

FINISHED FILE

ITU WORLD TELECOMMUNICATION DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE 2017
BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA

18 OCTOBER, 2017
09:30 LOCAL TIME

COM 4

Services Provided By:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-482-9835
www.captionfirst.com

This text is being provided in a rough draft format.
Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in
order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a
totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

>> CHAIR: Good morning, colleagues. I ask you please to
proceed to your seats in order to start our meeting. Good
morning, colleagues, I would like to welcome you all to the
fourth meeting of com 4, I would like to bring attention to
Document DT/8 which have the clusters you are going to tackle in
this session. I would like to start with the output ad hoc
group on resolution 2. We will postpone the output of ad hoc
group and resolution 1 to be the last in our session today, so
as you remember, I had requested the Vice Chair to Chair the ad
hoc group to come up with a skeleton of what the revised
resolution 2 could look like based on the contributions
received.

I understand that he had also received the study questions
from Com 3. These revised study questions were passed to the ad
hoc for consideration. I invite Mr. Adel to share with us the
results of this group which can be found in Document DT/60. Mr.
Abdel, you have the floor.

>> Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, and good morning,
friends and colleagues we have had the ad hoc meeting of
resolution 2 yesterday afternoon and we could have gone through
most of the issuing pending from the previous meeting. In the
Document we have completed all of the issues related to the main

body of the resolution. We have agreement on the text in that resolution. We have also had had a look at Annex 1 which talks about the scope and in line with the questions that I had received yesterday afternoon from Com 3, we have also updated some of this scope of work for the Study Groups. We have looked at the questions that were sent to us as well by Com 3 and we have allocated those questions under the Study Groups. I would like to point out that because the structure or mainly areas of focus under of the Study Groups have not changed a lot so the structure of the questions more or less is not very different from where they were last period. We have a few issues that are still between square brackets, Mr. Chair, and I would like to bring back to Com 4 for probably further discussion if we can proceed with that.

One of the issues was mainly related to working parties. We had a lot of discussions about working parties. Due to time constraints I could not reach consensus on the issue of working parties. We have different views in the room and, therefore, I have asked the delegates that were concerned with the issue of having or not working parties to get together and have an informal discussion about that to be presented here in com 4 and whether a decision has been reached. Mainly the delegates were United Arab Emirates, United States who have had issues about this and I have asked them all with the other members as well to have an informal discussion to update us about this.

We also have an issue regarding the definition of persons with disabilities and persons with special needs. I do understand, Mr. Chair, that we have already addressed this in the com 4, we had a bit of discussion again in the ad hoc, but I have left the text in and I would like to bring to your attention and the meeting's attention that whatever the definition of the text we agree to be used for this should be aligned across the board. So whatever your committee decides is the right phrase should be adopted here. I believe both in the scope of the work and in the question that's related to this, because we found that probably the question is missing the word persons with special needs. So if that needs to be updated, I would ask your meeting here to kindly have a look at it and decide on the right way forward. Thank you Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Adel, for your efforts and for all delegates who participated in the ad hoc group. So we have a few pending issues that we need to settle and decide on in our meeting today being the last meeting. So I would like to start with the first square brackets. I believe it's in the title with respect to the principle of having working parties. Let me

start by saying is it possible to take out the square brackets to include the working parties?

I'm not sure if you can hear me, but the system is booting again, so we just wait for the applications to restart.

Apologies for this technical issue. We need to have the system showing the list of requested speakers, so if we two minutes. Dear colleagues, as we have a technical problem, I would like to apologize for that. We have a few issues pending. I requested if we could maintain the wording between the square brackets in the title which is stating that they are working parties. You have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to all fellow colleagues. Actually I requested the floor before you request to this subject. I know from the briefing that we had Mr. Dr. Adel, the chair of the ad hoc committee, that there are two issues pending from the discussion. The first is related to the inclusion of the working parties and the second one is with the wording using the specific needs. So I think we maybe start with the second one, because it is the easiest one. I was the person involved in the discussion of the question and Mr. Babu's committee and they advised we use the same wording that we already agreed in the working of the plenary committee where we approved a strategy. So basically we only have to copy paste the text as it was agreed in the working party committee.

So we use, so I heard that there was a compromise and agree text, we may be referred to what was agreed in the strategy and with that I will proceed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jordan. I was going over the square bracketed text, I see we have four in this proposal, but we can tackle the working parties if you anticipate will maybe take a longer discussion. So I will start second with the phrase using the terminology of using persons with disabilities or persons with special needs. If we can align the text that has been agreed during the discussion of the Com 3, I would like to ask Mr. Adel if you could point out to the specific Paragraphs in this resolution so we could insert exactly the text that has been agreed with respect to the terminology or the expression used for this, Mr. Adel. You have the floor.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chair. In relation to this particular issue as you can see there is a text highlighted on the screens, and that is the text in accordance with the scope of work that we had agreed in the ad hoc of Com 4, and this was in line with the discussion as far as I'm aware that happened in the Com 3 here as well. If you look at the question that came from Com 3,

question 7.1, it's more or less the same text, but it reads, access to telecommunication ICT services by persons with disabilities and with specific needs.

Now, as far as my understanding is of the discussion that the actual agreement that we have in the committee was persons with disabilities and persons with specific needs. And when I saw the difference in the text, I was wondering which one was the one we should use and hence I am back to the com here to seek your advice on the appropriate terminology whether it is persons with disabilities and with specific needs and is it persons with disabilities and persons with specific needs, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Adel. If we can go back to the Paragraph there, so I would propose access to telecommunication/ICT services by persons with disabilities and persons with specific needs. Is that acceptable?

>> Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and good morning to all colleagues. Yes, the text as appears Mr. Chairman is acceptable to us so it should read as persons with disabilities and other persons with specific needs to be in line with the discussions and agreement at the Working Group of the plenary when we discussed strategic plan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for this clarification. So we will accept this as it's showing on the screen. So it's persons with disabilities and other persons with specific needs. Thank you very much. So I would like to move on to question --

>> Excuse me, Mr. Chair, I would like to clarify, if you look through the Document, you can find four square bracketed text as you mentioned earlier on, just to clarify the status of these. The first two square brackets are related to the working parties as we have mentioned. The second two square brackets are, one of them is just a comment just to indicate that as requested by Com 3 we have managed in our ad hoc to merge questions 6.2 and 6.8, and this is something that we managed to do in our committee, and the other one is also a text that came to us in square brackets for Com 3, and it's related to the inclusion of OTT in one of the questions and we decided to leave it in square brackets to be addressed in line with other discussions on OTT in Com 3. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Adel for this clarification. So I would like to go to question 4/1. The first square bracket is including next generation networks, so I would like to ask if there are any comments. I will start by the agreement to remove the square brackets including next generation networks. Oman, you have the floor.

>> OMAN: Thank you, Chairman. I just have a clarification. I need a clarification. I have worked in the past with Mr. Babu in Com 3 on those questions and we did agree on moving this part of the sentence about OTT and IM services from question 1 to question 4, but I see that this is missing in the Paragraph. I have tried to see where would it incorporate that in question 2 and we are not there either. We have also to check this question about 4.1, because 4.1 is about economic issues and not about policy and organizational matters, so I would like to seek clarification because we did not mention everything here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Oman. The ad hoc received the questions from Com 3, so that discussion took place during the ad hoc Chaired by Mr. Babu. So I'm not sure even if I give the floor to the Chair of the ad hoc group in resolution he will be able to answer this. So regarding that it's a policy question, I'm not sure if it's, if it has been discussed to be clustered, so I just need a very quick comment from the Chair of the ad hoc group and then we will go with respect to the square brackets. We are very short of time. This is our last session so we need to proceed quickly.

>> Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, as you can see from the Document, the questions we have discussed and agreed upon are highlight in yellow and as question 4 as square brackets in it, we thought that the discussion in that was not completed in Com 3 and, therefore, we did not discuss anything about question 4.1. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Then we will decide in question 4/1 wording and we will see if we need to move it to the other Study Group. So, again, I am putting the request to the floor with respect to the first square bracket including next generation networks. Germany, you have the floor.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning. I'm a little bit confused now. The questions that dwell within an ad hoc group or several ad hoc groups of Com 3 and this includes the text. What does it -- does it really make sense in Com 4 to decide about the title if at the end there is a danger that the title doesn't correspond to the rest of the text of the question? So I think with regard to the questions, we should leave it to this group of Com 3 to give us whatever is the final conclusion, at least I don't feel very comfortable if you discuss records in the title of questions in our committee. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Germany. Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chairman. I would like to say that

during the meeting of Com 3 yesterday, we have had a discussion about a number of questions and I think that these questions have been discussed as the delegate from Oman has specified, but maybe the conclusions and outcomes of the discussions were not sent to the ad hoc group because the ad hoc group was meeting at the same time. So maybe we have to inquire about what happened in the plenary yesterday after Com 3. These issues were really discussed, yet the reports and the contents have not been sent to the ad hoc group maybe because of the prior meeting that was taking place. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: I would like to thank the Kingdom of Jordan.
New Zealand.

>> NEW ZEALAND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, with regards to the OTT issue, we think that it has been deleted from question 1 and it has to be incorporated in question 4 because question 4 is about economic aspects and policy matters. So the proposal, Mr. Chairman, was to keep the OTT in question 1, and then move into the economic and policy matters in question 4 and dwell on that aspect, but keeping the sentence in the question 4, I think, we have a problem with that, Mr. Chairman. And we hope that this will be reviewed and addressed once again.

