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>> CHAIR: Good afternoon, everyone.

This is the fifth meeting of Committee 6.

We will get started in about 3 minutes ‑‑ let's say 5 minutes. There was a schedule change this afternoon during the Steering Committee and there's also a room change so we just want to make sure that everyone has time to get to this room.

Thank you very much, everyone. Thank you for your patience.

All right. Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you very much.

I know that we have a number of Delegates that were in our original room that was announced earlier today. Unfortunately, that room did not have as you recall the Conference agreed to have captioning and webcasting of our major Committees, and in that room it was not possible to do that. We had to change rooms. I apologize for that last‑minute change.

Hopefully we'll strive to do better with our schedule. I thank you for your patience. Our agenda is in Document ADM‑10(Rev.6). And as I indicated today on our agenda, we'll have T2.5, Resolution 162, Independent Management Advisory Committee, and Resolution  66, that document is in publications of the Union, in DT/23 and we will then my understanding is that for digital inclusion, T6.1, Resolution 30 that the U.S. and India are still coordinating on Resolution 30 which is in DT/20.

(Technical issue).

As we get through this technical agenda, we would conclude our meeting.

I would say from Com 6 there was ‑‑ we thought we had three hours and we only have an hour and a half today. So we end at 4:00. Then at 4:30 as we indicated the Ad Hoc Group on Res 48 will meet from 4:30 to 5:30.

Okay. With that, I would like to go to ‑‑ it is DT/16.

Resolution 162. Before doing that, Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: There was an agreement to delay the discussion of that resolution with the Resolution 77. My question is, when will we open that discussion once again on Resolution 2? Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Saudi Arabia.

Yes. Resolution 2, we're going to discuss it related to Resolution  77, scheduling duration of Council as well as the new proposal. That most likely will come up tomorrow. When we introduce our documents related to financial plan so, they will come up tomorrow.

Okay. Thank you.

With that, we have ‑‑ let's look at DT16.

In reviewing all of the contributions from the Regional Groups there is one outstanding issue that we should discuss, and I do think that if we all can agree on this, on the major theme of that, it is expanding the IMAC from 5 to 6 and representing the six geographical regions of the ITU. Is there any Member State rejecting to the expansion of the IMAC.

Great. That's approved. So that overall theme of expanding from 5 members to 6 member, that's approved.

What I would like to do is to take the remaining of the edits offline and if you could, please, make sure you send me your focal point I will send the regional focal points of the document that takes into account all of the proposals that we have taken to date.

If you recall, during Council, in the Council Working Group on FHR a number of the edits were from the IMAC itself and we did not discuss them at PP‑18. That was one of the documents that no Member State made a proposal to the Conference. A number of these edits in DT/16 are from our IMAC group and so we will ‑‑ I will take that, those edits from all of the Regional Groups as well and to present to the regional focal points a contribution that takes into account all edits and see if we can work it informally and then bring it back into this meeting.

That is my proposal forward for Resolution 162 DT/16.

Any objection.

Thank you. I don't see any objection. That's what we'll do.

Thank you very much.

Going to Resolution  66, documents and publications of the Union, DT/23.

We have DT/23 on the screen, please.

So earlier this morning, we took a look at edits proposed in DT/23 and there was still a little bit of confusion. My proposal is that we delete consideration d, the new considering d because we have taken care of that contribution by adding a new resolves. The new resolves would include allowing ITU academia members to have access to documents and publications as Mr. Ba had indicated on the first day that we introduced this, there would be no financial ‑‑ increase of financial responsibility for the Union. If we could all agree to that, then we could agree to send this document to the Editorial Committee.

Any ‑‑ sorry. Can you go to considering? One moment.

Thank you very much.

On the screen, considering D, the access and funding challenges, this proposal, the proposal from the ‑‑ we have dealt with this by including a new resolves.

If we could go to ‑‑ my proposal is to delete this text and go to the new resolves.

Number 8, the new resolves number 8 is consistent with Resolution 169 from PP‑18 and this would address the concern from the proposal.

Any objections? We would do that.

