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 >> We would like to start in two or three minutes. So please wander back in gently. Thank you. Good afternoon. We would like ask you to take your seats and put on your earpieces so we can start the meeting. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Dear friends and colleagues, we have a short session due to the long debating Committee 4 Plenary. So we have one hour left for our discussion, but I hope that as usual you will be so cooperative, so efficient that we can conclude our agenda.
 So you have the agenda projected on the screen. First, approval of the agenda. Any objection? No. So the agenda is approved.
 We have recent contribution is always the same result. We have the approval of the report of previous meeting in ‑‑ you have Revision 4, where practical have been added the discussion of this morning. Egypt, you ask for the floor. Egypt, you have the floor.

 >> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You adopted the agenda rather fast, Mr. Chairman. I should like to say that the Ad Hoc Group considering Resolution 64 is to meet tomorrow because the Chairman and the members of the group had to take part in other meetings. So, in fact, the Resolution 64 Ad Hoc Group will be meeting tomorrow.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. I will leave on the agenda wherever this document is labeled to say that we will leave this point to other meeting but maybe there are other points as necessary to consider tomorrow. So I remain for the time being in the agenda in French ed memoir and after we will proceed. Having said that I was going to the Revision 4 TD13 where there is practically the report of our morning session. You see in point 6 this is the result of our morning session. So I draw your attention in particular on page 5 where there is the result of this morning's session.
 I will give some time to go through the two pages, 5 and 6. Any observation? If not, the report is approved.
 So we can move to the next document, and this is the ‑‑ there was an informal consultation on revised Resolution 40, was given the text in TD38 Rev 1. So may I ask everything is clear? We go to TD38 Rev 1. So please correct the agenda, put TD38 Rev 1. Egypt, you have the floor.

 >> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. After further consultation about Resolution 40, we reached a compromise for Item 3 in the resolve part. So the text will be "To instruct TSAG to study and identify the operational and technical areas related to the quality of service, quality of experience of telecommunications/ICTs that might have policy and regulatory nature taking in to account the studies being carried out by the relevant Study Groups and report that to the next assembly WTSA." Compromise for Item 3 in the resolve part of Resolution 40. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt, for your work. Can we accept this compromised text and therefore adopt Resolution 40 as in TD38 Revision 1?

 >> IRAN: Could you kindly clarify if we are talking about the paragraph in QoS/QoE of telecommunication has been deleted?

 >> CHAIR: What I understand from the written text there is QoS/QoE of telecommunication/ICTs. That is what is in the text. So Iran seemed satisfied. No one is opposing. So we approve revised text of Resolution 40 as in the TD38 Revision 1. Thanks, Egypt, for the work he has carried out during the break.
 Next document is quite a complex one, is Resolution ‑‑ we have the result of the Ad Hoc Group. And I see the first on the list is Resolution 50 in TD ‑‑ it is not labeled.

 >> It is coming. It is coming.

 >> CHAIR: So the next one is ‑‑ one labeled Resolution 61 in TD51. May I give the floor to the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group, Egypt ‑‑ sorry, Russian Federation ‑‑ no, Egypt. Egypt. You have the floor.

 >> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We held discussions with the interested parties. I received a number of e‑mail communications from a Delegate who said he was speaking on behalf of a number of other Delegations. And in that e‑mail ‑‑ switch to English. Group 3 to develop description and definition for activities. Proposed to replace fraud and/or fraudulent activities with misappropriation and misuse. The rest of the sentence remains almost the same while adding international before numbering resources in every word in the text. This was a proposal. And after consultation with some other Delegates as well it was proposed to use the text as emerged from Study Group 3 work program which said that "To request Study Group 3 to continue to develop description and definitions for fraud as well as guidelines for fraud mitigation, related to misappropriation and misuse" and to continue the rest of the sentence. And this stems from the fact that the Study Group 3 already have work items relating to these subjects.
 I hope that the council can display the document and adjust TD51.

 >> CHAIR: I'm afraid that's ‑‑ the Secretariat has noted the text. Maybe we need the text. I understand the replace point 5 in the resolve further, if I am correct and we have to read what is the final text you are proposing to us so we know what we are approving.
 Iran, you have requested the floor before Egypt.