We are not sure whether this committee can discuss this issue or whether this issue better be discussed under Com 3. So can we ask about the terms of reference of our committee whether it can look into the contents of questions or not. Com 3 has to look into these questions so please advise. And I think that OTT is a very, very important issue for Developing Countries, and it's not only about economic and policy matters. That is why I would rather keep it under question 1, but if you want to delete it from question 4, this may be better for us to review our position but for us it's better to keep it under question 1. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Actually I'm trying to ease the work for the plenary as much as possible not to send a square bracketed text, but listening to the interventions and the responsibilities I mandate and for the sake of time I would say we put the question 4/1 as it is in square brackets, the complete question, and we move on. So it will be tackled maybe in the next meeting of Com 3 if there is an agreement with respect to the question it will be reflected automatically in Annex 2 in this resolution. So with that I would like to ask delegates if this is acceptable. Who is requesting the floor on this particular item? If that is acceptable we will move to the next square bracket.

Oman.

>> OMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to add

that maybe my observation was not fully understood. We have already agreed to move this issue to the third question, 3/1 and not 4/1, so we had discussion and we agreed on moving certain aspects to 3/1.

>> CHAIR: It will fall on the same arguments that our mandate is we are responsible to change or amend the question itself as it's the mandate of Com 3. So I would suggest to move forward and put question 4/1 in square brackets and move on. ATDI?

>> ATDI: Thank you. Good morning. There was a conversation between Com 3 and Com 4. We proposed that the Secretariat would harmonize the titles of all of the questions to hear them from Com 3 on the questions, and we approved them in Com 3. So the Secretariat will harmonize the titles and you don't have to put square brackets, detail or not, the Secretariat will complete it off line. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, ATDI, for your comments. Actually, this is what we received from Com 3, the Chair of the ad hoc group received question 4/1 as shown on the screen. United Arab Emirates briefly, please, because we need to move forward.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Very brief, after the explanation from the Distinguished Delegate from Oman, I think we can move forward by putting square brackets on question 3 as well, and until this issue is clarified, and then we can come back to you and we can discuss at Com 3 as well and come back to you. This is my proposal not to put square brackets not only on question 4, but question 3 as well until we get clarifications on where the issues on OTTs will be addressed among those different questions. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United Arab Emirates. Togo.

>> TOGO: Thank you, Chairman, and good morning, everyone. I think that you already addressed this issue as regards the debate we are having in Com 3 because during plenary yesterday of Com 3 we handled this issue and we are going -- there are going to be ad hoc meetings about these questions. I don't think that this meeting was held. It's been put off until the Com 3 meeting at half past 11:00 so I think we are going to hear back on this especially with regard to 4/1 11:30. So there is no need to discuss this title of this question in this particular meeting now. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Togo. I totally agree, and we could leave question 3/1, 4/1, whatever is decided by Com 3 we will take it and insert it in this Annex with no further

discussion in Com 4. United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to say that I don't -- I believe that question 3 was already approved in committee last evening, and so I don't think that unfortunately we cannot put it in brackets now. You can correct me if I'm wrong, but if we could clarify, my understanding was it was already approved and is now final. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United States. Actually whatever is going to be decided in Com 3 even after this meeting with respect to the questions, it has to be reflected accordingly in Annex 2 of this resolution. So maybe I go back to comments by ATDI that we are going to be in Com 3, it is the mandate of Com 3. If Com 3 decides that question X or Y is approved, it will be maintained no exchange in Annex 2. If there is any update through the Secretariat, we will just copy the approved questions by Com 3 and we will insert it in Annex 2. With that, I would like to move to the next square bracket in this Document. Jordan, you have the floor briefly, please.

>> JORDAN: Yes, briefly, Mr. Chairman. This committee has to approve the resolution with all of its Annexes, we request not approve now the resolution, and we don't have a complete Annex. It's not a matter of editorial things, we have to see the Annexes with the questions and the location of that, and we need to approve the Document in this committee. So if the result of the Com 3 working was not perfectly prepared and submitted to this committee, so maybe you can postpone the discussion on resolution 2 until we have a complete Document in order to approve in this committee. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jordan. Indeed, what we are going to do in this Com 4, we will approve resolution 2 to be sent to the plenary for the final approval. Whatever text that we can approve, we will put forward any questions that is building in Com 3. That means we cannot approve the whole Document and give recommendations to the plenary to approve the whole Document with no further discussion. So what I suggest is that we do our best to approve the possible text on this resolution.

We get the feedback from Com 3 getting to know that Com 3 had another session after the conclusion of ad hoc resolution 2, and maybe this was the confusion that there was an update not reflected. We will leave it to Com 3 as its mandate to decide on the questions. What we will do will reflect these questions. I agree that we have to cluster them either in Study Group 1 or 2. If there were any comments, we could bring it to, in my

report to the plenary. That's the way I see moving forward taking into account this is our last session.

Bahrain, you have the floor.

>> BAHRAIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I would like to point out one last thing as Chair of the ad hoc for resolution 2. If you look at the questions, even the questions that we did not have approved text on yet, we have allocated them under the appropriate Study Group. So, therefore, that makes our job much easier. So when Com 3 does actually decide on the actual text, it wouldn't be far away from the current text or the discussions of the elements of the current questions which means that the structure as is in resolution 2 without the actual final text should be enough for us to move ahead with the work that we have here. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Adel, for your explanation. For that we would like to move to, it seems to be the one before our last square bracket which is question 4/2. May I ask the Chair, Mr. Adel, to enlighten us with respect to this square bracket.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chair. As part of the discussions we had last night, this question as far as I'm aware is not completely finalized in Com 3 so we postponed the question as well and left it in the structure as is. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Germany, you have the floor.

>> GERMANY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. This discussion on the square bracket is one issue, but after you close it, probably I have no chance to speak on resolution 2 core text as such. We are very disappointed as Germany that the issue we brought forward at several locations of this Conference in other meetings of the Union that the issue of duplication of work in particular between Study Groups of the different sectors is not mentioned at all in this resolution. We reserve the right to have probably a statement of this particular problem. There is a plenary meeting of the Conference. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Germany. So after listening to. So I would suggest to deal with it with the previous two questions. We will have the final input from as it is from Com 3. So with that, I would like to go to the first square bracket which is on the principle of establishing working parties. I would like to open the floor for any comments on that. ATDI.

>> ATDI: Thank you, Chairman. We didn't have the possibility to participate in Com 4 or the meeting so we couldn't express our view. Our view is that today after many

years of work we know what Study Group 1, Study Group 2, and we know what are questions. In ITU-R, the working parties are very, very efficient and work for many years. The moment that we will insert the working parties into our work, it will make confusion not only in ITU-D, but also in ITU-R. In ITU-R we held that the statements collide and we don't know where to put them, and now that we should have another situation like working parties, the separation of work between the working parties and between the question and between the rapporteurs, they will have questions like most resolutions, most of the resolutions the question but resolution 9 has no question.

So to our view, working party will provide more confusion and more overlap of work so our view that we have to continue work of the last years and only working party that was active, only questions from them. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you ATDI, Togo.

>> TOGO: Thank you very much, Chairman. It is true that we began discussions on the need of having working parties within Study Group 1. My intervention is not on that debate, however. It's on the fact of wanting to include that in the title which is shown. No matter what the outcome is of our discussion on this subject, whether it's addressed again or not, I would encourage it not to be included in the title shown because the questions are allocated to Study Groups. No matter what the organisation is of the work after that the questions are allocated to Study Groups so we would really suggest that this be removed from the title. As I said, I am only addressing the issue of the title for the moment. I am not going to talk about the outcome of this discussion on whether or not there is a need to have working parties. Thank you very much, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much Togo. I think this is a wise intervention. With respect to the title, we could maintain the title as it is, and we tackle the idea of having the Working Group, the working parties in the body of the resolution itself. So may I have the agreement of the floor to maintain the title without the square brackets? Questions assigned by WTDC to ITU-D Study Groups. I hope this is acceptable. United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And thanks to my colleagues that have intervened on the issue of working parties. Mr. Chairman, when we have a different view with regards to the organisation of work, we believe by introducing working parties this would organize the work of the Study Groups, and secondly, Mr. Chairman, why we have introduced working parties in the title of Annex 2, we are

talking about Annex 2 to resolution 2 is because the Arab group proposed to have working parties within Annex 2 which unfortunately is not reflected in this Document, Mr. Chairman. So we had the title for each working party and we have grouped the questions according to that.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, we had some informal discussions yesterday with a number of colleagues. And there was an issue raised with regards to the working parties that there might be parallel meetings, and also meetings might be conducted without interpretation or translation, and also that there might be additional days for working parties which will imply financial cost. After the discussion we showed them that this is not the aim behind this, and we can reflect that in this resolution to say working parties will not meet in parallel. There are no financial implications from introducing working parties, no additional meetings is foreseen by introducing working parties and no additional days of meetings. So this captured the concerns of a number of colleagues that was expressed yesterday. We had some informal discussion, as I said.

We were discussing the idea of having working parties only during the rapporteur group meetings, not during the Study Group meeting. So this was not discussed with other colleagues, so if possible, Mr. Chairman, we can have such discussion informally with a number of colleagues and see if we can reflect this in the text of resolution 2 and move forward if it's acceptable. So the proposal is as follows, that in this resolution we indicate that there are no overlap or no parallel meetings for the working parties. Second question, second text to be inserted that there are no financial implications by introducing working parties. Third thing, there is no additional days required for meetings, and by introducing working parties, we will not reduce the time allocated for each question.

And since now we have reduced the number of questions, I don't think we will have an issue with that. So and there are no additional meetings foreseen from introducing working parties so those are the main concerns that were expressed yesterday in the informal discussion with a number of colleagues, so if you capture this and then the idea of having, introducing working parties only at the cluster of the rapporteur group meetings not the Study Group. So maybe we can elaborate on this idea here, or if you prefer, Mr. Chairman, we can have informal discussion with colleagues.

And also there was an idea or proposal to have it on a trial basis until the next Conference and not necessarily both Study Groups. So we are very flexible, Mr. Chairman, with

regards to working parties unless we implement this in this study period, implement it fully, and what I mean by fully is give the appropriate terms of reference or the appropriate work to the working party, not like this study period where the working party was only facilitated, was not doing any work, was not second management layer as such compared to the other sectors.