We have just approved our third document from Committee 6. Thank you very much. Yes.

All right.

That is approved.

Our next document, if the secretary could introduce the relevant parts of Document 55 dealing with creation and management of Council Working Groups and remember we agreed you have 3 minutes to introduce our documents.

Secretary, you have 3 minutes.

Thank you very much.

We are ‑‑ we don't need to introduce Document 55.

If I could go to RCC proposals, please, Document 68, Addendum 2.

Could someone from RCC introduce this document? Thank you very much.

I have the Russian Federation. You have the floor please. Thank you.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman.

On behalf of the RCC, I would like to introduce our proposal for a review.

In the concern of adding a new section, we're asking that in order to propose proposals regarding the implementation of the goals, objectives and priorities defined in the Strategic Plan and financial plan of the Union, any decisions of the Plenipotentiary Conference the Council creates Council Working Groups here, and we would want to delete the reference to 2015 because we have already gone past that.

As proposed, the reference to Resolution 70, we're not going to insist on this.

We think that since criteria already clearly mentioned that we have to have a gender balance we don't know if there is any reference to this needed but that's up to you. We suggest adding the resolution to it, it is a similar resolution.

Furthermore, in the deciding section, when we are talking about key issues for achieving of goals, that's in 6, we add a reference to reference to 887, we're suggesting that advisory and other groups be included. That's exactly the same as it was in a previous resolution. We also suggested an addition of a new subparagraph 13, that meetings should not be held during major Conferences and Assemblies of the Union or meetings of Advisory Groups, CWG. We unfortunately had that situation last year when TSAG was working quite often as Council Working Groups and that in the future as a result of this will not happen again.

We are then suggesting a little bit further that we look at subject to the provision of the Plenipotentiary Conference to propose an addition in paragraph 14, the last one.

With that, I submit this document for your consideration on the part of the RSS.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russian Federation for introducing edits for Decision 11.

Would you like to have the floor again, Russia? You have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman.

I do apologize, there was something I forgot which was a very, very important proposal.

We are suggesting that management of the Working Groups have not one term of office but two as is the case in all other groups.

Thank you very much. My apologies for not having made that point earlier. I just forgot it.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

I would like to put the Decision 11 edits proposed by RCC to the floor for General Comments, and after General Comments if ‑‑ well, first, any objection to including these edits on Decision 11? No objections.

I have U.K. and then United States.

U.K., you have the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. I don't quite understand the process.

The U.K. does have aspects of what's proposed which we think are inappropriate. Our general view is that some of these are fine, some of them aren't. How do you want to row seed, Chairman? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, U.K.

My understand something that some of the edits are okay and some of the edits are not.

As a General Comment, we could go line by line with the adds and I wanted to make sure that as a meeting of Com 6 that we can discuss and agree to go with looking at the edits, and based on your proposal that is the case.

U.S., you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES of AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Yes. We also had some questions or comments and concerns with some of the edits. We can proceed as you suggested.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much.

So it is on the screen. As we have done in previous meeting, we will not look at the editorial changes. If we could go to considering d, which the Resolution 71, I consider that an editorial change and I think that we can let the Editorial Committee take care of that.

The new considering e.

Any comments there? United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES of AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair.

We have I guess a question ‑‑ we think ‑‑ we're not sure why this is needed. It is clear that the Council can establish Council Working Groups. That's the intent of this proposal. I mean, of the whole decision. We just think it is unnecessary to state that we can establish Council Working Groups.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

RCC, could you explain this edit, please.

Russian Federation, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman.

Well, basically, this decision, it is the only decision which defines the establishment of Council Working Groups and that is why we did stipulate what we're creating them from. I know it is obvious to everybody, but all the same we think it is worth saying why we set the Council Working Groups up. Yes, it may be crystal clear to a lot of people already, but the underlying logic I think means that we should say why we are doing this and how we're doing this. That's our opinion. Of course, I'm in our colleague's hands if we don't think this is necessary. We want to make it clear at the beginning of the document why we're setting up these Council Working Groups.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United States, does that answer your question.

