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>> SECRETARIAT: Good morning, everyone. Hello. Good afternoon. We are actually waiting for the working group of the Plenary to finish its session, so we can start right after. Thank you very much.

Dear colleagues. WG‑PL just finished. We will give it a couple more minutes to allow colleagues to get to the room. Thanks.

>> CHAIR: Good afternoon, everyone. I'll start the meeting now.

>> Recording in progress.

>> CHAIR: Welcome, everyone, to the sixth meeting of Committee 5. I apologize for the delay. We were waiting for the working group Plenary to finish their meeting, because that's the meeting we were told not to overlap from the day beginning. Now we can start our meeting.

You can see the agenda, ADM/35 for this afternoon. If you have no comments on this, we will open the agenda. I see no requests, so agenda approved. Our next agenda item is Resolution 167 that we discussed this morning, and we asked Ad Hoc Chair to have an informal discussion. So I will give the floor to (?) to report back to us. There has been improvements. So please take the floor.

>> WILLIAM LEE: Just to report back to the committee, following the session this morning an informal group had met to discuss this issue with Secretariat support from the advisor. We want to present the following text for the consideration of Committee 5 for insertion into the report of this Committee to the Plenary.

And I will read this out in the ‑‑ in acknowledging the limitations imposed by the current regulatory framework, as indicated in recognizing e) of Resolution 167, PP 22 strongly suggests Member States, Chairman of meetings which have remote participation, to take into account the positions and proposals of remote participants in regard with issues being discussed. The meeting as far as potential technical issues ‑‑ sorry, at the meeting, as well as potential technical issues with their remote participation.

This text will form part of the report of Committee 5 to the Plenary. We invite the Plenary to enter this text and adopt Resolution 167. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Chair, as Ad Hoc Chair suggested, this will be in the report to the Plenary. They will advise Plenary to adopt this and adopt this Resolution and put this in the minute.

So now I open the floor for any comments on this. UK, you have the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I'm the lead of CEPT on this. We had agreed the modifications to Resolution 167 during ad hoc, and we have reached a final text which everyone's agreed with.

At Committee 5 this morning we had an intervention from a country that had not participated in the Ad Hoc Group and therefore was not aware of all the discussions we've had and all the compromises we made. At the Com 5 meeting this morning we agreed that there would be some offline discussions to see if it was acceptable for a text to be put in the record of the Plenary. And the elements which will be included in that text.

Although I was the CEPT lead, I did not see this text before it was written, and indeed I had to ask several people if I was able to get a copy of the text. So I'm not sure what discussion took place.

So having looked at the text, I don't think it covers anything that we don't include in the Resolution. And I think it's inappropriate to put that into the Plenary record. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, CEPT. I share the view that we discussed all these matters in the ad hoc groups. But there was a question raised at the Com 5. And I also appreciate extra work from ad hoc chairs and all the participants to bring this text. So Iran, you have the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We are not dealing with the proposal of CEPT. We are dealing with Committee 5 delegations of chief persons may not attend so many ad hocs that has been created and for them all important. They should be given the opportunity at level of Committee 5 to express their views. And this view has been shared by others, distinguished delegate of northern kingdom says in this text there is no more in the Resolution, therefore take it within the matter of the Plenary. It is not hard. By the way, Chairman, many of us dealing with the complex issue of ITU‑R, six study groups, all of them policy issues are not IQT. Some of them policy, we are not objecting to anything. Chairman, for us it's vital because we have a WRC and we have to have a clear indication. I request kindly that if this text is not harmful, please kindly report that to the Plenary and included and humbly and and plea to distinguished delegates not to oppose to that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. US, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. A we have looked at the text very carefully and we thank the colleagues for putting it together.

We do have a concern about the words regulatory framework as indicated in recognizing e), because we don't understand what regulatory framework that is contained in that recognizing e). So we would like to, if possible, just to replace it by saying, in acknowledging the limitations imposed by the current requirements as indicated in recognizing e), and we would be very satisfied with that small modification. Thank you very much.

(Silence).