 >> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Do we discuss Document TD51 or it is a proposal to replace some of the current text in further resolve 5 with something else? Chairman, not to ask the floor again if we don't refer to fraud and fraudulent activities and just talk of misappropriation, I'm afraid we have difficulty with that due to the fact that misappropriation and misuse is a very general term and could be assigned and associated to many things, Chairman. Here we are talking fraud and fraudulent activities and should remain in the text. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Egypt, you have the floor.

 >> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The final texts will be after the original text we add continue, but I think we have to display the texts as the right to be difficult for Delegates to follow up. However it will be adding continue after requests Study Group 2 to continue to develop. This is the first change. Then after the description and definition of fraud we have two alternative texts. One is to add for fraud, to add a definition for misappropriation and misuse. The other square bracket will be as well as guidelines for fraud mitigation. For fraud as well as guidelines for fraud mitigation. These are the tools, square brackets indeed. The other additions are editorial for the time being.

 >> CHAIR: I'm afraid, Dear Friend, that you are requesting extra work and I will give to you because we need to have the text in front of us. So we charge you to have further informal consultation in order to show us the revised text for Resolution No. 61. You come back with this Resolution 61 tomorrow morning. Germany and United Kingdom.

 >> GERMANY: Thank you, Chair. And thank you for your proposal because that's what we have would have requested anyway, to have the text in writing before we decide. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: United Kingdom.

 >> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Well, I have got two concerns and a comment. The concerns are that I am not aware that Study Group 3 has been looking at fraud. And the text talks about continue to study. But you have Richard Hill sitting next to you that can confirm or otherwise. The other issue is I am not sure that it is appropriate for ITU to study fraud. It is a national matter. There is no definition of fraud. It is fraud where it is a matter for national courts or international courts. ITU is neither. I made this point in the informal discussion. Mr. Guinena is putting forward the text. It is not a Consensus text. It is a text that he prefers. I am not sure any further discussion will take that forward. So my comment is if that's really what Mr. Guinena and Egypt and Arab States wish Study Group 3 to look at, then they will have to attend the meetings and make the contributions because I am not aware that it is a Study Group that has a strong presence in the Arab States and I am not sure what other countries will be looking to have the input to this. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Egypt requests the floor.

 >> EGYPT: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Just to correct the information my Dear Colleague from the United Kingdom that Egypt is attending Study Group 3 and proposing for Vice‑Chairman for Study Group 3. Additionally the fraud has been if you can go in to the website of the work program, Study Group 3, find two issues, condition for fraud in D003 and another one is a work item for guidelines for fraud mitigation. In addition to take that we can pick up from social and even output of Study Group 3. However understand the concerns of our colleagues about fraud. So we can maybe refer that fraud is not meant with the legal or status of or national legislation of Member States but we can put like a footnote to refer that it is related to the issue of misuse and misappropriation and not to go in to national issues or national legislation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: I think that I repeat my previous conclusion, that means we need to have some text in front of us more or less discussed and agreed. There are some question of principles that anyway if not solved we come to the Plenary we will make a decision, but there are some alternative text proposals that I have not in front of me, and not the Secretariat and nor the Delegates. I think it will be really wise to have your one try at least to meet us this evening if possible. It is possible for you tomorrow morning early? Egypt, you have the floor.

 >> Egypt: Yes. I prefer tomorrow morning early.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Iran.

 >> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, we are here representing either Member State or Sector Members. We are not delivering to national court. We are dealing with national court. It should be easily covered. If you put in the text within constraint of national law or legislation, that's the expression we have used.

 >> CHAIR: United States.

 >> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon. We would ‑‑ we share the concerns of the UK about the use of the term "fraud". Fraud in common understanding is a term that means a deliberate intention to deceive and it is a criminal act in many countries, at least in ours.
 And we don't think that it's appropriate for the ITU to be studying issues, studying fraud. The ITU is a technical body. If you are going to get in to this, I believe that it would be more appropriate to find a different term for the word than the use of the word "fraud". Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you United States. China.