U.S., you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES of AMERICA: I think we still think it is an unnecessary addition. I think we're trying to keep these as minimal as possible and if it is duplicative of our understanding of the Council Working Groups, if we could leave this one out.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

I do think in reviewing the creation management of Council Working Groups that is a Council decision. If we are ‑‑ if they decide to create Working Groups to facilitate their work, if there are ‑‑ Russia, do you insist? You have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman.

Well, first of all, sometimes Council Working Groups set themselves up, sometimes they set themselves up on a decision taken by the Plenipotentiary Conference. That's why we thought it was better to make things clear. If people prefer to remove this text, then no, we have no objection.

You can take out the words implementation of the goals, objective, priorities defined in Strategic Plan. As I say, sometimes the Council Working Group sets itself up, sometimes it is based up on the basis of a decision of the PP and that we think should be reflected.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia.

Can we put this in square brocket and I'll coordinate with Member States offline as to how we can address this question.

Moving on to item F, which is an editorial change, and then there is a change to delete f and g. Let's start with f actually, g is being rewritten.

Any objection to deleting item g.

No objection, item g is approved to be deleted.

Item g is deleted but here it is being rewritten. Any objections to the rewritten text in considering g?

I don't see anyone opposing ‑‑ United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES of AMERICA: Thank you.

Is this the new considering g on Resolution 208?

>> CHAIR: Yes, United States.

>> UNITED STATES of AMERICA: I think for U we maybe want some clarification. Resolution 208 as specific to the Advisory Groups and Study Groups, and they have criteria about the qualifications that are ‑‑ that don't have the same applicability to the Council Working Groups. They're different. The types of group are different. We don't think it is appropriate to mix the two issues. We think this specific decision relates to the specific nature of the Council Working Group, so instead of sector groups, Advisory Groups, it is not an appropriate reference.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

U.K., you have the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you very much, Chair.

The U.K. has the same view that the reference to Resolution 208 is inappropriate here. Indeed, we're still looking at Resolution 208 in an Ad Hoc Group and there are aspects of that that are being proposed which the U.K. is uncomfortable with. I see no reason to refer to Resolution 208 in this text.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So I have separate requests for the floor. I have Nigeria, Ukraine, Brazil. I plan to close the list.

Are there any others wanting to take the floor on this point, item considering g? Okay.

The floor is closed. Nigeria, Ukraine, Brazil. I'll start with Nigeria.

Nigeria, you have the floor.

>> NIGERIA: Thank you, Chair.

I just wanted to draw your attention to the fact that the deleted g is not the same as the rewritten g. The deleted g is on Resolution 70, gender mainstreaming so that we don't miss that.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Nigeria. You're right. My notes ‑‑ it says that in my notes actually. We'll come back to that.

Let's stay with edit, the redline edits to the new item g here.

Ukraine, you have the floor.

>> UKRAINE: Thank you, Madam Chair.

We would also like to add our voice to the U.S. and U.K., we still are not considering Resolution 208. We have concerns of the same and we consider the mention of it here also is not appropriate.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Ukraine.

Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I'll be brief.

Brazil supports the same opinions shared by our distinguished colleagues from U.S., U.K. and Ukraine, and we believe that at this time we cannot mix the two different provisions from Resolution 208 and this resolution.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil.

So RCC, there is no support for including Resolution 208 in the decision 11.

I think Council has its own Rules of Procedure, and if you recall the Chairman of Council had been ‑‑ of the Council Working Groups had been in place for quite a long time and it was only in 2014 I believe that we decided to have some term limits regarding our Council Chairman and consistent with the Constitution that the Council can set their own Rules of Procedure. I would ‑‑ if you would agree that we not include this text. Thank you.

Russian Federation, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman.

We proposed amendments to this text in case there was no agreement to the Amendments we suggested and still suggest returning to the original text.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. We will not accept this text.

If I understood you correctly, we would agree to go back to item g, item g would stay as it was adopted in 2018, correct? All right.

Here's what we've done. Item g on the screen now that's Resolution 78 is restored. We're not deleting that. That's related to gender. Yes. The new item g proposed by RCC is not accepted and is ‑‑ if we could just put that in red so that we know that was not accepted.

