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>> JOSHUA PEPRAH: Is third session is about to start and we'd like the agenda to be posted on the screen, please. I assume also that the translators are all at Post and all channels are working.

>> CHAIR: So yesterday we had a chance to go through the documents on Resolution 76 on for item 5.1. This afternoon we're going to continue and discuss these documents as quick as we can and take the appropriate decisions. So before we do that, I'll let TSB make a statement on the first document, a quick one.

>> PAOLO ROSA: Mr. Chairman, just to say that document 29, 48 in page 90 is just amending factual and editorial issues like to change from Johannesburg to Dubai, et cetera. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: So we'll start with the ACP document 35. Anybody wants to comment on that document as it was presented yesterday?

First of all, we'll start with China, followed by Germany on this document, please. China, you have the floor.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, everyone. Yesterday, on behalf of APT, I already introduced this Common Proposal. If time allows, I'd like to highlight our changes to this document.

Recognizing, D, recognizing D, conformance testing doesn't guarantee interoperability but would increase the chance of interoperability of equipment conforming to ITU standards. In considering, D, we add that the 2012 session of the ITU Council in reviewing the KPMG business plan for the long‑term implementation of the conformance and interoperability programme agreed on an Action Plan which in particular invited WTSA‑12 to identify the appropriate study group to address the Sector's activities related to the ITU C&I programme across all Study Groups.

In resolves, 2 we add that ITU‑T Study Group 11 coordinates the Sector's activities related to the ITU C&I programme across all Study Groups and reviews the recommendations in the KPMG business plan for the long‑term implementation of the C&I programme. resolves 4, second bullet, we add one sentence, "also in cooperation with local Governmental and international accreditation and certification bodies. Resolves, 5, the last sentence, to take into consideration market demands, or taking into account market needs.

Instruct TSB, second bullet, bullet 2, the last sentence, measures to face the problem of counterfeited equipment. That's a new addition. There above are all the changes to the Common Proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China. Germany, you have the floor.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Please allow me to make some comments on behalf of CEPT on this Asian Common Proposal. We appreciate very much the remark that a market driven approach should be taken, and that the studies on the ITU Mark should only be continued after the development of a trial is achieved.

Please allow me also to make a comment concerning the allocation of work where the ACP proposal proposes to ‑‑

>> CHAIR: Just a second. I thought you were going to comment on the document from China.

>> GERMANY: On the ACP document.

>> CHAIR: Is that what you're?

>> GERMANY: Yes. This proposes to change the allocation of the function to Study 11. Currently the development of high level criteria and guidelines is done in Study Group 17 and the joint coordination activity on CIT is also reporting to Study Group 17. This Joint Coordination Activity has done a great job and developed guidelines that help Study Groups to properly address the issue and it also became clear Study Groups are responsible for the development of test specifications in their specific area of responsibility, like Study Group 11 for signaling, Study Group 16 for transport and so on.

So CEPT considers the current work split within ITU‑T most appropriate, and they would need for further clarification why a change in the allocation is proposed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. Any other comments on this document from ACP?

Okay, points noted. Can we take the document briefly from CITEL, I think, IAP38, A4/1. Just a quick recap, and we can discuss it. Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yesterday I got the opportunity to introduce this document and today I will take a couple of minutes or so to go through the actual document to indicate the main changes we are proposing. I would like to point out Mr. Chairman many of the recommendations provided by different to different proposals are similar. This proposal from CITEL differs from the other proposals in the sense that it recommends the removal of the ITU Mark but with respect to other items they are quite similar. If I go to the document right now, for example recognizing D is not very different from the one presented just a couple of minutes ago by the distinguished delegate from ACP ‑‑ sorry, from ATP. And it reads that while performance testing does not guarantee interoperability, it could increase the chance of interoperability of equipment conforming to ITU standards.

So we have come to a point after some consideration that we feel more comfortable to indicate that there is a possibility, there is a possibility, that conformance will increase interoperability but certainly, there is no for sure, but there's a chance and we'd like to point it out. And then we would scroll down, we can see other text that have been added. In considering C, we have added 7 considering, indicating what has happened in the recent past. We quote some Resolutions, 177 from the Plenipot, 76 from WTSA, 47 from WTDC, and so on. There's nothing controversial there.

We also quote the executive summary of the C&I report conducted by KPMG highlighting the important issues regarding the four pillars of the C&I programme. The first one is conformance assessment. The second one is interoperability events. And the third one is capacity building, and fourth one is regional testing centers, in particularly the KPMG report recommended that the introduction of the ITU Mark should not be considered along as test specifications preparation activities are not fully implemented.