So with that explanation, Mr. Chairman, if you agree, maybe we can have informal discussion with the colleagues who are interested on this topic to find a way forward with regard to working parties, and come back to you. I know this is your last meeting, but, Mr. Chairman, we are in your hands to decide on how we move forward with regards to this resolution. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United Arab Emirates, for your explanations about the needs and necessity for the working parties. Also in terms of the extra, I would say, expenses that might be allocated being that these working parties will be meeting back to back with the Study Groups, however, due to the time constraint and receiving the questions the cluster as is from the ad hoc group for this Study Group 1 and Study Group 2, the way forward that I suggest, let's accept this without the working parties and we will have the informal discussion as requested by United Arab Emirates.

If that informal, there is an agreement to include working parties in Annex 2 and we allocate some of the questions in the working parties in Annex 2, we could reflect that very quickly in the plenary, and not to take time from the plenary. So if that's acceptable, because we have only 30 minutes and we were starting late due to technical issues and we need to move forward. We still have the ad hoc resolution 1. Cote D'Ivoire.

>> COTE D'IVOIRE: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, everyone, we requested the floor 15 minutes ago. Thank you for having given us the floor now. With regard to the title we would like to support Togo's proposal to keep the title as it was removing these new references. Now, with regard to the working parties, the Africa Group expressed its concerns already with regard to the fact that there shouldn't be more meetings planned. The issue of translation in this new organizational structure with working parties and the fact that there should not be parallel meetings during these meetings. We would also like to recall that resolution 1 mentions that Study Groups have the possibility given the work that they are undertaking to create working parties if they think it is necessary.

We just heard from the delegate of the United Arab Emirates

who mentioned that there had been steps taken to ensure that there be translation in the working parties, that there would not be financial implications on these meetings and that there could be a discussion. We favor this informal discussion so that we can be certain that our concerns are taken into account because we as the African states would like to effectively participate in all of these ad hoc meetings. We are in favor of having an informal meeting and discussing what is on the table. So we reserve the right to return to this issue on the working parties. Thank you very much, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Cote D'Ivoire. I see the list is growing, so we need to move forward and in order for me to give speakers the mic, I ask in a timely manner, I ask our colleagues to be very brief when taking the mic due to the time. So I have Jordan, Brazil, U.K., Russian Federation and I would like to close the list. Any more questions for the floor? Jordan, Brazil, U.K., Russian Federation, United States. Okay. The list is closed. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, and briefly. The reason why the Arab group introduced the working parties in the title of Annex 2 is to be in consistency with the resolve part of this resolution. If you move from resolve 2, it says that each Study Group and their related groups will study the question adopted by this Conference and assigned to it in accordance with the structure shown in Annex 2. So basically this Annex 2 should show the structure for the question not only allocated to the Study Groups, but relevant to groups, which means that they are working parties.

So this Annex should not describe how we locate the question only to the Study Group, but we need to describe how we are looking to their sub groups. This is why it is important to keep this reference in the title. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair. In the Brazilian opinion, the structure of working parties, it's our opinion that it should be some mechanism to improve the time that each of the questions inside each of the working parties would have. For that, we think it would be beneficial to have parallel sessions so that, so to allow more time for each of the questions. But we understand that this is dealt in resolution 1, and if in resolution 1 we do not have parallel sessions for working parties and for the questions, we feel that as Brazil we wouldn't need to have working parties be set up because it would be next level of coordination and management, and for us the

benefit of working parties resides more on allowing questions to have more time for their discussion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Brazil. U.K.

>> ROMANIA: Thank you, Chair. It's actually Romania. I don't know why its U.K.. I'm speaking on behalf of the European countries. We would also support the deletion of the mentioning of working parties in the title of the Annex. We believe that the Study Groups have the opportunity to create their own working parties. It is not necessarily a decision of the WTDC. It can be a decision of the Study Groups to have their working parties, the allocation of work. We don't believe that there is a need for a new layer of management, of micro management in the Study Groups. We can also see that there are fewer questions for the study period, so we don't see the necessity for arranging them differently in working parties. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Romania, and my apologies, I wasn't reading correctly from the screen. Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. We would like to support the creation of working parties in the framework of the Study Groups of the development sector of the ITU. We believe that there is a need to implement working parties. It is a good way of increasing the effectiveness of work on documents which are sent to the meetings on various issues and also on documents which are liaison statements from other sectors.

We also believe that implementing the structure of working parties allows the structure of the development sector to become more like the structure in other sectors. So it will be more understandable for those delegated who are coming from Developing Countries and want to participate in the work of the radio sector and the standardisation sector. The unification of procedures in this case would allow people to clearly understand the link between Study Groups, working parties, and rapporteur groups.

We would also like to note that this decision will not lead to an increase in the budget or an increase in the number of days for meetings to be held, because we just like delegates from the Arab countries believe that establishing working parties is only required for the time in which the rapporteur group meetings are held in those two weeks. We believe that working parties will allow us to assist in the work of the rapporteurs and also will help Chairs of the Study Groups in their work too. Now, as regards the proposal on the title of

Annex 2 to resolution 2, we believe that this decision should be taken in accordance with results and if we believe it's required that we continue our formal discussions on this issue, we can come back to the square brackets later. Thank you very much, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation. United States, our last speaker.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We would associate ourselves with previous speakers from Togo, Brazil, ADTI, and CPT. We are amenable to having a further discussion about this, but I would say briefly they want the procedures that are applicable to the D sector take into account the specific outputs that are being released in this sector. And we don't believe that the structure should serve any other purpose than to promote optimal results from the sector, and other things like, you know, unification is fine, but unification has to be appropriate, and we don't want, we are not trying to just, you know, create additional layers for no particular reason. So we need to know exactly how. Finally, Mr. Chairman, there needs to be interpretation in these groups and translation, and so it's not clear to me why this is not going to have a financial implication.

So with that, thank you very much for giving us the floor.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States. With that in order for me to move forward with this and have my report to the plenary submitted as much as possible with agreed and complete work with respect to resolution 2, I would suggest again to agree on this resolution without reflecting explicitly the working parties' issue, and with respect to results too that each Study Group number 2, let's state that each Study Group and their relevant groups will study. I think that's still maintained valid even if we take out the working parties because the Study Groups could establish working parties during the meeting.

It's not mandated to be coming from the WTDC. So the flexibility is there. So we could maintain results too as it is. And for the time being due to the time constraint, we will move forward with resolution without reflecting the working parties for the time being. Informal consultation will be carried. If there is an agreement, it will be reflected in the plenary very quickly. I hope this is acceptable. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We would like to support your way forward to resolve this issue, and in order to degrees on that, we need to use the same text as was

used in resolve 2 in Annex 2. We need to start each statement by saying that Study Group 1 and the relevant groups will study the following question and this will be applicable to Study Group 2. If you want to be consistent with the language of the resolve part, so this will be clear for everyone that this question is only not for the subject of study for Study Group 1, but as well for the group which can be working parties established by the Study Group. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. I would like to conclude the discussion on this. I will try last attempt to take into account the comments made by Jordan on the proposal. Is it acceptable to include in the title of Study Group, Study Group 1 and its relevant groups or exactly where it was in resolve 2 and its relevant groups? Is that acceptable? I hope this is acceptable and we move forward. Cote D'Ivoire.

>> COTE D'IVOIRE: Thank you, Chair. Chair, if you look at the title we are talking of allocating questions, not the -- I think, therefore, the questions have already been assigned to the Study Groups and that the ITU activities we can, therefore, place these the Working Group and the working parties can also study this. So we shouldn't talk about assigning questions in this title, and not the study of questions. Therefore, my first suggestion is to have questions assigned by the relevant Conference ITU Study Groups is valuable even if we look at resolve 2. So it's to insure that we are compatible. Therefore, we should remove relevant groups. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Cote D'Ivoire. What I suggest is to put it in square bracket and we just move forward. I see requests for the floor. It seems that there will be further discussion on this. So it is going to be in square brackets and we can delete and it's relevant groups which we just inserted. Thank you very much. With that, I would like again to thank Mr. Adel for his efforts and all of the delegates to participated in the ad hoc group. Now, I would like to move to resolution 32. This is a very quick one. We just learned that Com 3 agreed on resolution 17 and recommended resolution 32 to be suppressed. So Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm sorry for my intervention. So I tried to -- I push the button so many times not to mention our delegation, just a confirmation, and just that I can make comment for resolution 2 about the working party and thank you very much for the explanation from the Arab states. I believe we need more further discussion for the study of the working party on the Study Groups, however, according to resolution 1 the Study Groups may set up the working party that

is clearly mentioned on the resolution 1. And consequently we don't need to take more time for discussion, but the working party is pertinent in WTDC, thank you very much. And that is my intervention. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Japan, and as I stated it will be in square brackets and further discussion will take place and we will see how we settle this in the plenary. So going back to resolution 32, I seek your agreement to suppress resolution 32 based on the output from Com 3 and the agreement that took place in the discussion of resolution 17 and the recommended suppression of resolution 32.