Thank you.

Canada, do you need the floor for item g that ‑‑ if ‑‑ is it on item g? We did close the list on this one.

>> CANADA: Yes. Thank you.

I want to take the floor to apologize for being late. There are so many meetings at the same time, sometimes it is difficult to arrive on time for the important meeting of this Committee.

Just to briefly add our voices to previous speaker, in particular Brazil, you would know the position of Canada when we align with the previous intervention from Brazil.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Canada.

Algeria, is it a new point?

>> ALGERIA: Yes, Madam Chair.

Thank you.

So on Resolution 70, of course, I can see the relationship with that decision. Right. So from fairness perspective, I do agree at some point that this 208 roughly doesn't have relationship with this decision but of course, 70, we can conclude in the same lines. What's Resolution 70 have to do with this decision? From fairness perspective, I think we should treat the 20 and the 70 the same way.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Algeria, if you recall in our very first meeting, the ‑‑ Russia has ‑‑ RCC has withdrawn the deletion of item g. Item g was adopted by Plenipot in 2018.

With that, are you ‑‑ I would request that we continue, that we keep item g as it was adopted in PP‑2018 and we have the new one submitted by the RCC. Thank you.

Moving now to recognizing ‑‑ to the recognizing section of this resolution. There's a new word further. Any objection to including the word further? No objection. We would keep the word further.

Now moving to decides. Decides 2, any objection to the text in Decides 2.

Thank you. I see no objection to Decides 2. We'll keep that.

Now moving to Decides 5, those appear to be editorial changes. I think that the Editorial Committee will correct that.

Item 6, as we did not accept the insertion of Resolution 208 we will not insert the New Resolution 208 text here. That will be in line with the decision we just made.

Moving down to item 7. Any objection to including Advisory Groups in this list? That's accepted as well.

Now moving to decides 8, changing the interval to two terms of office between consecutive ‑‑ two terms of office. Any objection to including this text?

United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES of AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I was wondering if the RCC could clarify the intention with this. It seems like two terms between two consecutive Plenipotentiaries is likely not what they meant to say. Maybe they could clarify, please.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

RCC, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman.

Perhaps our colleagues could give a better wording in English, but at the moment the Chairman and Vice‑Chairman of the Working Groups can be appointed only for one term of office between Plenipotentiary Conferences. We suggest that we move to what we're doing in all other cases, which is give the possibility of two terms of office that maybe somebody that served for one term of office could go on to serve a second term of office. That's done with elected officials, it is done also with the Study Groups, with the Advisory Groups and with other types of groups. If this approach is accepted in principle, then if our colleagues could tell us how better to say this in good English, we would be grateful. What we're trying to do basically is to get all of the procedures aligned. I don't really understand why here it is that we should limit people to one term of office when in other places it is two. Because I have already retired, I can say this quite honestly, I don't need another term of office, I have had quite enough with 17 years of this. If we can accept this in principle, we would be grateful.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, RCC.

United States, does that address your question? U.S., you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES of AMERICA: I think that addresses my question.

Maybe the language could be better. If it is an interval between two Plenipotentiary, that's four year, two terms in a four‑year period is maybe not the right wording. So we may need to reflect on the wording of it.

>> CHAIR: Yes. I will put this ‑‑ and principle ‑‑ in principle, this is accepted. I if you look at Resolution 133 from Council, the idea was that the Council Working Group Chairs only have two terms of office. So if we could work on ‑‑ fix the text a little bit to reflect ‑‑ we're saying the same thing, it is just written in a way so that we can simplify it so we would do that.

In principle, it is accepted.

Item Decides 13, any objections to including this new text on item 13? We will accept that text as well.

Moving to Decides 14. Any objections to item 14? United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES of AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I think again if the RCC could clarify the intention behind this it seems that number 14 is just very plain that the Council shall consider the four‑year reports and submit the recommendations to the Plenipotentiary. I'm not sure subject to the appropriate decisions is supposed to mean.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, U.S.