 >> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At the informal consultation there was another solution actually; that is, to delete fraud and/or fraudulence. Inappropriate, and replace these three or four words with the word inappropriate. Inappropriate activities it will read like this. Another point is in the second part of the sentence in front of numbering resources international should be inserted. So it reads "misappropriation of international numbering resources specified in ITU‑T."
 So I will be grateful if you can also consider this possible solution. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Egypt.

 >> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It has been part of the discussions but did receive some text but however it is a good proposal is using inappropriate activities. But I think you should postpone this also to the discussions further.

 >> CHAIR: United States.

 >> UNITED STATES: We would like to thank China for that proposal. We can support use of that term. I think that was far more appropriate and it would resolve that problem.

 >> CHAIR: So in this case can we try not to have the meeting and if Item 5 will read "To request Study Group 3 to develop description and definitions for inappropriate activity related to misappropriation of international numbering resources specified in ITU‑T. Recommendations and in collaboration to state the relation," maybe we have to stop there. Because there is no study in relation to misappropriation, misuse of numbering. We can stay there. This text can have the support of the meeting? If that is the case, the lead to your request for the floor. I have only Russian Federation to remain.

 >> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. I would like to recall that within Study Group 17 in this study period we began to study technical issues related with countering loss of income for telecom operators during misuse and fraudulent activity and in the list of future work. I think it would be correct to include a work area related to continuing these technical studies within Study Group 17. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Egypt.

 >> EGYPT: Thanks, Chairman. And listening to the last intervention I think there is a point that the fraudulent activities has been studied in Study Group 3 and studied in Study Group 17. So I don't see a big issue using the same wording as is used already in the T Sector. And the verbal text from Study Group 3 work program is fraud and guidelines for fraud mitigation. And with the footnote to define the scope of the fraud as not interfering with the national legislation and criminal activities or consider it is not including criminal activities.

 >> CHAIR: I do not want to continue the pain point. I see that, Mr. Guinena, you want to have your group tomorrow morning. In this case that it is the decision of the meeting to meet tomorrow morning to solve these pending issues on Resolution 61. I give you extra time and good luck in solving the problem. Now there was a request to the council on the Study Group 3 activity. So I give the floor to Richard to say something.

 >> RICHARD HILL: Yes, indeed as mentioned by Mr. Guinena Study Group 3 is studying the issue of fraud and I believe that it is understood that this is not criminal activity but rather what is called misuse of telecommunication revenue or misattribution of revenue or things of that nature. It is certainly the case that in the Anglo‑Saxon country it is a criminal act. I checked in Switzerland. The behavior we call a criminal act is used but the word is not in the Swiss law. That word denotes a criminal activity is something that depends on the country. And perhaps it could be clarified that what is at issue here is not any crime but rather a certain type of behavior and we are trying to define that type of behavior which is, of course, a technical behavior.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Richard, for this clarification that I think Mr. Guinena will take in due account when drafting the text.

 >> ALGERIA: Thank you, Chairman. I should simply like to come back to the first version of the language. Reference was made to recommendations of E.166, various other documents. And there is a reference to the use of these resources, telecommunications, and ICTs for illegal or inappropriate activities. This Resolution does make quite explicit the role of ITU regarding the use of these resources for elicit purposes.
 And I believe that one can avoid the words of fraud which can be defined as inappropriate use of ICTs.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you for your contribution and I understand that you will attend the drafting Ad Hoc Group informal consultation group tomorrow morning to have the final text. So having not finished with that, and don't forget tomorrow is our last meeting, so you have to come with the final solution. In that case we will be in trouble. Move to the next point is the report on Resolution 65, the Ad Hoc Group. And you find that in Temporary Document 52. Mr. Guinena, can you introduce the document please? Egypt.