>> CHAIR: Before I give the floor to UK, USA, is ‑‑

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Add as indicated, but that's optional. But that's fine, Chair.

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

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I'm not sure which group was consulted because CEPT was not consulted about this draft text. Despite the fact that we made an intervention this morning.

It is the will to edit this text, then we will propose edits. So can I go forward with edits, please?

So CEPT propose in acknowledging limitations imposed by the current regulatory framework in recognizing e) of Resolution 167 PPT and we diverge from the text, recognizes the importance in considering the positions and proposals of remote participants in regard to the issues being discussed at the meeting and the importance of a stable, technical setup facilitating remote participation.

>> CHAIR: We have two options here. Iran, you have the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chair. Perhaps we still need to (?) how the Conference works. People may not have the opportunity to act in the meeting, we are not dealing with any particular proposal of any country or any region or any conflict region ‑‑ requested not toist insist that what they said should be included in the document. We are getting together. We extend our views and everything is based on the mutual understanding even if distinguished Chair, we have not the possibility to do because of the other meeting. However, we do it here.

What I don't understand is a stable technical setup. What is that stable technical setup? Where do we find the stable technical setup? Who has established that technical stable setup? I don't understand. This is a vague text, and I need some clarification. Thank you. I think we once again request kindly to take whatever was agreed, distinguished colleagues from CEPT, many other people have not been contacted before you. We have amp time here to have a look. You have kindly bear with all of us given the time to discuss. I don't think that we should say we have not been discussed. 2,000 people are not available to discuss in short time within 12:00 and 1:00. In fact I have missed one important meeting Resolution 148 because of this, Mr. Chairman. Once again, I request to kindly agree with each other to work together in a friendly manner and not to have anything that intentionally or nonintentionally do not allow the people to participate in the discussion, Chairman.

I think the text that was proposed by the legal ‑‑ not legal, by the group that established that, I think it's sufficient because we have difficulty with the stable technical setup.

If instead of the stable technical setup is something else but inserted in the text, I have problem. I have difficulty, Chairman, because distinguished delegate of United Kingdom would never attend any ITU‑R meeting. They are not aware of what we're doing. What they expect of WRC, the recommendation which may be incorporated by reference become a treaty. The ITU‑T has no policy issue to be as a treaty. It's a policy issue as a recommendation. Recommendation only Study Group 2, and 3. Again, kindly bear with us, collaborate with us, and agree that we are not to propose something which has no known meaning, stable technical setup. We are talking about a stable technical setup for the remote participation? What does it mean? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. To accommodate your opinion on this morning, since there has been a lot of discussion ad hocs, because you expressed ‑‑ since you are three delegations you cannot attend the ad hocs. That's why we doing this. Even though we had the groups, we are doing it. So we are accommodating everyone. And we are doing it in a friendly manner. So do not say that we are excluding anyone here.

So if you want to discuss on this matter here, I will close the list now. Denmark, Serbia, UK, Brazil, Sweden, US, and Mexico, the list is closed. Otherwise, if you want to discuss, please press the button now. Otherwise, the list is closed. The last is Philippines.

Denmark you have the floor.

>> Denmark: We also appreciate that this is a question that has been put before this Committee. And I wouldn't spend a lot of time going into what we think about the process and where there should have been and introduced at an earlier point. We are here we are here, and we are working with the text. My CEPT colleague also clearly gave an input to help further the output of this committee on this question that has been put before us.

And then the question was raised, stable technical setup, well, for the limited time my CEPT colleagues and I have had to consider the initial input proposal for text, the understanding at least I gained was that the problem that wanted to be raised with the potential technical issues with remote participation was the question of colleagues not ‑‑ disconnected from the meeting from all sorts of technical issues.

So to put it in a positive way, we just tried to phrase the importance of a stable technical setup. I've had the joy of participating in ITU‑R meetings. So for that end of the table, I also know the importance of our remote colleagues is able to enjoy a stable technical setup. If it causes a lot of concerns, well, it could also be put in the other waying say the importance of avoiding technical issues, if that would be a solution to the concerns. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Denmark, for your insert to the question. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. We thank those who worked on this text. I believe we should make it focused on the study group meetings, because that's the intention here, because the nature of those technical discussion at the study group meetings, it might be difficult to have everyone represented there.