Is that acceptable? Thank you very much. Resolution 32 is suppressed. Now, I would like to move to resolution 59. I request my colleague from the Russian Federation to -- oh, before that, sorry, my apologies, before resolution 59, I would like first to tackle the ad hoc group in resolution 21. I requested the Russian Federation to lead this ad hoc group and I would like to give the floor to Russia to introduce the ATT/63. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you Chairman. The ad hoc group on resolution 21 in coordination and collaboration with regional, subregional organisations held two meetings. We had a number of input contributions and considered them. And they concluded our work taking into account the proposals that came in and these are the comments on this proposal. The new name of the resolution is coordination in cooperation with regional and subregional organisations, and this is in accordance with the discussions that we had. Thank you very much, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russia for your efforts in this ad hoc group, and I would like to seek the approval from the floor to the proposed changes in DT/63. Germany, you have the floor.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Chairman. It's not your fault, I know, but the organisation of this Conference does not allow to follow each and everything. Now, resolution 21 is about the collaboration and coordination with regional organisations and subregional organisations. We believe that when some of the amendments proposed there is a lecture speaking about this collaboration, but also speaking about organising regional groups and regional meetings, and in particular I'm referring to the new instruction the Director of the Telecommunication Development Bureau? Collaboration with the Radiocommunication Bureau and the Telecommunication Standardization Bureau, that they should within allocate or contribute resources that are available, provide necessary support for regional groups, and

consider whenever possible holding conferences, workshops concurrently with meetings of the ITU-T regional groups. I believe that this new instruct should not be part of this resolution and should be deleted, Mr. Chairman, or at least for the time being put into square brackets. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. So we have a comment. We will speak to the last instruct. Russian Federation you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. We would like to note that the comments from Germany were discussed in detail in the drafting group taking into account the participation of the representative of CPT who made a contribution to the work on this resolution. This text was one that we agreed on. I would also like to say that this isn't new text. This is text which was approved and adopted at the WTSA. And this is text which we also used here in order to insure that both sectors can work in the same way with regard to regional groups. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russian Federation. I would like to give the floor to Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: While the discussions are going more quickly and there are a lot of meetings in parallel, we have had very constructive discussions yesterday in one of the many parallel groups, and we intended to bring this back to the European group after discussions, but just to indicate why in the discussions we were prepared to accept this as part of a compromise and that was deleting the text within the contributory resources that are available that sits the limit of what can be carried out under number 3. We understand this is not optimal text, but regarding all of the discussions that were carried out in the INTA group, that if there is no agreement of this, that we withdraw discussion on this until after the coffee break so we can have further discussions if necessary, but from our point of view, from the Swedish point of view, this is an acceptable compromise between all of the proposals that were put forward in the group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Sweden. Actually, unfortunately, we don't have time to break and come back to this. This is our last session and taking into account the work carried out by the ad hoc group, and being similar text used in WTSA, and taking into account the statement in allocated or contributed resources that are available, I believe this is a good compromise to move forward especially with the time. So I would like the floor to kindly agree and we could move forward with respect to this resolution.

I hope this is acceptable for you. Thank you very much, DT/63 is approved. Thank you. With that I would like to move to resolution 59. We have requested our colleague from Russian Federation, Mr. Alex to carry out an informal consultation and we invited all interested members to coordinate with Mr. Alex and I know he received emails from interested Member States I so bike to ask Mr. Alex to brief us on the outcome of this informal. Russian Federation, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, colleagues. Taking into account the instructions and taking into account the remarks made during the discussion at your committee yesterday, I prepared a short version of the amendments to resolution 59 and I sent it out to the interested parties from the various regions. Having asked them to make any remarks they might have had by 9:00 in the evening. We didn't get any remarks, so I sent this text in at 2300 hours to the Secretariat, so that's 11:00 at night.

The text is shorter compared to previous texts including on references to recent resolutions of the WTSA and the Radio Communication Assembly. And text is included provided by APT on the organisation of meetings. This text was considered at the ad hoc group on resolution 1, and the agreement was reached that the text would not be included in resolution 1, but it would be reflected in resolution 59. Unfortunately, I cannot see the Document on the website. Perhaps I have missed something, but with that I would like to conclude my report. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Alex from Russian Federation and to all Member States who participated in this informal. I would like to thank you for the output of this informal group. So I would like to ask the floor for their agreement with respect to the output of this informal and the amendments to resolution 59. United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I thank my dear colleague, sir Alex for leading the work on resolution 59. Mr. Chairman, during resolution 1 discussions, I had some informal discussions with my colleagues from Japan and I refer them to resolution 59 and specifically the United Arab Emirates group proposal. However, there is a slight amendment, Mr. Chairman, if the Secretariat can kindly go down on the screen on this instruct the ADT Director.

I will explain it, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps Mr. Alex can let us know if this is reflected or not in the text. It is simply, Mr. Chairman, we are asking the BDT collaboration in collaboration with the TSB Director to provide an annual report

from TSB or from ITU-T activities to ITU-D Study Groups in order to update them on the work carried out in the ITU-D sector. So the request that came from colleagues from Japan that we should also ask the Director to provide such a report on the activities carried out in the ITU-R, and in order to inform ITU-T, ITU-D Study Group on the activities. This comes, Mr. Chairman, because resolution, I'm sorry, question 9 is no longer, it will not be in the current or the new study cycle, and question 9 was given the mandate to collect all of the information from ITU-T sector and ITU-R sector which has a particular interest in Developing Countries.

So only that small amendment here, exactly this one. The Director of BDT to inform TDAG -- not this one. Maybe, I can maybe discuss this with Mr. Alex and we can come up with some text. So it's a general comment. Unfortunately, due to many ad hocs and many conferences and discussions, we are not able to send our comments to Mr. Alex. I do confirm that I received the email, but unfortunately, I did not have time to reflect the comments on the text of this resolution. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thanks very much to the Emirates. I would like to ask the interpreters, please, could we continue until half past 11:00?

>> INTERPRETER: Yes, sir, you can do it.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I would like to give the floor to United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to our colleagues. We too would like to thank distinguished colleague from the Russian delegation from the work that he has done and express our appreciation for his hard efforts. We know this is a challenging issue. We still have some concerns with the text in this version which we would like to have an opportunity to meet with him and other interested parties to discuss specifically in attempting to be consistent with the resolution 18 that was adopted by the WTSA, we find that we now have significant consistency problems with resolution 7/3 that was adopted by the RA in 2015 which establishes the process for collaboration and coordination between the ITU-R and the ITU-D. In that respect we believe it's important for the sectors to have compatible procedures, so our compatibility with the ITU-R should not be jeopardized in terms of compatibility with our procedures with theirs in favor of trying to create compatible procedures with the ITU-T. So I think we can resolve the concerns, but we would seek the opportunity to meet further with our colleagues and see if we can find a way forward. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States. I believe we might go with the suggestion made by United States of allowing more time to have informal discussion and we will see how are we going to reflect that maybe when I present to the plenary the outcomes of resolution 59. Of course, any changes will be posted on the WTDC website. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: I apologize, but the day only has 24 hours unfortunately which are full with other applications. Now, with regard to this Document, I fully agree to your conclusion, but I ask myself why the Secretariat didn't advise you prior to starting a decision at all. We are looking at the Document called Res 59, which is obviously an internal working Document, and it's nowhere published. It is maybe distributed between participants of an ad hoc group and it's really not the best practice to discuss the actual Document unpublished in a committee meeting.

So but this is not your fault, Mr. Chairman. Your Secretariat should have advised you accordingly. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Germany, actually the Secretariat is doing tremendous efforts with the amount of very many Study Groups and documents, and actually I'm the one who requested to put this Document taking into account that the Document is not published. So it's me, the Chairman, and I apologize for any inconvenience. With that, I would like to give the floor to use Kazakhstan.

>> KAZAKHSTAN: Thank you very much, Chairman. I would like to note the work that has been done in search of consensus which usually have the prevailing mode in the ITU. I would like to call on states to cooperate on this resolution. Thank you very much, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So with that, I ask our distinguished colleague and interested Member States to convene with Mr. Alex from Russian Federation and tries to come up with the text which I could reflect in my report. Now, I would like to check resolution 1 and first I would like to extend my gratitude to Ms. Roxanne Weber for her able convening of this group and hard work and all participants who participated in the work of the ad hoc group. So I would like to request Ms. Roxanne to present the output of the ad hoc group DT/62 and for resolution 31, DT/70. Roxanne you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to report to you that we have concluded the ad hoc meetings and have concluded the work on both resolution and resolution 31. We had one tiny issue remaining late last night

that was resolved through consultation with the regional group who agreed to modify their position from CITEL, so we have concluded the work on resolution 1 which are the Rules of Procedure for this sector. Some of the things that we included are new definitions for the documents and the basic text of the sector and how those things are approved. We have put some very specific duties in for Chairs and Vice Chairs and rapporteurs and Vice Rapporteurs, and a number of other things.

We do need to take one last look at the Document because we have got to -- there are so many different cross references in various sections that we are going to need to really just make sure that the text that we provide, I don't know if this is to the editorial committee, has all of that matched up correctly, so we have some additional cleanup work to be done there but we hope that the Rules of Procedure will support the work of the D sector to continue, you know, to increase efficiencies and so forth for members.

With regard to resolution 31, this is the resolution that deals with the preparation for regional preparatory meetings for WTDC. This, you will withdrawal, there was a proposal to merge that resolution in with resolution 1. The group is, has decided not to do that merger and to keep the two things separate since the Rules of Procedure deal mostly with instructions for members to help them navigate through the sector, and resolution 31 deals more with how the arrangements for regional preparatory meetings we be made by the BDT.

So we have looked at is that text, and I'm awaiting to hear that there is approval of all of the text. There was one administration that had proposed a no change for that, they were acquire, are aware of changes and we are waiting to hear back from them. So our work is completed. I did want to give special thanks to the legal adviser, Arno, because we called upon him time and time and time again to give us legal advice on how the rules should be structured, and, of course, the Secretariat, Christina and Kamal who were there hours and hours even after we were there, and everyone that was in the group that participated. It was a very good experience and we are glad it's finished. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Roxanne, and thanks for all of the efforts and all delegates who participated in the work of the ad hoc group. So just to make it clear to my understanding, the Document is, there is an agreement with respect to the Document, however, I see some of the square brackets along -- no, there is no care brackets. Okay. Thank you very much.