RCC, yes, could you please explain this change?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman.

Well, in submission of the report was not required but we're not going to insist on having these words included. If everybody understands that each Study Group has the opportunity to provide the four‑year report, I don't have any issue.

I have had the experience when preparing with Conferences for submitting four‑year reports when it is said to me that it is not actually necessary although it is apparently required. If everybody, including the Secretariat understands that each Council Working Group has to submit the outcome of its work to the Plenipotentiary Conference, then fine, we're not going to insist on the inclusion of the proposed wording.

There is another point that we may take into account, that being that not all the groups provide reports to the Plenipotentiary Conference but any way, we're not going to insist on this point if everybody understands that each Council Working Group should report to the Plenipotentiary Conference.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, RCC.

My understanding is that all Council Working Groups, whether they're created by Plenipotentiary or by the Council, this language requires all of them to submit a report through Council to PP.

That is my understanding. I think that subject to the appropriate decision, I'm not sure that is required here, it starts to limit who does. Right now all of the Council Working Groups have to submit a report through Council to the PP. I don't think this text is required. You agree? You're shaking heads that we can delete?

Thank you for that.

What I would like to do is send this to a DT. Thank you very much.

Welcome back to our next meeting and if we could get it done this evening, it will be on our agenda so that we can send to the Editorial Committee after everyone gets an opportunity to see the text.

Okay. That is what we'll do.

Algeria, you have the floor Algeria.

>> ALGERIA: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair.

Briefly, on Decide 8, I want to go back if you allow? Decide 8, on two terms of office, so ‑‑ yes. Should not exceed two terms of office, and then we follow‑up that the period in office in one CWG does not count as a period of office in other CWG. Is the intention here to say that in total we will have two terms of office by the amendment of RCC? The paragraph, the amendment, the rest of the paragraph are ‑‑ the result would be more than two terms of office if one term of office, one CWG does not count for another CWG. I wanted to attract this attention. If the intention of RCC is to two terms of oft of office in total, we have to read the whole paragraph. It is fit with the new amendment.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Algeria.

Having some experience with this, serving with the Council Working Group, that's the intent. If you are, let's say, in office in the working ‑‑ in the Council Working Group FHR, that, after my two terms of office in Council Working Group on FHR that would not prevent me to chairing another Council Working Group and limited to two terms. That's the understanding of this text and that is ‑‑ I will say that we spent a lot of time discussing this in Council between 2014 and 2018.

That's the understanding.

I see Canada, you have requested the floor.

Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you, Algeria, for the question. Yeah. It needed your clarification, Madam Chair, and it is our understanding that the text as it is written on the screen, you can be the Chair of FHR for two consecutive years and then you are chairing another Council Working Group for two periods. That's the understanding. I think it is clear. Thank you for your explanation.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Canada. Yes.

Algeria, I would ‑‑ if this is okay with you, when I say we spend a lot of hours on this text, we spent a lot of hours. If you do not object, I would recommend that I work with the U.S. and RCC to correct the language here and bring it back as a DT.

Thank you.

United States. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES of AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Because you mentioned Resolution  1333, the text ‑‑ the original text in number 8 is what is in 1333. I think it is still just to make sure we have clarification on what the proposed edits from RCC mean, it is a change from what is in 1333. I think we may have the same idea, just to make sure. I think offline conversations could help. I think there is still some clarity on what that would mean for the previous arrangement.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

It is ‑‑ it is my understanding of our discussions here today, it is that the Council Working Group Chair would stand for two terms, that's it. Would not prevent a Council Working Group Chair for standing for another Council Working Group for two terms. It is just to make the text ‑‑ have more clarity. I know that this will require an edit to 1333 when we go back to Council. Thank you very much.

With that, I declare we have closed discussion on Decision 11. I will ask the Secretariat to work offline to get the language, have clarity of the language and then we'll bring this back as a DT for a meeting tomorrow.

Thank you very much.

We have once again, completed our agenda.

Thank you all.

We're moving really full steam ahead on addressing the issues that have been delegated to Com 6.