So maybe on number 1, to make it read, it is study groups and meetings of the union. And then if we can redraft it in a way to look like positive text, because it's now, that Member States and Chairman are always taking different sides of those participating remotely. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. UK, you have the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. I'm glad Saudi Arabia raised the issue of the onus on Member States and Chairman of meetings. I think that is a troublesome text for us. And this is why we removed it from the CEPT proposal.

Denmark has put forward a potential solution to the objection that Mr. Aristeh gave by this proposed text by CEPT. Mr. Aristeh seems to object to the fact that CEPT as a region has tried to coordinate and suggesting this is coming from just one area. Whereas, it does seem that there's only one area which is proposing this.

Mr. Aristeh, my friend, we're not trying to be unfriendly to you. We're trying to get a text which we think is already covered by the work we've done. We're trying to be helpful. And we're trying to come to a compromise. So please help us to reach this compromise. Thank you.

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

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, many dam Chair, to give me the floor. I'll try to get a consensus considering the comments we have here. First, I believe that the initial part with the comments from the US, it's a good way forward in recognizing e). Regarding part 2, I suggest go with minor additions. I understand these limitations should be focused on this this point should be focused on study group meetings, because that's probably where we will have remote participation when we talk about conversations, it's a different process. I cannot agree ‑‑ to focus on study group meetings. In recognizing persons of, not only Member States but ITU members that are discussing at the meeting, right, if I take ITU, you have a lot of Sector Members. So recognizing the importance of ITU members as well as Chairman of study group meetings which have remote participation which have remote participation. Then you can go considering the positions and proposals of remote participants. Then you can go all the way ‑‑ I don't see any problems with the text that we have at the end of the first part because it shows in a positive way that the idea that you should have a good connection at least in Brazil's view is fine. I believe Denmark also shows a way forward in trying to fix that.

The idea here is to avoid potential technical issues or a positive way is exactly what we have right now on the screen. But I leave it open to the members. Brazil would indicate it would be okay with both ways. Either to avoid technical issues or go with number two, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil, for your proposal. Sweden, you have the floor.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. We, Sweden would support number two. And in number 2 we would support the second ‑‑ the avoiding potential technical issues. We note that text is taken from the above ‑‑ from the first alternative. So it would be a way of merging the two in a sense. So we would prefer the second alternative instead of the stable technical setup if that is causing problems to the meeting. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sweden. Your point has been taken. US, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll be brief. We agree with the way forward presented by Brazil. I would like to make a small modification to the second one where it says of stable technical facilities and leave it at that, stable technical facilities, and we would be happy to accept both 1 and 2 in the way forward. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, US. Mexico, you have the floor.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just to be brief here, we support the comments put forward by our colleagues from Brazil and the United States as well as the comments raised by the CEPT region. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mexico. Philippines, you have the floor.

>> POLAND: I represent Poland but I took the wrong microphone, so I'm speaking for Poland. I would like to thank our distinguished colleagues and the proposal on the screen. We recognize Option 2 as a good way forward and to thank you for editing the proposal. So Option 2 alternative is very good for us. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Poland. So I hear the room. So I hear the support for 2. So let me try once more. Secretariat, please delete number 1 and use 2 as the whole sentence. So with the Resolution of 167, then we will add this sentence in my report to the Plenary. So with this 2, do we agree on that text? And then DT/41 as well. I see no more requests for the floor. So DT/41 and this text to be included in my report has been approved.

(Applause).

>> CHAIR: Thank you, everyone for doing this together. So our next agenda item is the Resolution 196. So DT/40. This one we discussed this morning. I believe Romania has a solution for us. Romania, you have the floor.

>> ROMANIA: Yes, Madam Chair. Thank you so much for giving me the floor. We have indeed, after discussion we had earlier, we have agreed to an alternative text which would solve this resolution. Can we open DT/40?