 >> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And we have reached discussion but there are some square brackets left mainly about the technical ‑‑ this will be on Resolve 1. We have selection between two phrases where it says that international calling party number delivery, CI and OI shall, where technically possible, alternative is consistent with technical capabilities and national legal and regulatory frameworks. And it has been repeated elsewhere. And our suggestion is that to leave the word "technically possible" assuming that consistent with technical capabilities and national legal and regulatory frameworks already existed in the Constitution and not to be inserted here and we focus on the technical aspect of the matter which is technically possible. But there was no complete Consensus about this issue, Mr. Chairman.
 Another square bracket left then resolves 5 at the last part of the sentence where it says that "The requirements associated with data protection and data privacy are subject to national laws and legal and regulatory frameworks." And the part that is in between square brackets is "provided that any masked information shall be made available to duly authorized law enforcement agencies." And there are requests to delete this last part and the rest of the text has Consensus except these two issues. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you now for this introduction, clear introduction. Now we open the floor for discussion on the text of Resolution 65, both for comments and if I appropriately understood you you propose to delete the same text in the first square bracket ‑‑ the second text in the square bracket, national laws and legal and regulatory frameworks and proposed deletion of text and why for the second there is no guidance on your side if correctly understood.

 >> EGYPT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Maybe second part we can have some ‑‑ it is not a very serious issue, but I think it exists to complete the sentence properly. But the response of the floor or indeed will be needed in this aspect. The first one it is suggested that we delete the second part without losing the context of the issue.

 >> CHAIR: So you have clearly listened to the proposal. So that means in Point A Resolve 1, Resolve 2, Resolve 3, Resolve 4, there are these texts and the second part is proposed to be deleted. You agree with this proposal? United Kingdom.

 >> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. We were part of the discussion of this document last evening. And our preference would be to keep the current text in the current Resolution. It was agreed in Johannesburg '08 and has stood the test of time and we see no need to change it. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Canada.

 >> CANADA: Thank you, Chair. Regarding the text in Resolves 1, 2, 3 and 4 Canada would support the existing text consistent with technical capabilities and national legal and regulatory frameworks. Thank you, Chair.

 >> CHAIR: United States.

 >> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, we have the same view as Canada and the UK. We ought to return to the original text in our view. It is more accurate. And we also support the deletion of the language in Section 5.

 >> CHAIR: Egypt.

 >> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I now talk on behalf of the Arab States. I think we support keeping the text where technically possible because this gives the flexibility that responds to the concerns of other Member States and the Constitution as I said before covers the regulatory and national matters as the same applies also for Article 5. The Arab States would like to keep the new text where technically possible as proposed and keep the text in square brackets.

 >> CHAIR: Australia.

 >> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chairman. We strongly support retention of Resolves 1 through 4 inclusive and definitely prefer to see Resolve 5 deleted from this text. Thank you, Chair.

 >> CHAIR: Sweden.

 >> SWEDEN: Thank you. We support the United Kingdom and other speakers. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: So Iran.

 >> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, the text here, there are two parts. One part is consistent with national law. National legal and regulatory framework, Chairman. I think whether or not they put the sentence everyone is bound to act in accordance with national law even if we do not put it here or even if we put it here but we don't apply that we have to apply that. So I don't think there is a need to repeat it ten times in any regulation consistent with national law and consistent with national legislation. None of our Governments, Chairman, act against its national law. That's not possible. If we delete that because it is a fact, it is a preamble of the Constitution what remains technically possible which is already there in the first bracket where technically possible. So I don't think that we need to argue that. Once again make the life easier Chairman. How many times you have to refer to consistent with national law and consistent with national legislation? This is a preamble of the Constitution and we have it elsewhere. I don't want to refer which area.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. There are two ‑‑ I try to find the compromise. So what about saying where technically possible and consistent with national legal, regulatory frameworks? Since the Constitution noting arm to add this sentence to me. So if we say where technically possible consistent with national and legal, regulatory framework I think that satisfies both camps if I can say so. Egypt.

 >> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. You just took the words of my mouth as they say. So I think this may be a compromise solution. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. For that I think we can accept this text and I hope the Secretariat took note because I quote and I forget. And now for the last paragraph 5, there is a proposal to delete the text ‑‑ the entire text of the text in square brackets only. The text ‑‑ may I ask United States was first proposed to clarify.

