish to. Then Secretary will be there.

As I heard from the members it's their will to take a part or not, it's their own will. We cannot predict that. Anyway, we will have an informal consultation. And then I will give more time to you to discuss this matter until next week.

So when we have next week the meeting, we will table this this agenda item. And we can hear the progress and maybe we can discuss it further. This is my way forward.

So there any objections to it? Czech Republic, you have the floor.

>> Czech Republic: Thank you, Madam Chair. This is once more on behalf of the 27 EU Member States. I would say on the contrary. What you propose is for us a fully acceptable way forward. And we thank you for that proposal.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Czech Republic, and EU. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I ask the floor simply to thank you once again, we are encountering discrimination. Very well. We can continue hearing the fact that a number of states do not want to consider the document. We're not trying to get them to do so if you don't want to, don't. We can work with those who do. There's no problem. Nobody makes it obligatory on you to work with our proposals. This is the right of each Member State. It's none obligation. At the same time do not force me to open the general rules of assemblies and conferences and specify what we should floor and comply and go back to the constructive approach, I would like to thank you for your constructive proposal. In contribution has received support. We should not consider what we will consider or not. We will work on the substance. If any Member States do not want to participate in this work as you've rightly pointed out, they don't have to.

At the same time, we'd like you to show on this the screens when consultations will be held and provide assistance from the Secretariat. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. As I explained earlier and repeatedly, I didn't create any ad hocs for one proposal. I'm giving you the screen and then Secretariat in room for discussion. But whether you discuss about the ‑‑ having this resolution or not or the substance or not, the substance in it, that's up to the informal consultation. I will leave it up to your consultation. Thank you for that. We will have informal consultation on this. We will table this resolution under the agenda item next week. Thank you, everyone.

Now we move to the agenda Item 12, the Resolution 208 and elections. So we have Resolution 208 and a new draft resolution. And then we also have a Council report on this and then new draft decision as well.

I think this is another issue, we might need an ad hoc before I give the floor to the presenters. So I now open the floor for any comments if you object to create the ad hoc groups on this. I see no one is asking for the floor. So we will create an ad hoc group on this.

Before that I would like to invite the Chairman of the Council to present this document number 40 under agenda anymore 12.3. UAE, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. At the outset I would like to congratulate you, madam chairperson for your appointment at the head of this meeting. Ladies and gentlemen, dear Delegates, I'm delighted to present to you the Document 32/40 with regard to the electoral process at the ITU. This document contains the dates of the discussions and documents pertaining to the ITU and electoral process which started at the PP of 2014.

And the recommendations of the PP 2018 suggesting comprehensive review of the electoral process. As you may well know, the Council in 2019 appointed the Secretary‑General to review the electoral process in 2020 with regard to the sixth and seventh sessions submitted at the fifth committee of the PP 2018 which were adopted by that conference.

It was supposed to discuss those outputs in 2020, session of the Council as document C 20/13 was submitted. But it was updated and taken into account a short time frame before 2022. Rev. 1 in this regard. I would like to point your attention to the two recommendations made by the 2018 PP and the great support garnered for the document due to its impact during the virtual session discussions.

I would also like to point out and welcome the support of the Council members through this review process and having a number of guidelines with regards to the electoral activities shall also include some directions to the way elections can be held during this current session of the Plenipotentiary Conference and a number of other considerations.

After discussion, we have agreed via correspondence to submit this matter to PP 22 for further discussions. We submit this report for discussion and take all the necessary measures according to the needs. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Chair of the Council. We heard your report with thanks.

Now I open the floor for any comments on this report. Please note that we will discuss, if necessary, we will discuss this in the ad hoc groups as well. Because we are going to create ad hoc groups under this issue.

No one is asking the floor, we take note of this report. And then we will move to the nomination of the ad hoc group Chair. I see no request. So we took note of this report. Thanks again.

For the ad hoc groups on this Resolution 208 and then election issues, I propose Japan, Ms. Memiko Otsuki, to take this ad hoc group. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would be happy to take on the role of the ad hoc Chair. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Memiko. Secretariat please announce identify the Secretariat for this ad hoc group.

>> SECRETARIAT: Thank you very much. The Secretariat will be provided by my colleague Ms. Cristina (?). Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Secretariat. This group can maybe start discussion next week. Because since we are ‑‑ we have limited number of delegation and Secretariat, so this group will start their work next week. Thank you.

Next agenda Item 13 is other businesses. I believe Secretariat has something to announce. Nikolaos, you have the floor.

>> SECRETARIAT: Thank you very much. If it may please the floor, I would like to recall that the elections will start tomorrow morning at 9:30 in the Plenary Room. A kind suggestion to be on time as the meeting will start promptly, and the doors to the Plenary will be closed shortly thereafter. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for that announcement. Indonesia you have the floor. Please give the mic to Indonesia.

>> Indonesia: Thank you, Distinguished Delegates. We would like to invite you to Indonesia night in collaboration of music and performance. Along with credit spaces of consensus. It will take place in the National Museum. It is located right next to the Unirii Hall. From Unirii Hall you can take the exit next to the tunnel. (Difficult to hear) general attire will get you in. See you at the night of the museum. I thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the kind invitation. We look forward to seeing you at the museum. Thank you. US, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Madam Chair, again, thank you for an excellent meeting. Madam Chair, through you, may we kindly ask that the chairs of the informal groups or ad hocs, for example, earlier we discussed about the GSR. We discussed about Resolution 136, et cetera. May we kindly ask that the DLs of those informal discussions be uploaded prior to your meeting, so that they can be converted to TDs and we can go ahead and approve them very promptly at your next meeting, et cetera? Can we kindly ask the DLs of these informals be uploaded by the chairs. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, US, for your question. That's what we were trying to do yesterday. We wanted post Com 5 DL. Since there is a conference document ADM 17, so we had to wait for them to upload. We will try to find out what we can do. But your request has been noted. Thank you.

Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Madam Chair, on behalf of Japan, I would like to invite you to our reception before the Indonesia reception at 6:30 in Unirii Hall. We seek your support our candidate for the TSB director and the member of the Council. We welcome all delegates. Please join us for Japanese food including sushi and saké as well as a performance of Japanese musical instruments. We look forward to seeing you all tonight.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your kind invitation. I look forward to having some food. We are at the end of our agenda item. As I announced it before that our ad hoc group on the membership will be taking place in this same room. So maybe we will take ten minutes break. My Vice Chair ‑‑ ten minutes, okay? So we will have a ten minutes break. And then the ad hoc group will be continued. But my meeting is adjourned for today. Thank you, everyone.

(Event concluded at 16:08 EEST)
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