>> CHAIR: Yes, Secretariat, please. It's on the screen. Please continue, Romania.

>> ROMANIA: So we can delete the text in the square brackets. And we will introduce a new .4 in resolves. Or .5. Can I dictate it.

>> CHAIR: Yes, please.

>> ROMANIA: That ITU‑T continues to study in close collaboration with ITU‑D on consumer protection issues, including aspects related to international telecommunication/ICTs, according to its mandate. This is what we have agreed to in informal discussion. And I hope we can adopt this resolution in this committee. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Romania, to come up with the text in a short time. I really appreciate your work and all the participants that participated in this discussion.

So we have new text here. With this new insertion, I would like to ask that we can approve this DT/40. No one is requesting for the floor. So DT/40 is approved.

(Applause).

>> CHAIR: Thank you, everyone, please to other ad hoc chairs, this shouldn't be the habit of the ad hoc reports. I will really appreciate if you come up with text without square brackets and then we'll discuss the details, so we can approve at the Com.

Next agenda item is updates on discussions on specific topics. So I will invite US to report on the ad hoc on article 48. Do we have Ad Hoc Chair s in the room. Please give the floor to him.

>> Thank you. The ad hoc on Committee 5 on Article 48 of the Constitution has met eight times. Earlier in the week I was quite pleased with the progress that we were making. We had a very robust discussion on the various proposals, the differences of views on different aspects were identified. And we were able to establish some principles on those differences. So that was very encouraging. We then started considering a merged document focusing on the resolves part, the opportune part. There, again, we were making very good progress. We had a large number of resolves, and we started to focus on a few of the most important ones.

We had two meetings earlier today, two one‑hour meetings. It seems the deeper that we dig on the most sensitive aspects, the deeper the divisions between the sides seem to be revealed. I am a bit nervous, but we do have a meeting tonight.

I understand from my Councillor we have a tomorrow. I encourage all come with their thinking caps on with the most clever ideas to try to resolve the differences while at the same time respecting the differences. But it's a very complicated issue. And it's a very, very delicate issue. So perhaps it's no surprising that we are where we are. I'm always hopeful that we can progress. I'm always amazed that how things come together in the end. So I'm still cautiously optimistic that we will have something to bring to you next week with no Jerry brackets. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, US. I really appreciate your hard work. I heard you and then all the other participants that took place in those discussions. They worked tirelessly. I really appreciate all that work. I would be surprised if you brought me a simple text by now. So I would expect you to work very hard tomorrow.

I heard Sunday this place will not be possible to reach because there will be the marathon outside. So you don't have a place to discuss on Sunday for sure. So you have to finish by 9:00 PM tomorrow. So I will expect a document without square brackets on Monday from you. Thank you.

Next agenda is another issue on the space issue. So I will give the floor to UAE. Thank you.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. We had our last meeting of the Ad Hoc Group for space issues just awhile ago before this Committee 5 meeting. And I would like to recall that we are looking at three different topics. One of them is Resolution 186. The other one is a new Resolution about space sustainability. And the third one is a new Resolution about the implementation of the Space 2030 agenda.

During today's meeting, we looked at the space sustainability resolution. And I am glad to mention that the meeting could agree on completing the modifications ‑‑ sorry, the proposed new resolution without square brackets. So hopefully in the next ‑‑ in your next meeting, Madam Chair, I will be bringing this resolution for approval.

With regards to the implementation of the Space 2030 agenda, we've conducted good progress on the resolution. We still have a small portion of the preamble of the resolution that we need to conclude. Unfortunately, we could not have a good time to finalize on that. But I hope that we will be able to do that in tomorrow's session as we are planning to have a session tomorrow on Saturday.

In addition for the resolution 186, we looked at it in today's session. But unfortunately, we had different views with regards to the proposals and that resolution. I'm also hoping in tomorrow's session we would be able to conclude on Resolution 186 proposal as well.