I would ask for Resolution 30, is India in the room? I will work with those Member States that have input on Resolution 30. I would really like to close this out. Had it on our agenda for a couple of meetings now. If we could get together and work on completing this so that we could send it to the Editorial Committee that would be great.

The only question from our previous meeting from last week is item 212. Can I ask U.S. and Canada and Arab States where are we on Resolution 212?

U.S., you have the floor U.S.

>> UNITED STATES of AMERICA: I think we had been tasked with informal conversations with the Arab Group and U.S., Canada, to see how we could take the proposed revisions to 212 and take into account some of the concerns that were expressed in the meeting and those conversations still continue. I think we were able to listen carefully to some concerns expressed and also to recognize that there are some questions on the financial implications or the indirect costs to the building. We hope to come back to probably not tomorrow but the meeting afterwards with some text for consideration and we will do our best to coordinate with all of those who have expressed interest in this topic.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States, for that readout.

With that, again, for the other topics ‑‑ sorry, Deputy Secretary‑General, you have the floor.

>> MALCOLM JOHNSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I have been asked a few more questions of clarification, I provided quite a few if you recall at the first session of Com 6, the last time this issue was discussed.

Since then, I was asked a few other points for clarification. Perhaps I could make Committee 6 aware. The question I received was the 2 million related to the new building, is that only for the AV/IT equipment, and that is correct, it is only for the AV/IT equipment. However, I would like to point out that it sounds like we need a new building. I would like to point out, if you can hear me, that even if we didn't have a new building we would need most of that money in any case to update the current equipment, AV equipment in Geneva, which is becoming rapidly out of date.

The other question was where's the money coming from for the furniture. The fixed furniture is coming from the loan as was agreed; mobile furniture, which is not covered by the loan is estimated to cost 1.5 million, and that will come from the new building fund which is currently 5 million.

The money is already there.

Also, there was a question regarding what is the current status of the agreement in the Council on the future of the current Popov Room, that's found in Council 2019 summary record, that's C119/120. That clarifies the status of the room as being part of the future and sale condition.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Deputy Secretary‑General.

Any questions ‑‑ if I understand, U.S., we should not put this on our agenda on Tuesday. We'll come back on Wednesday.

Any other questions regarding Resolution 212 before ‑‑ if so, please take the floor now. I plan to close the list.

I have Kuwait and I have Russian Federation, I have the Russian Federation, I have Algeria. With that, I'm closing the list on Resolution 212. Okay.

Kuwait, you have the floor.

>> KUWAIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I would like some clarification, please, with regards to the proposal that's been given by CITEL, what will happen with regard to this proposal? There was a proposal to form a group or a Committee to look at this from a financial perspective, I don't know what Committee 6 has reached with regards to this. I know there is a formal group from the Arab Group and the American group to discuss this proposal and I would like to have more clarification, please, with regards to this issue.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Kuwait.

If you recall, there was no support to forming that Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 212. What we have done, the proponents from Canada and U.S., as well as the Arab Group have been discussing this informally. As of now, there is no group and it is still in informal discussions.

Also now I will give the floor to the Russian Federation. Thank you.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman.

Yes, we would like to have some confirmation, please, of how we're working the questions. At our last meeting, if I recall correctly, we agreed we would provide a little time to Canada, United States and the Group of Arab States so that they could provide some kind of general approach to us, after that we were going to discuss the general approach. I would like to remind you that the Russian Federation, speaking on behalf of the RSS did provide participants of their proposals by text, to the participants in the consultations, and we would like to know from the U.S., Canada, the Arab States whether they looked at them, whether they're going to invite us to the informal consultations or how they intend to deal with the questions that stand between us.

We would be happy to carry on to become involved in the discussion of this question as and however it is going to be discussed.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia, on behalf of RCC. Yes.

There is a proposal that you made on the floor that's not been discussed yet, as you rightly indicated. The U.S. and Canada and the Arab Group are still discussing it informally, once they discuss informally they were going to bring it back to Com 6 for discussion. That's not occurred yet. So we're waiting for those informal discussions to take place and then it looks as if this will be on the agenda based on the input from the United States on our agenda for Wednesday. The intent is to have the discussions on 212 in Com 6.