So with respect to the editorial numbering of the Paragraphs, that will be handled by the Secretariat. So I would like to ask the approval of the floor with respect to DT/62 and DT/70. United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And on taking the floor, Mr. Chairman, I thank the convener of this ad hoc group and Roxanne for leading us to this resolution. It was a very difficult task given the complexity of resolution 1, and I thank also the legal adviser and all of the participants who joined us in the meeting to achieve this important goal with regards to resolution 1 and the amendment proposed to resolution 1. Mr. Chairman, still I see one issue, I'm not sure if it's resolved or not. It's 19.4 with regards to the number of questions, so maybe there was informal consultations with the colleagues from African Union on that, but still I see square brackets on that. So maybe we can get some clarifications on that specific Article. Apart from that, Mr. Chairman, we don't have any comments or any concerns, and we thank Madame Roxanne and all of the participants for the great job and the great work. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United Arab Emirates. Togo.

>> TOGO: Thank you very much, Chairman. Togo would also like to thank Ms. Roxanne for this difficult work she has been carrying out. I congratulate her on that. We would like to turn your attention to 3.2 and 3.7 which do not correlate with our way of viewing things particularly with regard to the discussions on the working parties within Study Groups which is still ongoing. We have remarked on it in the ad hoc group, and we will do this again that 3.2 and 3.7 give the impression of having agreed on the powers of the working parties while it does not say at any point that working parties have more power or more weight than rapporteur groups or any other group.

So the current wording it seems that there is as much weight given to them as others, however, the question that we are discussing and whether or not working parties are to be created at all has not been addressed. Everything with regard to this innovation under 3.2 should be deleted and put under 3.7 where we in fact deal with other types of groups and their authority. Thank you.

>> ATDI: I give thanks to Roxanne for excellent work. With regard to brackets to approve limited number of questions per study period and preferably not more than 5, we had some discussions, and the African Group gave the explanation that we are five days, one day per question for every Study Group. Now,

I find it preferably not more than 5, correct, and we can take off the brackets, but if it will cause a lot of discussions, we can take off preferably not more than 5. And there are five other issues in brackets. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, ATDI. After listening to the comments, I will give the floor to Ms. Roxanne to address some of the concerns. Russian Federation, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. We would like to thank Roxanne and the Secretariat and all who participated in the group for the huge amount of work they did on resolution 1. Chairman, if you look at the amendments made, then evidently it's a significant resolution 1 over recent years. The group discussed this issue considerably, and it wasn't easy to find a compromise decision. Nevertheless, this text reflects the consensus achieved in the meeting of the group. Of course, here there is a need to undertake a number of editorial clarifications, firstly, clarify the references, but to my mind, we manage to achieve the unimproved text compared to previous versions. Moreover, in this version we managed to use standard terminology of the Union, and clarify some definitions. So once again, I would like to thank everyone for the work that they have done, and now we just need to fulfill the requirements of this resolution, resolution 1 in its new version, of course, after its approval at the plenary meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russia. I would like to give the floor to Sweden and may I ask our colleagues to be brief as much as possible. Sweden, you have the floor.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First I would like to thank the convener of the group for an excellent work carried out. It was a difficult task, and I think that we have reached a Document that is workable for the ITU Study Groups and TDAG period up to the next WTDC. I hope there will not be major needs for revisions later on at the next WTDC because it's a very time-consuming process with all of the changes in this large Document.

Regarding the number of questions, we are fine with preferably not more than 5. It gives the flexibility to adopt more if necessary. We also would like to stress the need -- like to stress the need which was mentioned by the convener of the group that there is still editorial group to be done in this Document before it can be finally adopted, and I think they have indicated a few square brackets that have to be dealt with. As far as I can see, it can be dealt with editorially in most of the cases. There is no need to discuss it here, however, there is also need to make sure that all

terminology is aligned between the new text and the old text, so we use the same words for the same things in the Document to avoid any ambiguity, but I assume that will be taken care of by the editorial committee in their editing of this Document. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Sweden and for this proposal. I think it's a constructive one and we could move forward with that. United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I associate myself with the other speakers on this. It's my understanding that we went through the Document line by line last night and went through every, all bracketed text. So there should be no remaining bracketed text in the Document, but we will go back through it to insure that, you know, we haven't missed something, but line by line by line. There should be no agreement on any substantive point remaining in that Document. So -- well, except there is one point, but we resolved it after the meeting and we have to incorporate that as I said when I presented the Document initially, but other than that, there should be no further disagreement. But we will confirm that for you, and I guess we will maybe possibly need to revisit it at plenary when we have the cleaned-up version. Thank you.

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

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. In our turn, we would also like to join other colleagues in thanking Ms. Roxanne from the United States for the efforts she made to find a consensus on this very important resolution. It's also a very long resolution, but thanks to Ms. Roxanne's excellent leadership, her know-how and her experience, we have managed to come up with an acceptable Document. Now, with regard to the number of questions and what other sectors have in the ITU, we believe that we in fact prefer to leave the number of questions to be determined by the Study Group itself. We aren't obliged to handle one question a day. Some Study Groups have more than 20 questions. But they do nevertheless manage to conclude their work on all of their questions and quite quickly too.

Chairman, we believe that we do not need to set the number of questions, and this will not have any great repercussions on the work of the Study Groups. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. So I would like to ask the floor to approve this Document. I understand some of the square brackets deals with the matters and some of it as I have seen it's suggesting information with respect to the specific Paragraph aligned to it. With respect to the 19.4, preferably not more than 5, I will leave it maybe to Roxanne when we do the

final, or we can decide on that by removing the square brackets and even if deleting the square brackets and the wording in the square brackets, nothing preventing the Study Group to establish more than 5 with it or without it.

So I would suggest now to delete that if that's possible, and the other square brackets deals with the information matters. I will give the Cote D'Ivoire the floor after United States. United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Just one final clarification on the issue of the working parties and the text applicable to working parties in resolution 1. As you know, we already have the ability to have working parties. That was something that is not new. That text is in there. So the amended text is just applicable to working parties if we establish them. We already know that Study Groups can establish them. Whether we do or don't in resolution 2 I think is the issue that we are still debating here, but we did not, the group found consensus on procedures that would apply to them when and if they become activated, and as you know, we had one before. So I wanted to make that clarification that it's not a foregone conclusion that we are doing them in resolution 2, but we have procedures applicable to working parties because the sector has the ability to have them. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Roxanne, and I believe this addresses the comments made by Cote D'Ivoire on 3.2 and 3.7. Cote D'Ivoire, you have the floor.

>> COTE D'IVOIRE: Thank you, Chairman. We think that with regard to the proposal that you are making to delete this set of words under 19.4, I think it resolves a certain misunderstanding of the reasons we gave in the African Group to justify this new provision. Contrary to what was said, it's not a question of talking about planning the work on the questions adopted within the Study Groups.

We heard a reason voiced just now about having a question per day, five days of a meeting and five questions. We would just say that's not the reason unfortunately. For those who have followed the work and the ad hoc group, this wasn't in the section on approval of questions by the WTDC. We discussed this provision in the session, session 18. This was before, but not the African Group. It's a question the allocation of questions to Study Groups by the World Telecommunication Development Conference.

This recommendation for the Conference is that to insure that the WTDC that it may be good to limit questions to Study Group and our position from African Group would be to not have

more than 5 questions per Study Group. The age is to insure efficiency of future work within the Study Groups and to allow more effective participation by delegates coming from our region. So here it's a preference in the approval of questions to be assigned to Study Groups and not an issue of planning done by the Study Groups for their programming of how they are going to examine the questions.

So that's the clarification we wanted to make. So we are not, therefore, in favor of deleting this phase here because as I said, provision 19.4 would lose all of its sense if we deleted these words because then if we don't have any number here, then how can we say it's limited? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Cote D'Ivoire. We could maintain the preferably not more than 5 and remove the square brackets, and I ask the floor to accept this. There is no obligations by saying preferably not more than 5. So I hope this is acceptable. We need to remove from resolution 1 to resolution 31, so I would like to give the floor -- I have two more speakers, Togo and Jordan please very briefly. Togo you have the floor.

>> TOGO: Thank you very much, Chairman. Togo season often very flexible with regard to such proposals, but we would also like to come back to 3.2 and 3.7. We welcome the excellent work which has been done, but we would once again like to repeat the 3.2 says, well, it grants greater power to working parties. If you could look at 3.2, it says that Study Groups may create three kinds of group. At the same time we only talk about working parties. And then 3.7 covers what is done in the other groups, rapporteur groups and intersectoral rapporteur groups. Togo believes that this wording is not good. We think that we should cut the part about working parties from 3.2 and put it under 3.7. So cutting 3.7 and putting it in 3.2 because otherwise we are dividing our way of seeing things and we cannot support 3.2 and 3.7 in the way they are currently worded. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Togo. I believe Roxanne addressed this 3.2, 3.7. It's just setting the working methods with respect to the Study Groups and the working parties there is not any decisions with respect to the power of the working parties. If it's acceptable, we could move the second Paragraph of 3.2 starts with working parties prepare draft reports and we move it to 3.7 at the beginning. I mean, we cannot have -- I mean, there is a tremendous efforts done by Roxanne and the ad hoc group and we work with the available time. We seek perfection, but I think it's not really -- I mean, if you could maintain it as it is or maybe we move the second part to 3.7, maybe this

will accommodate the concern.

I would like to give the floor to Jordan. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have asked for the floor to talk about something else about resolution 1, as a matter of fact, so if you can give me back the floor once we finish this point on the discussion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I would like to give the floor to the United States. You have the floor, Roxanne.

>> UNITED STATES: I'm sorry. I just wanted to say that we are fine with making that change, moving that text around 3.2 to 3.7 or whatever. I mean, if that is helpful, then that is certainly fine with us. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Roxanne. With that, Jordan, if you make your comments very quickly, please.

>> JORDAN: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Actually my comments is on section 11, the section 11, we have a new Paragraph inserted under Article 8 which reads in addition to other duties, TDAG vice chairman in cooperation with the regional area offices with membership in their region and in consultation with the ITU Study Groups Vice Chairman will evaluate the implementation of the regional initiatives and to prepare a single report for each TDAG meeting.