That is the progress that we have, Madam Chair. And I hopeless I can be here on Sunday for the marathon only. Thank you very much. Can.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. Like you said, tomorrow would be a good day to conclude everything. But it's good news that you have progressed a bit. And then also I really appreciate ‑‑ I know every delegation has a limited number of experts. But they are working on the difficult issues tirelessly. So I really appreciate that.

And then please only here Sunday for marathon. Nothing else. Then we can move to the next one. Ad Hoc Group on ITR. I will give the floor to PNG. Please give the floor to Papua New Guinea.

>> PAPUA NEW GUINEA: As we all knew, this was going to be a challenging resolution to update. I think the divisions among the opinions of the regional groups are well known and well‑established. It's been the case for many years, I think.

That said, we have a position where none of the regional groups absolutely oppose any continuation of discussions of the ITRs. But we still have divisions about how that discussion might take place, what would be the mechanism for it? Where it would take place? And how it would conduct its work? And what would happen to its outcomes? So still quite significant issues that we need to discuss and agree.

So we've had three meetings of our Ad Hoc Group. On top of that, we've had some very intensive and I think in many ways productive informal discussions among the regional representatives who have also been taking any kind of suggestions and ideas back to their regional groups. So there has been a lot of work ongoing on this. There will be homework going on tonight.

We have also had a late contribution from the Russian Federation, which has now been uploaded by the ITU Secretariat. And I understand it would be translated and available tomorrow at quite a late part of the consideration, although it had been circulated among a number of the regional representatives.

So tomorrow we are going to be starting at 9:00 AM. And we will be going until at least ‑‑ well 8:00 PM until we have a steering group Chair. We're all prepared, I think, to do a lot of hard work. But it will be difficult. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, PNG. Yes, this group has started a bit late this week. Since you have a new contribution, it's going to be more complicated, I understand that. So good luck with your 12‑hour meeting tomorrow. I will be there to see the discussions as well. Thank you for taking this hard work. We look forward to receiving some (?) from you as well.

Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. We would like to thank (?) for her leadership. She is making maximum efforts to ensure that we can reach consensus as quickly as possible concerning progress. However we would like to express a number of concerns. Thanks to our work of Member States at this Plenipotentiary Conference with regard to this issue. It's completely clear that the Plenipotentiary Conference of 2018 gave a clear instruct to the group of experts to reach consensus concerning the future steps related to the ITRs.

That means at this PP we were supposed to already consider a single consensus‑based approach as to how to move forward. Under these circumstances, it's clear that the group has not fulfilled its mandate. Going back, once again, to the same format of work, it seems unproductive to us.

We cannot be satisfied with the results of the work of a group where we have two opposite views.

Also, it is completely clear now that we need a very stringent mandate that should be adopted about I the Plenipotentiary Conference. The Plenipotentiary Conference must set a very clear goal at the end of the work, not to transfer it to the Council. We must understand what we're expecting from the group, whatever format it may take.

At the same time, we must clearly understand that the positions of the regions that have been presented at present, including the contribution of the Russian Federation are the starting ones, the starting point. We must not remain on these positions. Each region must make a step toward each other. And now we are in fact encountering a situation whereby several regions are trying to find a possible solution.

However, some are clinging to their positions. This cannot be called a balanced approach in trying to find consensus. Moreover, there's one important aspect, the ITRs. One of the main documents of the Union. They are part of the Constitution and part of international agreement, which is mandatory and binding on all states.

If some Member States believe that the ITRs are not needed, it would be ‑‑ it would have been correct to submit to this proposal, to this conference a proposal on changing the Constitution and the IRs. We assume that such proposal have not been made. Therefore, we must develop a common approach.

In conclusion, I would like to thank the Chair of Our Ad Hoc Group. While waiting for our work tomorrow, we make every effort to ensure this work can be considered a success. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. I understand ITR is a delicate issue. And there are diverse views. But this is still under discussion in the ad hoc groups. I will leave that discussion for the Ad Hoc Groups for the moment. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to start by thanking the Chair woman of the Ad Hoc Group and madam Caroline Greenway. She's done a superb job in this exercise.