 >> UNITED STATES: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We believe it should be deleted completely. It is a matter of national law. And who are we to tell national law ‑‑ national bodies that they must ‑‑ that the requirements are subject to national law but only if the information is made available to law enforcement agencies. That's clearly an intrusion in to the national laws as to the process that needs to be followed to establish a failure here. So we think this is factually flawed, this language and should be deleted entirely and in that regard I believe Iran also took that position. So we would associate with Iran.

 >> CHAIR: Is that sufficient explanation to the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group? Because you say that there is no firm position on that. So can you accept the deletion of Resolve 5? You have the floor.

 >> EGYPT: Yes. Before reverting to that, it was ‑‑ there was some voices or some opinion that enforcement agencies related to the same national country or to the same country. Not to other countries. If you can find the text with this meaning, this will alleviate reservation or the comment of United States. Maybe the Council can hear me in English in that part.

 >> CHAIR: Yes, I think national matter is not for international organization to deal with. My proposal is to delete this Point 5 if you agree. Canada.

 >> CANADA: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. We would support your proposal.

 >> CHAIR: Germany.

 >> GERMANY: Thank you. I am sorry but by now I am a bit confused. I would prefer to have the whole thing in writing. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: The Point 5 is in TD ‑‑ in the resolve in TD52. It is proposed to be deleted completely. United Kingdom.

 >> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. We would support your proposal.

 >> CHAIR: Egypt.

 >> EGYPT: It was like a compromise if we delete 5 with the deletion of the consistence with national and regulatory frameworks. Can delete both in 1, 2 and 3 and 4 and consequently delete 5.

 >> CHAIR: The text on ‑‑ I read on 1, 2, 3 and 4. It was clear enough. So it is still there where technically possible consistent with national legal and regulatory frameworks. That was the text in Resolve 1, 2, 3 and 4. Germany.

 >> GERMANY: Yep.

 >> CHAIR: Greece.

 >> GREECE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We support your proposal to delete Resolve 5.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. So if there are no ‑‑ Egypt, you have ‑‑ you agree on that?

 >> Egypt: To be clear suppose that deleting 5 and as a compromise to delete consistent with legal and regulatory frameworks, national legal and regulatory frameworks. So delete both from 1, 2, 3 and 4 and from ‑‑ and delete 5 accordingly. We leave only where technically possible.

 >> CHAIR: There is a compromise that the Secretariat is suggesting because it is not a real resolve. If the Item 5 remains the text, I read for resolve Item 5 noting further because it is a consideration of what is happening at the national level. That's what the Secretariat has proposed to me to put that in the noting. Egypt.

 >> EGYPT: Maybe this could be a possible solution. But just ‑‑ give me one minute to consult colleagues. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Iran.

 >> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. This Assembly should not give any instruction to the national Government to do or to take any action. This is up to the national Government to decide the way that the original accordance with the Preamble of the Constitution. You cannot, should, shall and not comply the Member States to take any action. We intervene. We should avoid that. The matter is left to the national administration to decide as appropriate. That is the Preamble of the Constitution and we always said that ITU should not be used to resolve the national issues. The national issues remain under the purview of the national administration and national Government. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Australia.

 >> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chairman. We agree with Iran on this particular issue. Regardless of where you choose to put this text we would not be satisfied with that. It does still in our view with very sensitive sovereign issues of some, if not all, Member States and in our estimation those issues are most eloquently dealt with under Plenipotentiary Resolution 21 which was referred to earlier in this document. Thank you, Chair.

 >> CHAIR: So I come to my original proposal to eliminate item 5 leaving the text as I said before because I have had the strong opposition from Iran and Australia. Egypt, can you be satisfied with that?

 >> EGYPT: To delete 5 only or 5 and the second part of the text on 1, 2, 3, 4?

 >> CHAIR: 5 only.

 >> EGYPT: We have to consult with the Arab group for deleting.

 >> CHAIR: 1, 2, 3, 4 has been accepted. We can postpone with this in mind the approval of this Resolution. And we come back tomorrow morning but this being only pending item. Iran, you want to speak at last?