And then we scroll down in the resolves, number 1, we have other text to indicate the ITU‑T Study Groups develops the necessary conformance testing recommendations for telecommunication equipment as soon as possible, associated with the development of the standards.

Resolves 4, that says that conformance and interoperability testing requirements shall provide for verification of the parameters defined in the current and future ITU‑T recommendations as determined by the Study Groups developing the recommendations and for interoperability testing to ensure interoperability taking into account market requirements.

And after that, you will notice that text related to the Mark have been removed. Also, I would like to mention that in instructs the Study Groups number 2, we have added to cooperate with interested stakeholders to optimize studies to prepare abstract test suites for those recommendations identified in instructs 1 above, particularly for those technologies for which there is a market demand for a conformity assessment programme. We want to emphasize the need of the market, too.

And that in a pretty short summary is what we are proposing, Mr. Chairman. We'd like to emphasize again that the main difference from this proposal with regards to the other ones is the removal of the ITU Mark. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Canada. CITEL. Iran, please, you have the floor.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. For those distinguished colleagues that were present at WTSA 2008, Johannesburg, they clearly remember that the Resolution emanated from the clear and the need of African countries and other developing countries. There was extensive discussions on the matter, and our administration was fully involved in that discussions.

It took a lot of time at the beginning, Chairman, the people are struggling to the considering part, and they had 29 considering. I proposed to them, please stop discussing considering. First go to the resolves part, and once the resolve is clear, come back to see how many considering or noting you need, and they kindly agreed with that. So this is the background.

Now, in that Resolution, Resolution 76, Mark or ITU Mark was major and important element of that. Therefore, Chairman, we have serious difficulty to agree with the Canadian proposal to delete the notion of Mark in the Resolutions. This is point number 1.

However, we could put the issue in the proper context, properly steps, and so on, so forth, but we disagree totally to remove that. That is point number 1.

Point 2, Chairman, reference is made to KPMG, usually no ITU document has any reference to any consultant or consultant office. We don't want to use the ITU as publicity for any company, no matter where this company comes from. Please note that I have no sensitivity with any consultancy or consulting company but it is not a tradition to put anything in the ITU documentations. This is point number 2.

Point number 3, in the Resolutions of the ITU Sector Assemblies and conferences like WTSA, like RA and like WTDC, we never use the term "shall." "Shall" is only limited to the treaty making conference, when the membership either unanimously or by consensus agree to take up some obligations. Therefore this is the third point that we disagree.

The fourth point, Chairman, is that they mentioned the needs of the market. Chairman, we don't know needs of the market. Who can tell me what is the needs of the market? Where is the market? Who defines the needs?

Chairman, many of the countries may not be part of the OECD or may not be part of any other entities and talking of the market and so, and you know and everyone else know that market today is on a very, very critical situation. No one could even foresee what would be the demand and need of the market even with the next month. So we cannot put Resolution ITU meet the needs of the market.

User needs, I could agree, users' need, but not need of the market.

Fifth point, Chairman, it is mentioned should be abandoned until the conformance test is fully implemented. Chairman, who could say that it is fully or not fully? Fully is an adjective or adverb which requires a lot of careful consideration, so we could not agree to put anything fully or not fully, to put any subjective matters or any qualification or any adjective or adverb to this one. Therefore, Chairman, in general we have difficulty with proposal of Canada with respect to that. But the most difficult is to delete reference to the market, serious objections. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Iran. Now we go to Italy, please? Let's hear your comments.

>> ITALY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have to point out the, in the recognize D, the point that state each could increase. Mr. Chairman, Italy have more and more contributions on this direction, to the TSAG to the joint interoperability testing, to Council Working Group 2 and in all these contributions, is stated that the conformance testing is the first vehicle in order to ensure compatibility, interoperability, because if you're not compliant with the ITU recommendations, you cannot ensure also this performance, Mr. Chairman, and in line with what I have stated now, I would like to change the word "could." In the word conformance testing, does not guarantee interoperability, but is the first vehicle to increase the chance of interoperability and so on.

In addition, I would like to repeat once again that in order to ensure interconnection and interoperability between equipment provided by different manufacturers need that the recommendation is defined from the beginning in order to reach this goal, because another way is impossible.