But Madam Chair, I think we have to recognize two things. First and foremost we've been discussing this issue for eight years. Two consecutive of the expert group of the ITRs and then a specific mandate. And to the extent that what I know having participated in that, I think that we completed our mandate. Our mandate was to review the ITRs, not to revise them. And the conclusions of two reports, last of which the one sent to the Plenipotentiary Conference in 2018 concluded that there was no consensus on the need for the ability of the ITRs.

With regards to contributions in this conference, there were several contributions submitted within the deadline. On that note, Madam Chair, I know that we have a little bit of an inconsistency between the applicability of Resolution 165 and at the same time the interpretation on the rules of conference and assemblies that allow any member States to present any contribution they wish, irrespective of what the Resolution 165 establishes in terms of deadlines.

But having said that, Madam Chair, and in conclusion, we continue to fail to understand where is the empirical evidence that points to a need for a new ITRs? Secondly, if I recall correctly, and we have here someone from the Office of the Legal advisor, there is no inconsistency or legal problem from the coexistence of the 1998 and 2012 ITRs. We continue this consultation and dialogue to see if we can send this issue to Council for Council to decide what to do with this important method. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Like I said previously, I will forward ‑‑ I will leave those discussions to the Ad Hoc Groups. It pertains to the ad hoc groups and you have 12 hours tomorrow to discuss. Thank you.

Actually, this is the updates from the ad hoc groups. We didn't want to discuss the materials here. Yeah. Okay. Thank you. So you have ad hoc tomorrow to discuss ITR.

Let's move to the next agenda item. So Ad Hoc Group on the MoU's. I will give the floor to Australia to update us.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. We've progressed drafting on text on an approach for MoU's with significant strategic and financial implications. It's available today in DL/65. If adopted it would ensure the ITU shall enter in MoU's consistent with its mandate reflected in the Constitution of convention resolutions and the financial plans of the Union. Two, require the ITU to seek prior approval of the Council before enter into any MoU that had instant financial or strategic implications and 3, to develop guidelines for the Secretariat to use when assessing whether an MoU needs Council approval before signature.

There are two outstanding issues which I believe can be resolved with further discussions.

However, in view of the fact we've already had extensive discussions across five meetings and an informal. We would benefit from Committee 5 as to there are reasonable prospects of reaching consensus on the proposal I've outlined.

I'm conscious of the time of the delegates over the next day. And the instruction to bring all ad hocs to a conclusion tomorrow.

Briefly, the remaining issues we have to discuss are the interaction between the proposed text and existing Resolution 100, which deals with the Secretary‑General as a repository of certain MoU's. I believe this issue has prospects of being resolved from advice from the Secretariat as to the current functioning of Resolution 100. And the other outstanding issue is the form of reporting Council and PP will receive in relation to this issue.

Before I give it back to you Chair, I would like to thank all the delegates for their participation and Julia and Maria for their excellent advice and support.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia. Let me ask you this question. I know you've spent ad hoc time that you've requested for the Committee. Maybe you have time limits. I would like to ask, do you think that you have a general agreement to the way forward? Do you have any more sessions to your ad hocs? Australia, you have the floor.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. I would like to hear views of my colleagues around the room to see. Because as has been expressed not all delegations and not all regions have been able to attend all ad hocs. So it would be useful to hear the views of other delegates.

(Silence).

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia. I know this has been a difficult issue for you. I heard there has been a request for some information from the Secretariat. I believe if you have another ad hoc meeting, the Secretariat will be providing those information to the groups. We can hear from the room. US, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Madam Chair, we've been listening to all the colleagues in the room. And we have actually been sensing the temperature in the room. Madam Chair, we've made a very noble effort, a very noble effort to try to enhance the transparency of the process.

We would like to thank the valiant efforts from our colleague from Australia for the hours he had put forth in order to reach consensus on the item.

Madam Chair, we're also realistic. We're realistic in the sense that we do not see a way forward for this resolution. Again, despite the noble efforts to try to enhance the transparency of the process.