 >> IRAN: Yes, we support Egypt. If we delete Item 5 totally which must be deleted, we delete anything to refer to national legislation and national law and that is already clear answer and up to the national legislation to decide. Maybe in treaty making conference but not in Assembly. So we support Egypt to delete 5 and to delete reference to national legislation or national law in 1, 2, 3 and 4 all together. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Is there any opposition at this last proposal? Yes, I see several requests for the floor. So it is not the solution, Mr. Arasteh. So I will ask really on the business of my proposal to come back tomorrow to this Resolution 61 and find the agreed text. Okay. Please take out the ‑‑ your requests for intervention because in any case we will not solve the problem. Cuba, you want to speak still or different item? You delete also.

 >> CUBA: I think the group should meet and it should be clarified that we do support the Iranian proposal.

 >> CHAIR: So informal consultation on the basis of what I said. And tomorrow we will approve Resolution 61. So I'm afraid that we have approved very little today but ‑‑ and time is running. Next item in the agenda TD46 or Resolution 50 it seems is now available. Yeah. It is available. So may I ask Mr. Kremer to introduce TD50 for us? Russia, you have the floor.

 >> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. I am happy to report the Ad Hoc Group on the consideration of proposed amendments to Resolution 50 on cybersecurity completed its work and we submit to you for your consideration a fully agreed text. I should like to thank all who participated in the work of the group for their very hard work in the quest of compromise and agreement and I ask you now to consider and approve this text.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Kremer, for this very promising introduction. So you have the text of Resolution 50 under your eye in TD46. And there is a request for approving. Any observation, request for clarification or we can proceed with the approval? That pleased me a lot. No request. 1, 2, 3. Approved. Thank you, Mr. Kremer, again for the excellent work you have performed.
 And now we move to the next item on the agenda because the time is running, I think we have the ‑‑ what we have? Resolution 69, is that the agenda?

 >> No, no. We said ‑‑

 >> CHAIR: Yeah. We say that there were some pending items in Resolution 69, DT64 Rev 1. 64? 54 Rev 1.

 >> That's not agreed.

 >> CHAIR: I will check now.

 >> We need to ask for ten minutes for interpretation.

 >> CHAIR: 54 Rev 1. May I have the occasion to ask interpreters if you can stay with me ten extra minutes?

 >> INTERPRETER: Yes, we can stay ten extra minutes.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you for your cooperation. So now we go to Sudan. Can you tell if you found the solution?

 >> SUDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think there is still an issue in square brackets, either resources or not. Public Internet sites are resources, this is in square brackets within which any agreement hits, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: That means still consultation are needed because really I didn't send these directly to Committee 4 hoping that in the time being where possible to have some consultation on this particular aspect. Maybe it is needed some more extra time due to time difference with some countries and we can ‑‑ you have to come back to that tomorrow morning. Or Iran, you have the floor.

 >> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I don't think that anyone could make any miracle. The title of resolution is Nondiscriminatory Access and Ise of Internet Resources. So we put just part of the title in the resolves. Could a resolve be not covering the title of resolution and the subject of Resolutions? What is the difficulty, Chairman? So we just ‑‑ instead of the services we said and use of Internet resources. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Yeah. In Resolve 1 really public Internet site resolves. May I try to have this text as approved? There is some text taking out square brackets. Can we approve this text and send to the Committee 4? If there are no requests from the floor ‑‑ United States.

 >> UNITED STATES: Mr. Chairman, we continue to maintain that we need to use ‑‑ go back to the original text and in fact, we need to ‑‑ it might be helpful if we can have a little more time for consultation, if we could defer a decision on this until tomorrow morning. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: So we will do that. We will put in the agenda also specifically these documents tomorrow morning. Hour meeting. Hour meeting tomorrow morning. Tomorrow let's say. I don't know if it is morning or afternoon. Morning. Now let's go to the next document in our agenda which is Temporary Document 75. You remember the words Resolution, if we decide to charge the Secretariat to provide us with text or draft opinion. And now the draft opinion is in TD75. I give the floor to the Secretariat to introduce TD75.