So I'm wondering what is the source of this text? I mean, how the Vice Chairman of the TDAG will evaluate the implementation of the regional initiatives for each region and prepare a single report for each TDAG meeting? This means that we have to evaluate on an annual basis the implementation of the regional initiatives, and you know that the regional initiatives usually take not one year to implement, but 40 years of implementation, and it is the duty of the Vice Chairman of the TDAG to implement the implementation of the regional initiatives. I think this is a new text that needs to be re-examined and to carefully decide on who will be responsible.

You are gathering many parties to produce a single report which is going to be very difficult exercise. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jordan. I will go, I would like to give the floor to Roxanne to address this. Maybe we could change evaluate to follow up, something like that, we will follow up the implementation, if that's acceptable? Roxanne, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We work from a consolidated Document of proposals from the various regions. I think I mentioned in the presentation that there were specific

duties given to TDAG Vice Chairs and Study Group Chairs and Study Group Vice Chairs because this was completely absent from the earlier rendition of resolution 1, and the idea behind this is that TDAG is to have some sort of reporting to its members on the progress of the regional initiatives. And so the Vice Chairs from TDAG would stay in touch and be involved -- I mean this text had in there as of last night that the TDAG Chairs and Vice Chairs from the regions would be looking at their own regions and present a sort of a progress report to TDAG that would be shared with the members. So there was one regional proposal that was very interested in having greater information about the progress of the regional initiatives being disseminated to members and this is where it ended up that it's TDAG that reports on it, but the Vice Chairs in their capacity as representing the regions would follow that progress and would share that progress with TDAG. It would go, rather than 19 different reports from all of the Vice Chairs, maybe it's one Paragraph and it becomes one report for the TDAG to share with its members on the progress of the regional initiatives. So that's the intention. Of course, you know, as you said, we work within our time limits. It may not be beautiful, but people were in agreement with the concept. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Roxanne. Just apologies for the interpreters. We need a few more minutes if that's acceptable.

>> INTERPRETER: Yes, Chairman. That's fine.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I would suggest to change evaluate to say will report in the progress made on the implementation of the regional initiatives by preparing a single report will report for each TDAG meeting. I hope this is acceptable. Of the regional initiatives by preparing a since will report. Okay.

>> I think the issue the way it is described is very complicated. First, the TDAG Vice Chair can follow up on the implementation, but they don't have any authority with the regional office even to request information or to monitor what are the project already started and if any Vice Chairman will prepare a report, he needs to have access to information and very detailed activities that really it's not under their mandate. I think we need to seek opinion from the BDT on what exactly the mandate of the regional offices in the implementation. They are responsible on implementing the regional office, what we can do as advice on the implementation of the regional initiatives, what we can do as a Vice Chairman, we can try to give guidance, monitor, whatever, but the way it

is drafted, it is the responsibility of the Vice Chairman to prepare the report while in fact from my humble opinion, I think it is the responsibility of the regional office to follow up and report on the activities to the Director of the BDT, but not to the TDAG Vice Chairman to report to the TDAG. So they have a legal link with the Director of the BDT, not with the TDAG Vice Chairman to be in charge of what they are doing regarding the regional initiatives.

I think there is no, that important value in putting this text or we need to redraft it in a way that is in line with the rules and the procedure that is already in the BDT regarding the duties and responsibility of the regional offices. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, very much, Jordan. If I may ask Roxanne. I think it's a procedural matter, so we could accommodate the text off line. I mean, and we will get the exact format and the reporting or the follow up to be reflected here and it will be shown in the report when we submit it to the plenary. I think it's not a controversial one. Roxanne will coordinate with the Secretariat and see how we can accommodate this one.

With that I would like very quickly, so I would like to approve this Document based on the comments. If there is no further comments, thank you very much, the Document is approved. DT/70. Kindly, very quickly, Roxanne, we would like to approve the DT -- I'm sorry, the one I just approved, DT60/62. Now, I'm going to request the floor for the approval of DT/70. Roxanne, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES: Unfortunately, we still haven't received the coordination back on the one administration that has a no change. I will try to get -- I'm sorry, I will try to get that for you and we will certainly have it by plenary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Roxanne. So I will take this and I the reflect it in the report to the plenary. This comes to the end of our meeting. Before I close, I would like to thank and each one and every one of you for the dedication of hard work. I know that delegates, the Chair of the ad hoc informal conveners have put tremendous hours and efforts to enable us to come up with the outputs that we have reached and I would like to thank everyone for their efforts, and I would like to also thank the Secretariat for their tremendous efforts. I would like to thank Mr. Brahim Hadad and all of the team from the Secretariat, Kamal, Christine, Roxanne, Mahmud, Isabel who have helped with the work. My thanks goes to the interpreters. Wrote them we cannot communicate and we cannot move a single

step. Thank you very much for the time you put and the extra time and efforts you give us.

I will submit my report for the committee to will Chairman of the Conference in the plenary, and I would like now to close the committee for sessions, and the work is done in this Com 4. Thank you very much.

(Applause).

>> CHAIR: So we will have a short break before the convening of Com 3. The meeting is closed.

(Break).

>> CHAIR: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, let us begin our work. The agenda for today's meeting it a continuation of what we were considering in our previous meeting, and we have a number of documents for discussion and approval. I'd like to begin with the Study Group questions. And the first is question 7.2, DT/20.

I would like to invite the focal point for question 7.2. I see that Sudan is asking for the floor. Sudan. Could we open the mic for Sudan, please?

>> SUDAN: Thank you, Chair. And good morning, everyone. On the agenda that we have in front of us, Mr. Chairman, I don't find any item related to resolution 37. This resolution needs to be discussed and it is under Document DT19. Can you clarify, please, thank you.

>> CHAIR: It is on the list of the resolutions that we will be discussing today. So be patient with us that we will get to resolution 37. Thank you very much. Next is Jordan, please.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chairman. Concerning the new resolution related to the theft of devices, we would like to inform you that we have met and we have discussed the Document, we have sent the final Document to the Secretariat. I don't know if the Document has been published on the Internet or not. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. Jordan, can you please refer to the Resolution Number?

>> JORDAN: It is in resolution which is proposed by the Arab and African Group about conducting communication device theft. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Let me check. It is not among the topics we will be covering in this session probably because it was submitted to the Secretariat probably late. So it is still going through the system to be processed. We make every effort to discuss it this evening. Thank you. Next is ATDI. You have the floor. Sir.

>> ATDI: With your permission, Mr. Babu is not here and I can present question 7.2, the Document that you show the DT/20, revision 1. Can I continue, sir?

>> CHAIR: Yes, please.

>> ATDI: Document, revision 1, 7 the .2 is the revision of question 7.2 and we propose not to change the title. So strategies and policies concerning, et cetera, this was decided in Com 3's own questions, and all of the others were integrating the input so there was no debate on the other issues, so with your approval, I hope that the Com 3 will accept the text in the Document. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, ATDI for the information, other colleagues who have not been working closely on this question in the ad hoc, the work on this question has been completed, but nevertheless we were waiting for the decision of Com 4 because there was a proposal to merge this question with another question, and it was finally decided by Com 4 that this question should remain as a separate question, not to be merged with other questions.

The only remaining question pending decision of Com 4 was the title and for that reason the title was kept in square brackets. Now, that we have a decision by Com 4, that question 7/2 would remain as a separate question on its own feet. Then the proposal is to remove the square bracket and keep the text between the two square brackets. In the rest of this Document, there are no square brackets, so I submit to the Com 3 that if you are agreeable, we can approve this Document. Any comments? Do we agree to approve this Document? Any objection? I do not see any request for the floor, so decided this Document DT/20 is approved with the square brackets removed from the title of question 7.2. Thank you very much, ATDI for your work, and for those who have been involved on revising question 7.2.

Next we go to question 1.2. We have a DT (Rev. 1), you may recall that yesterday we considered this question, but there was some ambiguity whether the latest version is reflected in the DT Document, so we have DT (Rev. 1), and I invite the focal point for this question, United States, to please present this Document.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And here let me explain the update. This Document that you are looking at is complete for sections 1 through the balance of the report. It was discussed at the Study Group yesterday at 9:14 a.m., and the title was decided. The title that you see here has not updated in the system yet, but the Secretariat has the Document and the correct Document. I also want to let everybody know not only

was this Document looked at again yesterday in the morning after the Com 3 meeting last night we met with parties that were interested. They looked at it again, no changes were made, and then this morning at the Study Group ad hoc, we once again looked at the Document to give everybody a chance section by section, and there were no changes made. So as soon as this Document updates with the title that was decided yesterday morning, the delegates will have the complete question. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Just for clarification in this current version that you see on the screen, the title is within the square brackets. In your latest version, can we take it that the square brackets are removed and the title is kept as it is in this version? United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Chair, there is a new title decided, and that new title is creating smart Cities and society: Employing ICTs for sustainable social and economic development, and so that's the title that was decided by the group yesterday morning. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. So can we consider this Document with the change in the title. The rest of the material in the body of this Document remains as it is. United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Correct, all of the other sections in this Document are what has been discussed at least three times. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So there are, this version of the Document that we are seeing on the screen and is on the system available on the Internet contains the body of the text, no square brackets, no changes, the only change is a new title as was read out by the Distinguished Delegate from the United States and I submit it for your approval. Do I have your agreement that we move forward with Document 44 (Rev. 1) with the revised title as read out by the Distinguished Delegate from the United States and contained in the revision that has already been submitted to the Secretariat? Do I have your agreement on this? Any objection? None. Thank you very much. So decided.