So we propose to bring back to your next meeting text for inclusion in the Chairman's report in lieu of the proposal that is being discussed further in this Ad Hoc Group. And we would like to thank all the colleagues for their excellent collaboration and their interest in order to enhance this process going forward. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, US. If you cannot reach the agreements, there will be no change to Resolution 100. Then there will be no new resolution. And then as clearly stated from the beginning of the Ad Hoc Group meeting, there is an existing region from PP 18 on MoU's. So that will be the existing text. Like you said, I will give you one more chance to have ad hoc groups. Then you can come up to me with the agreed resolution, either an agreed resolution or, like US mentioned, you can bring me the text to the Chair's report.

So if Australia is agreeable to have one more session on this Ad Hoc Group, I will ask the Secretariat to provide assistance for you to have one more session tomorrow. And I encourage that every region please participate in that meeting, because I was notified that there was not every region participated for the last meeting. But this will be the last chance to discuss this MoU issue.

So please attend the meeting tomorrow if there is an ad hoc. Australia, you have the floor.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. I'm happy to continue our work and return back to you at the next meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia. I really appreciate it. So our next agenda item is inform group discussion proposal Russia Document 88. So I will give the floor to Russia to update their informal discussions. Zambia is asking for the floor. Okay. I guess Russia ‑‑ please give the floor to Zambia. I assumed it was Russia.

>> GAMBIA: Thank you for giving us the floor. I apologize for a slight understanding as to who is planning to take the floor. We didn't have enough place behind the desk. Allow me to report on the informal consultation on Document 88 on the Russian Federation.

In line with the decision of Committee 5. Consultations were held on Document 88. It contains the draft new resolution. One respect for the right of Member States and Sector Members in the ITU and respect for fundamental human rights.

In contribution we process a draft new resolution just prepared in the interest of guaranteeing and ensuring human rights for candidates who put forward by Member States and Sector Members and when applicable by regional delegation organizations to the posts of elected officials to the RRB. I apologize, as Chairman and deputy chairs to study groups, Council, working groups, advisory groups, and other working bodies of the ITU sectors.

This resolution was also proposed in order to comply with the rights of Member States, Sector Members to be elected and put forward their candidates.

So during the consultations, some Member States opposed the consideration of the text of the document the proposal in principle overall despite the fact that the decision to consider the text was taken during the Committee 5 meeting in line with the provisions of the general rules of conferences and assemblies of the Union. At the same time, some Member States and representatives of regional delegation organizations supported considering the texts and proposals. They pointed out that such work within the framework of multilateral efforts and discussions of interested parties could lead us to positive results.

Furthermore, I must point out that the discussion of document ‑‑ of this document were held and bilateral format as well and also not ‑‑ with the participation of not all interested parties. But I must say that participants of the conference did show interest in the document.

However, because of their unwillingness of a number of member states to hold constructive consultations on the document, I would like to request the Chair of Committee 5 further instructions on the discussions of Document 88. I also would like to point out that the statement of the Russian Federation on these documents will be translated to the Secretariat to be included in the report of the Chair of Committee 5. Thank you for having given us the floor. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. We've heard from the informal group discussion. I open the floor for any views expressed on this. Czech Republic, you have the floor.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thanks, Madam Chair. We thank the Chair for providing the proponent of this draft resolution with an opportunity to discuss it in an informal setting as a demonstration of full transparency and inclusiveness that we all cherish.

During the informal consultation, yesterday the overall majority of states presented ‑‑ expressed objections to this resolution going forward as a whole. The states yesterday advice sustained their on arguments based on the Constitution rules and procedures. However, we have also listened carefully to some states who had expressed their wish for discussion on the proposal gin that it received support from some states.

At the same time, Madam Chair, we're also mindful of the time limits of this conference and deadlines for discussions that need to be met.

My respect to some states' views and as a possible way forward, we would like to suggest that we discuss the operative part of this resolution as a whole. This would allow all interested parties to exchange views on the general content and purpose of the text. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Czech Republic. Let me reiterate what you said right now. So you propose as a way forward to discuss the operative part as a whole for the Ad Hoc Groups but not the informal group for the second chance. Czech Republic; am I correct in your way forward proposal?