Thank you.

Algeria, you have the floor.

>> ALGERIA: I think we discussed in the last Council session, on the 24th of September while the external auditor was presenting its report and we flagged all the risks that the external auditor has mentioned, specifically the risks that may affect the attractiveness of the tower, the risks with the finances obtained for the construction and also some aspects related to the surface, et cetera.

So we also believe that this topic is being well considered under Council and we as Deputy Secretary‑General last time mentioned, that we echo, the fact that this can be well undertaken in existing platforms and we do believe that what we can say, it is that there is attention to the risks mentioned by the external auditor and the discussions and the response from the Secretariat on that. This can be done with Council and the way in which we see it is better for this topic.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the comment. They are the same comments made when this topic was introduced. U.S. and Canada and the Arab States, you can see that there is lots of interest in your informal discussions. My understanding from your summary, it is that we will be able to discuss this on Wednesday.

Please confirm. Thank you.

>> UNITED STATES of AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you for the additional time. Yes, we will ‑‑ we Noel target for having some text to discuss on Wednesday.

I thank those who have made their comments. We are taking those into consideration in order to find a consensus way forward to respond to all of the concerns raised. We expect to have some language that takes that into account and also for conversation on Wednesday.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

So I want to thank everyone. We will discuss this on Wednesday. I'll make sure that we have adequate time to do so.

I will work with the U.S., Canada and the Arab States to see if we need to make sure that that's in a DT so we all have it.

Thank you.

With that, let's see ‑‑ all right. I'm going to put out a request again, is India in the room so that we can perhaps finalize our discussion on Resolution 30? India?

Kuwait, you have the floor.

>> KUWAIT: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Can you tell us what is the next date for the next informal consultations on Resolution 212? Kuwait would like to attend these informal consultations. I'm sure you know that we put forward a proposal on this and we would like to participate in these consultations. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kuwait.

I do not know the next ‑‑ as this is informal discussions, I have not actually inserted myself nor the Secretariat into these informal discussions. U.S., please reach out to Kuwait and let them know when you are having these informal discussions.

Thank you very much.

Algeria, you have the floor.

>> ALGERIA: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair.

Two questions, when the IMAC informal discussion will take place and also I think we have Draft New Resolution on finance resource and I wonder if this document will be allocated to Com 6, is that planned to be discussed this week, next week? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Algeria.

We're planning to have discussions on financial matters tomorrow and this was ‑‑ this is part of the discussion. We had to wait until after internal discussions with leadership before we can discuss Decision 5 and those proposals related to Decision 5. The idea is to discuss those tomorrow afternoon.

As for the IMAC document contribution DT on Resolution 162, I'm not sure, you may not have been in the room, but the one question that was an overarching question was the ‑‑ there was no objection to increasing the number of IMAC to 6, so that will be done.

We have agreed that I will take the edits from the Regional Groups and present a new document to the focal points for discussion.

I'm hoping to have that done tonight and present it to the focal points.

With that, we have actually completed our agenda once again.

We are going ‑‑ we have 20 minutes left. I'm going to end the meeting here so that will give some time to create the DTs and make edits to the documents that are going to be on our agenda for the next ‑‑ for our next meeting tomorrow.

With that, if there is no other requests for the floor, this meeting is adjourned.

Thank you.

Sorry. The new room ‑‑ I will give the floor to our secretary to indicate what room the discussion will take place at 4:30. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much. The next meeting of the Working Group on Resolution 48 is at 4:30 in the Constantin Room.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I really appreciate, I understand that there are a few square brackets and I think that we could come to an agreement and that could be on our agenda as well.

All right. Did I see Mr. Johnson, Deputy Secretary‑General, would you like the floor again? No. Okay. I don't have any other requests for the floor. Thank you very much. I appreciate your cooperation. Again, thank you so much for all your hard work in our group and I will see you tomorrow.

Thank you. Bye‑bye.

(Committee 6 concluded at 15:40 EEST)
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