 >> RICHARD HILL: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. Following the introduction by the legal advisor of the view that had been requested of him and is summarized at the beginning of TD75, there was an agreement that it would be better to redraft the text that had originally been proposed as a Resolution as an opinion. So it was redrafted as an opinion. But there are consequential changes in the part that had been resolves that has to be changed to is of the view because that's how we do opinions. And therefore the legal advisor and I have now produced the consequential changes and you can see them here in DT75. The resolves is rephrased as is of the opinion that the concerned Member States may wish to consider withdrawing. And then the other two changes are really editorial. It is to separate the invites in to invites to Member States and invites to the Council. This reflects what we were requested to do, Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you for your work, Richard, and the legal advisor. There are requests from the floor. Iran.

 >> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We are grateful to the legal advisor once again and to the Secretariat to reproducing or providing this document. The only thing, Chairman, under the opinion when you have opinion 1, under opinion 2 in the second line still you have implementation of this recommendation. If you want to retain, that should be this opinion which is 1. No. 2, I don't think that we need that word because already you have the opinion that Member States may wish to consider, but if you want to retain this invite, this opinion 2, we have to replace the recommendation by opinion. That is the minimum that you have to do. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. I'm afraid in this case noting that the recommendation, I think our Recommendation D156 to be precise is not the recommendation but it is referring to recommendations who are subject to discussion. So to be more clear that some Member States express reservation on ITU Recommendation D156 I think the ‑‑ will reflect that by the Secretariat. So there will be modification on that. With that change it is more clear to you, Iran?

 >> IRAN: Yes. If you refer to Recommendation D156 I have no problem.

 >> CHAIR: With this modification I have any further requests for clarification of ‑‑ France, please.

 >> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. I am a little confused. I have heard the explanation of the legal advisor and now I see the document. If I apply the document to my country, it is asking me to declare that I would like to modify the reservations which have been put forward. This makes me uncertain because I am not fully in a position to do so. And it is also an opinion of the legal advisor and not of the Assembly as a whole. So I am confused. I need explanation.

 >> CHAIR: Iran.

 >> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I draw the attention about the Distinguished Colleague from France that we read ‑‑ we need to read the opinion that Member States may wish to consider. There are three actions. First of all, they may and second they may wish and third to consider. There is no obligations. I don't think that causes any problems with anybody. These are the invitations, that please kindly may you consider. The answer may be yes or no. But I don't think that causes any problems for anybody.

 >> CHAIR: Germany.

 >> GERMANY: Germany shares the concerns that were just voiced by France. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: So Iran made some comments outlining that really is an opinion that the concerned Member States may wish to consider withdrawing their reservation about Recommendation ITU‑T D156 is not an obligation, is an opinion. But it is not an obligation. I think that's ‑‑ I don't know if there are some better English texts for that. I am not English speaking mother tongue. In some cases it is difficult for me to find the way out. But if you have come texts also in French, that's ‑‑ Richard.

 >> RICHARD HILL: In French the text will be (speaking in non‑English language). Literally in English is of the opinion of the cause. We are speaking of an opinion.

 >> CHAIR: So these clarifications are sufficient for the meeting? Or you have further requests for clarification let's say? Can we ‑‑ Iran.

 >> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We should look in to the initial proposal from Cameroon. They call for resolution and resolves and we narrow down to opinion and narrow down that Member States are invited that they consider if they so wish. So I don't think that we should defer with the initial proposal from Cameroon in support of African countries. This is the minimum and we have to comply with that. There is nothing more than opinion and nothing more than may wish to consider. Let us be frank and objective and agree that a proposal from a group of African countries came and we have to comply with that and they agree kindly to accept that opinion. At the beginning they come for Resolutions. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Let's make a further trial. Can we approve this opinion, draft opinion? If there are no requests from the floor, 1, 2, 3 we approve. Thank you for your speeder cooperation, especially to my European friends and colleagues. Now we have only work to be performed and I ask both Resolution 64, informal consultation group to come tomorrow with agreed text with no square brackets, with everything in order. So with that I say thanks to the interpreters for the offer but we finish on time. The meeting is closed.
 (Session concluded at 17:28 CET)
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