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Yes. Only as a compromise to those who wanted to have a go at the text, we suggest only to talk about the operative part. But from the respective of the spirit of the resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Czech Republic. US, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, many dam Chair. The United States appreciates the delegations that participated in the informal discussion of this proposal yesterday. Most of the participants in the informal raised strong concerns about both the intent and the substance of this proposal.

It was very clear in the informal that there is strong opposition to this proposal, both at a conceptual level and based on the merits on the text proposed. We do not support the proposal, because we believe it is intended to overturn the decisions of the Chair of the WTSA, the WTDC this year. Nevertheless, we can support the proposal from the Czech Republic if the group grease. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, US. Sweden, you have the floor.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. This proposal has nothing to do with human rights. Russia has shown its disregard for human rights and national security through it's illegal invasion of Ukraine. Russia's gross violation of human rights during its aggression lead its suspension from the human rights Council. However we can support the Czech Republic's proposal to discuss only the operative part of this.

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

>> CANADA: Madam Chair, very briefly our voice in support of the interventions that we just heard from Sweden, United States, and the Czech Republic, among others. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to thank the representative of the Czech Republic for his constructive approach which he presented in his statement. At the same time, I would like to remind the representative of Sweden that the ITU is not a political platform. And this meeting does not consider political issues. You have confused or mixed up the rules. Please look at the table ‑‑ at the screen. Thank you very much.

We heard objections against further work on our document, as you already stated. We will transmit our statement to the Secretariat. And we would like to thank all those who took part in the work. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So Russia, if I hear you correctly, now they are offering another chance for informal discussion, but you don't want any further discussion on your documents? Russia, could you clarify that? Please give the floor to Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Madam Chair, I would like to express gratitude to you once again for offering to continue consultations. But after political statements made by the representative of Sweden, we do not see any sense in doing so. Therefore, we would like to thank all those who took part in the work on the substance of this document. We are grateful also to all those who took the floor, to you first and foremost. Yes, we are withdrawing this are proposal. Thank you very much.

I'd like to also repeat that an official statement will be transmitted to the Secretariat. I thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. So you are withdrawing this proposal. And I will wait for your submission for the statements to be included in my report.

Ukraine, you have the floor.

>> Ukraine: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just a reflection from our side. Of course, we align with the statements made by our colleagues and especially Sweden. And I also want to remind to the delegate of the Russian Federation that ITU Council is not a human rights Council as well. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Ukraine. Now, this proposal has been withdrawn. So we will not continue any discussion on this document. Thank you, everyone.

So we will move to the other business ‑‑ but before that, Ad Hoc Chair on the membership issue, he has some updates for us. So, please take the floor.

>> Thank you, Madam Chair. This is to update the meeting that the ad hoc on sector membership and industry issues has made tremendous progress on its outstanding item which is a new draft resolution on encouraging participation of industry in the work of the Union.

As it stands, the Ad Hoc Group will be coming back to the Union with a document that captures the essence of the proposed resolution and that is acceptable to every interest. Madam Chair, the new resolution, the new draft resolution has been proposed as DT/51‑E. We invite members to kindly take a look. Hopefully it will be translated into various languages in a bit.

However, in the spirit of all inclusive and not letting anybody be left out, we left two square brackets for you. Nothing too serious. It's on the title and one resolves.

On a positive note, we are still talking. We still have informal engagements. And we'll try to come to this committee with a way out of the two square brackets. Thank you, Madam Chair.

We would still appreciate the ad hoc. Thanks.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Nigeria, if you had told me you had two square brackets, I wouldn't have given you the floor. Please work on the informal consultation to remove those square brackets. I will expect a clean document on Monday. Those involved in the discussions, please discuss with him. He will continue the discussion.

Thank you, everyone. This is the updates on our ad hoc groups.

Next agenda item is other business. Is there any member who wish to take the floor in this matter? Otherwise, we will close our meeting. Everyone, thank you. Thank you for the interpreters and the captioners as well. Meeting is closed.