Next is question 4.1. We have Document DT57 and I invite Mexico to please present this Document as the focal point for this question. Mexico.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chairman. We worked on this Document in the sessions we had. We didn't come into any consensus on the title of the question, and one Paragraph which said there are no issues to be studied, because we discussed this. But we then decided not to discuss it in the ad hoc

group, but to discuss it during this session, sir. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mexico. As was explained there is square bracket in the title with respect to OTT services. I would like to seek your views on this, so the floor is open for your comments. United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, the United States has some concerns about including the consideration of OTT as in the study question on economic policies. At this stage, we understand the ITU-T Study Group 3 is already conducting or has conducted a lot of the work that is being proposed into this study question, and it would be a duplication of the work that's already ongoing. I think we have limited resources to address all of the topics of study within the ITU development sector, and at this stage I think this is a topic that should not be duplicated across both ITU-T and ITU-D. Moreover, we also did agree on a separate question on OTTs, so this would, again, create a duplication of effort within the Study Groups, and we believe that this section should be deleted. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Before I go to the list of speakers, and I have United Kingdom and United Arab Emirates, I see a number of square brackets in the title. The first square bracket is including next generation networks. I think it was mentioned earlier that for the sake of consistency, NGNs are now replaced with future networks. Can we use the term future networks instead of next generation networks? And if that is the case, if we remove the square brackets around including next generation networks? Let's focus on this point first and then take care of the OTTs. On this I'm seeking your views. United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, very much, Mr. Chairman. And good afternoon to all colleagues. Mr. Chairman, with regards to including next generation networks, yes, we agree with your proposal to take out square brackets. If you allow me with regards to the OTT services, we as was explained by U.S. we do have another question we tackle OTT matters in general, and since Study Group we do, and ITU-T sector we do study all economic aspects of OTTs, so with that clarification, Mr. Chairman, and in the spirit of compromise for census and compromise we agree, Mr. Chairman to take out and OTT services from question 4. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Arab Emirates. Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Jordan, please.

>> Thank you very much, to for your proposal to replace next generation networks -- we don't mind with your proposal

however, for the issue of the OTT, I was involved in the question of the Study Group 3 of the T sector and the problem is different from what we are addressing here. In this question, we are taking in the economic policies, the economic and policies issues of the OTT. It's different from the issues related to what is discussed on Study Group 3. This text was a compromise text. So I don't know if we reject the principle that the Study Group should be focusing on communications for OTT services. I don't think Atlanta will be any duplication of work between the T sector and G sector in this regard. Both sectors will study the question in place and now we cannot judge because we don't have the question of what has been mandated for Study Group 3 to study in the OTT services. So we have a question here and the question for us is quite clear. We have to study the economic and policy issues for the OTT services, and it is the only hoop hole in charge of studying economic and policy issues, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman..

>> CHAIR: South Africa, please.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you very much, honorable chairperson. We would like to support completely the statements from Jordan. This issue came up during the last Conference on the standardisation Conference, and we could not get satisfactory answers. If I am recalling correctly as the African Group, we had some concerns in terms of the impact that the OTT services have within our region, and we deliberated extensively, and our insurers not to be against, you know, having OTT services in other countries, but looking at the overall impact and we do believe that having this issue is an item which is to be studied properly will actually give us an opportunity as policy makers to actually and even the sector members to come up with answers that are appropriate, answers which will sort of take away the limited doubts we -- lingering doubts as to how these are affecting economic policies, and I think the Honorable Delegate under Jordan stated -- from Jordan stated quite clearly and accurately that this Study Group would actually help us in advancing and also getting a sense of an answer in those particular issues.

Actually taking it out, because we do know that as countries we do have the right to make our own laws and policies, but we want to do so having due regard to the studies that have been per formed to see that whatever decision we make, actually going to advance our goals as developing countries and also from our perspective as countries.

Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, South Africa. Next is United

Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair, and good morning to colleagues. As we are now discussing the substance of the addition proposed to this question, we have a procedural issue before us I'm afraid to say. The proposal of new section 6 under part 2 of the question which contains all of the language related to OTT for this question was proposed by email to the Chair of the ad hoc on we understand Saturday evening, and then included in the draft being considered by the ad hoc rather than contributed as a contribution for discussion at this meeting.

It is our view for CPT that we cannot have orderly meetings if we have contributions in whole contributed after the deadline for which contributions must be made which in this case relates to resolution 1, section 5, 18.1 which says that new questions or revisions must be proposed two months before the opening of the Conference, and in respect of contributions 14 days before the opening of the meeting. So with respect, irrespective of the value of the discussion of the subject or the content proposed, we do not believe that this proposal was made in good time, and we believe that it must be removed from this question on that basis, and introduced at a later time. I would also note that my colleague from Romania has a further query related to another part of the text. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom. Next is Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. We are grateful to colleague that's have already taken the floor. We would also like to thank South Africa for their very detailed and extensive recollection of the history of this issue. Jordan would like to thank the U.K. regarding the procedure, however, we have always very carefully and correctly approached new questions. But with regard to OTT, we already have a clear understanding of the task, of the objectives which we need to address. So at the World Telecommunication Standardization Assembly, we took the necessary decision in order to consider the regulatory, economic and financial consequences of international OTT services.

Why is this word international important? However, in accordance with the ITU's Constitution, the development sector has a whole area with regard to national aspects, assistance to countries and developing regulatory documents and their application. So we believe that in our sector we should pay attention to avoiding duplication with the standardisation sector on the national aspect of OTT influence. Thank you very much, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation. Next is Togo.

>> TOGO: Thank you very much, Chairman. And once again, good morning, everyone. Togo would like to speak on two or three aspects of this issue. The first one is with regard to the title. It includes, including next generation networks, these words, well, Togo suggested deleting this part. Togo as a former rapporteur question on this question 4 for the previous study put this forward why. Well, because in the work that we did we were asked to define what we understood by next generation networks. Other comments were made on what next generation networks were at the beginning. We have had this word for ten years, and it is still here now. So we need to avoid this entire discussion which we find not to be very useful, Togo suggested that we delete including next generation networks in the title because this expression has been used for a number of years, and now we know exactly what this covers.

So there is another comment that we want to make on OTTs. We have the impression using the word OTT in itself, I don't know white how to put it, but in Study Group 3 in ITU-T, we have all been aware for a number of years that their mission, their mandate is to address regulation and accounting between operators on an international level. That's always been its mandate, its terms of reference in the ITU-T. And the word OTT has been used in the mandate of the ITU-T.

The ITU-T took it upon itself to add the international aspect of this, but this does not pertain to national aspects of OTT utilization. So let's look carefully as what we have said under Paragraph 1 and 5 of our man date. Question 4.1 will study the cost models on networks generally. But nothing prevents the Study Group that's going to consider this issue from considering the OTT aspects. Because cost models on networks when you look at how these services are provided, if they go through OTTs, even if the mandate doesn't say the word OTT, it doesn't prevent the group from studying this issue.

It doesn't prevent them from addressing OTTs. Now, under Paragraph 5 we are talking about new trends, new trends in providing services. Even if there is an explicit reference of OTT in this terms of reference, Study Group can address OTT aspects. So I just wanted to say that let's not stumble on the word OTT in the mandate of question 4, it should say, and it does say that new service provision and cost models should be considered. And this over communications networks. So it doesn't hinder the group which is going to address these issues from considering OTTs even if we delete Paragraph 6 of these terms of reference.

And OTT in the title it still doesn't prevent the team dealing with this issue from addressing aspects of OTT. So those are the points which Togo wants to make. We shouldn't stay stuck on the word OTT because there is -- it can be one of the subjects which is studied in this Study Group.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your useful and extensive explanation of the problems we are facing. I now have a number of delegations asking for the floor. Brazil, Saudi Arabia, Romania, Germany, Zimbabwe, United Arab Emirates and Senegal. I would like to close the list. At this time. I see Sweden is also asking for the floor, Argentina and the list is the and Uruguay also. The list is closed now. Thank you. We go to. We go to Brazil first.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Brazil believes the discussion of ITU is extremely important for the membership of ITU, therefore, we are studying and putting all of our efforts on the work that is has been implemented in the. We think as is put here in proposal especially in Paragraph 6 is a duplication of work with Study Group 3 of ITU-T in particular with keeping in mind that deals specifically with OTT. Including Mr. Chairman, there are similarities of work items. If we can see 6.2 is, there is a great similarity with working item of Q9 which is the study on economic impact of convergence of technology and services in the role of the regulator. 6.3, for instance, can be dealt in SG3 working item, customer will address mechanism and consumer protection and 6.4 which can be dealt also in the work item economic impact of OTTs. So, Mr. Chairman, I think that number 6 must be really and thoroughly assessed by the membership so we can avoid duplication in some sort of OTT studies bearing in mind that this is an important issue that has been considered in ITU-T. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Brazil. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. Firstly, I would like to align myself with the intervention made by the representative from Jordan as well as the representative from South Africa on the importance of this question that there is no contribution between this question and it's appearing in other questions. I would also like to address an important point brought up by the U.K.. This referred to number 44 of the Rules of Procedure on the work of the Conference. This is number 44 which stipulates that contributions should be submitted two months before, but when we look at these rules, we read them as a whole. Number 17 of this same rules and procedures stipulates the possibility to submit contributions during the Conference. Therefore, Chair,

we feel that the text which has been presented by the ad hoc group is a Document in accordance with the rules on the work of the Study Groups and the Conference, and that there is no short coming in this regard. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: While we didn't necessarily agree with our friend from Saudi Arabia, but apart from the fact to discuss procedure, we would also try at least to address substance of the matter. As explained by Togo, I would put it much shorter and I would say in the age of convergence of networks and services, there is a kind of artificial distinction here between the work carried out in ITU-T and ITU-D. We have identified this clearly in our Document in the European Document 24, Addendum 17, and we are, we have the intention to discuss these issues at the plenipotentiary Conference because obviously at a sector Conference, it's very difficult to find a solution with regard to the cooperation rather than competition between the different sectors of the ITU.

As mentioned, the distinction between national and international, in particular with regard to OTT services, seems to be very, very artificial. It's avoiding, it does not really reflect the reality, and, therefore, we believe or taking into account the contributions so far received in ITU-T Study Group 3 that we are basically here talking about the same issue.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, we would prefer that the Paragraph on OTT is deleted from this question as well as the reference to OTT in the heading of the question. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. Next is Zimbabwe please.

>> ZIMBABWE: As Germany aligns it says with the submissions of Africa. The procedure issues prepared by the U.K. which have been responded to by Saudi Arabia, we are of the view that as we have collaborated on the importance of the consideration of policies related to OTTs, we surely can reach consensus on that and not be bogged down by matters of procedure to such an extent that we can leave out an important part of the. So it is our view that we need to look at the importance of OTTs, the input that they have on our economies, and in the discussion it lists the policies related to that in the Study Group. It would mean that we would have to wait until the next cycle for us to look at that, so it is important that we try and reach consensus on this and not be bogged down by procedural matters. I thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Zimbabwe. United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chair. We asked for

the floor after the intervention from the representative of the U.K. who discussed the procedures. Chairman, the proposal submitted by the United Arab Emirates group in Document 21. In this Document we have put forward the proposal to include OTT in question 3. With regard to question 1 and given that this text included OTT, we have not proposed to strike this out of question 1, therefore, the proposal from the Arab states is very clear regarding OTT. And in particular to include it within question 3. This question addresses economic policies and services. Therefore, we don't understand what is the issue here and what is the procedure on the Rules of Procedure which has been brought up by the U.K. delegate. That is why we submitted our proposal on this. When there is negotiation, there is always flexibility between parties.

Therefore, following the intervention from Saudi Arabia which spoke about regulation on this question, we address ourselves to the U.K. delegate because the Arab contribution was submitted within the framework of 21, Addendum 2. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Arab Emirates. Next is Senegal.

>> SENEGAL: Thank you, Chair. We think that the emerging services such as OTT should be included in this question because it has an economic impact on national networks. However, we can understand that including this in the title, deleting it in the title, but we should take into account, we should take this view into account in this question, but it should be considered here as well. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United Kingdom, is that a point of order? Romania. I'm sorry.

>> ROMANIA: I'm sorry. Thank you. I was apparently on the list, but then I don't know what happened that I disappeared. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: You are still on the list.

>> ROMANIA: I'm sorry, but I was on the list right before our colleagues from U.A.E.

>> CHAIR: The list I see here, you are on the list, so please be patient.

>> ROMANIA: Okay. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Please.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman, at this late hour of your morning session, I will try to be brief and not spend too much time, I think we are discussing two issues, the procedures and the subject. I also noted that the United Kingdom was speaking on behalf Europe. We agree with the U.K. statement regarding

procedures and we agree with those saying that we do not have the follow up procedures literally. We believe that the procedures that we have established in the past and the one we establish now in the new resolution 1 has to be followed by any meeting of the D sector, then regarding the subject, we agree what W what has been stated by the U.K. and Germany and we do not believe OTT should be included in this issue. There are other places to discuss the issue also within the ITU, but we should not add it in this place. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sweden. Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. We understand the importance of measuring the impact of these services, however, we are concerned by overlapping with the standardisation sector especially in Study Group 3, and as Paragraph 6 is currently drafted. It we need to look at more detail of the drafting and we have to take in account the work which has undertaken in the T sector of the ITU. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Argentina. Portugal.

>> PORTUGAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning to all of you. I would like to say to those who made comments on OTT particularly in regard to the issue of duplication which I think is very much on CPT agenda and I think we are trying to avoid as much as possible that the results of this Conference which are more conflicting our competition as the German delegate as between sectors. There are a number of sectors that expressed, Argentina, Brazil, and other delegation that's express the risk that bringing this text here introduce question would take us through the situation where two sectors are doing very much the same thing. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Portugal. Romania.

>> ROMANIA: Thank you very much, Chair. So apparently there was a mistake before. This microphone when I press the button, it says U.K. and not Romania probably that's why when I press the other button is said Romania, so I raised my flag. It was not a point of order, just to make sure. So my comments are regarding the possible duplication as well as the other colleagues mentioned before, the possible duplication with the ITU-T Study Group 3 who is already making a lot of efforts on this matter which we think it is very important. There is also a question 3 to this Conference that is taking into account the OTT. So now it might be a risk of duplication between questions in the Study Group. And we would also like to refer to a comment made earlier on by our colleagues from the U.K. mentioning the contribution to Study Group question. This was the meaning of his comment, the contribution to a Study Group

question has to be made way ahead the Conference.

So in order to not have duplication when we discuss resolution 2 in Com 4, we actually during the ad hoc for the resolution 2, we agreed and our colleague from U.A.E. can confirm it, we agreed not to have mentioning of work in ITU-T in the text of the resolution, but have it when we discuss the questions. So we would like for it to be clear that for any issue that is being discussed at the ITU-T level of Study Groups, there is a mentioning of these Study Groups into the text of the question which is the case in this question.

But nonetheless, on the OTTs, we think that the mentioning of OTTs in this particular question 4.1, it has to be struck out. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Romania. When I closed the list, three countries have put their names on the list. So if they are kind enough to be extremely brief, France.

>> FRANCE: These OTT services have a certain number of challenges on the questions in the area of regulation that should be addressed at a national and international level, because OTT operators are global players and who provide services for each country. Therefore, we think that ITU needs to work on this topic, but as Germany and Argentina and Brazil have said, we think that the work of the development sector needs to work in synergy with the T sector standardisation sector.

(Switching captioners.)

>> UNITED KINGDOM: We are confused, Chairman, because that is a contribution related to annex -- to Resolution 2's annex, and the words "OTT" raise questions to the title of Question 1/1 and Question 3/1. The question that is now in Question 4/1 in Paragraph 6, Section 2 is not to be in that contribution or any other contribution that we're aware of to this conference. And so if the U.A.E. is aware of a contribution which does contain the text in full that we now see in this question, we would be glad to know of it. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom. Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman, and we will also be very brief following the interventions of the colleague from the United Kingdom, Romania, and others, and particularly from our colleague from Argentina. We believe it is essential to avoid duplication of efforts. This topic is already being discussed and handled at Study Group 3 in ITU. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Last is the United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the text and this question, I do agree that we did not submit any amendments to the text of the question; however, in the title we reflected that we would -- we would like to have OTTs in Question 3, which is now Question 4, to study the economic impacts, so this is a practice, Mr. Chairman. In the previous conference we did receive a number of contributions from different regions proposing amendments on the title and not necessarily the text. Normally the text is discussed and negotiated during the conference. We have seen similar practice in other questions and other regions have proposed amendments on the title, so still, I mean, it's not necessary for us to provide text on -- on that text of the question, I mean, the reference of the question. I hope I made it clear, so if we do include it in the text -- in the title, we come to the conference, and upon the -- once we decide, then this will be reflected in the text of the question. This was a previous practice, and I don't see any inconsistency or any difficulty with that, and it's not against the rules. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, U.A.E. Oman, do you insist on taking the floor?

>> OMAN: Thank you, Chair. I would like to explain, I worked in the Ad Hoc Group of Study Group 3, and during the meeting, we asked the Arab States to represent an explanation, the contribution from the Arab States with regards to OTT. I did this. I presented a text. There was one opposition from the UK and the United States. The text was left in square brackets, yet the text was introduced following the request of the chair and represents the proposal from the Arab Group regarding OTT. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, we have heard from you different views on this, and I'd like to -- I'd like to take into account what all of you said, and in particular, I'd like to go back to what the Distinguished Delegate from Togo mentioned. He was a Rapporteur, Co-Rapporteur for this question in the previous study cycle, and in my judgment, he had some way forward. If I understand his position correctly, that was that -- the fact that even if Question 4/1 wants to undertake the subjects of OTTs and future networks, they can do that without having them specifically mentioned in the title or in the body of the -- of the question itself, so the way that I understood was that if we remove the square brackets, not only the square brackets but the text, and leave it up to the Study Group and experts that will be meeting in time during the course of the study period to see what is

best and what are the needs of the developing countries, and then come up with a plan election to study different topics that are of importance and urgency. That would be a way forward, so I am proposing to you if we would -- with this understanding that the experts on this question during the study period can work on general topics of relevance to this question and then now we can delete the square brackets and the text that were in dispute, that may be a way forward. I'm seeking your views whether we can move in this way. Germany.

>> GERMANY: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is what they referred to, words. I think this is a step in the right direction, by the way, but it will not all address the issue of duplication of work between the D sector and the T sector. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Before I continue, just to clarify some procedural matters, we started late, our meeting, and we were expected to have one hour of meeting today. We are still within that time limit, but nevertheless, I'd like to seek the agreement of the interpreters to continue maybe for another 15 minutes to close this?

>> INTERPRETER: Unfortunately, Chairman, the interpretation service does have to stop at this point. I do apologize.

>> CHAIR: Okay. I was told that the interpretation has to stop at this point.

Last, before we conclude, could I ask South Africa to be very brief.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, Chair. I'll be quite brief. Chair, the fact that you indicate that this will be taken onboard, unfortunately, we've learned from experience, because some of us can't -- some of our countries can't attend Study Groups, and issues which do not appear in a clear manner get ignored, and I think just to -- to clarify the way forward, this is not duplication.

In ITU we do have joint meetings of the different areas because we are not compared in terms of sectors as far as Member States are concerned. We need a collaborative effort, and I think that having those joint groups will facilitate the fact that we discuss issues there and decide whether this is duplication or not, but currently from our view, we think it's important that this issue be reflected. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. We understand. I would like to request that the focal point for this question, I believe it was Mexico, if you can continue your efforts along the discussions that we have had, and if we can have some feedback from you when we meet this evening at 6:30, we would be able to hopefully conclude

with the consensus.

The meeting, I have to close it now. Just request you to be back, please, at 1830. We have a lot of items on our agenda that we need to finish tonight, so your cooperation is very much appreciated as we go along. Thank you very much, and the meeting is closed.

(Sounding gavel)

(Session concluded at 12:58 p.m. Local Time)

This text is being provided in a rough draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.