Also, if you are compliant with the recommendations, ITU recommendations, to ensure this goal. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Italy, for your comments. We take input from Germany now, and I think I've got quite a list, so after Germany, we go to Japan. Egypt, Russia, Uruguay, Sudan and United States, and we'll close the list at this point. Thank you.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of CEPT I'd like to support the CITEL proposal to postpone the remarks until a market driven approach are available. It has been mentioned before that the ITU does not talk about market. I would like to quote the Council report of July earlier this year, that the Chairman writes in his report that a market driven initiative by industry players to run conformance assessment with regard to an ITU recommendation would be a good testing ground for the market.

So I think Council has recognized that this activity should be market driven, so CEPT is of the view that the CITEL proposal to delete the reference to ITU Mark in Resolution 76 is most appropriate.

Further, I would like to note that the proposal of CITEL to focus exclusively on recommendations developed by ITU‑T Study Groups sounds very reasonable, since we recognize that the development of test specifications is extremely time consuming, and ITU experts should concentrate their meeting time to improve the quality of ITU‑T recommendations. We think that this also should be in the best interests of developing countries. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. Can I get a little clarification from you? On one hand, you support CITEL to postpone the Mark, yeah? CITEL, said that the Mark should be postponed. And the word "postpone" and deletion are not the same. I think Canada indicated it should be deleted.

So which one are ‑‑ are you for deletion or are you for postponement?

>> GERMANY: Council has decided to postpone the decision on the ITU Mark. That is what I was quoting and we feel that it is most appropriate to delete the reference in this Resolution at that time. If Council so decides to take up the further discussion on an ITU Mark, then it is up to us to decide to change the Resolution but for the time being, Council made a clear decision thought to discuss the ITU Mark until this matter of fact driven assessment has come to an appropriate conclusion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Japan, you're next.

>> JAPAN: Thank you very much. Japan support the ACP position so that's why the ITU Mark programme should be pursued. After more and more stages suggest as with the facility or testing specifications will be enough to cover those facilities.

And but before the discussion, I would like to ask the clarification on the document 35, Addendum 4 from CITEL. According to their proposal, they experienced the programme of interoperability, however, they propose the reason of the current ITU description such as the location of testing facility in the part of the Director of TSB, and the second, the two prepare ITU recommendations, we think that although the description is very important in this Resolution, so we would like to ask the reason why deletion of this question proposed. Thank you. .

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Do we have an answer for Japan? Microphone, please.

>> CANADA: Microphone is ‑‑ sorry. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was trying to find the item the delegate from Japan was referring to in the document.

>> CHAIR: I think it's instructs 2.

>> CANADA: Instructs 2.

What was deleted was item III, cost of facility and 4 location of testing facility. Is that the item the delegate is referring to?

>> CHAIR: I believe so.

>> CANADA: Think, Mr. Chairman, that we could reconsider that item after discussing with the delegate of Japan.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. We move on to Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. And I'm not quite sure if we're now in process of reviewing the papers or into the discussion of the issues. I need clarification before I continue.

>> CHAIR: I think the issues are coming out as the papers are being presented briefly. The papers were presented yesterday actually so we're discussing the issues.

But before, we were going down and having the papers briefly reintroduced, but I think since you have the African position, African Common Position, you could briefly go over it and add your discussions also.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. After reviewing the CITEL proposal as said a few moments ago, we have very strong difficulty about deleting the reference to ITU Mark, and as expressed by the distinguished colleague from Germany, that the Council has resolved to wait with the ITU Mark until the progress and pillars are running and I have comment also about this point.

But if we just remove it from the Resolution right now, and the Council came next year with support for pursuing the Mark, then it shall stay for more than 3.5 years until you continue the work which is not acceptable.

Secondly, in resolve 1, the recent addition associated with the development of the standards this means that this Resolution would be applied only on the coming recommendations and prohibiting making any work regarding the previous recommendations, I propose that we delete that part, that addition part, and the first part is sufficient to describe the urgency of the issue. Secondly, regarding the market driven as expressed by our distinguished colleague from Germany, putting the Mark or raising the issue of the Mark is market driving forces only I think is not appropriate.

ITU is putting the main recommendations and leading in this aspect, and should initiate ‑‑ should begin with initiation of reducing the Mark. And then the market have follow. I think the market will not put or invent an ITU Mark on behalf of themselves without the inclusion of ITU. That is the proper place to raise the issue of the ITU Mark.

I may have other comments but I'll delay it for further discussions. Regarding the KPMG visibility study. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. I will now take comments from Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, as has already been stated by earlier speakers, the deletion of the ITU Mark is unacceptable. We are seeking to review what we're trying to come back over what has already been said at Council, and to refer the decision back to the Mark programme. We cannot delete it because we will never be able to reinitiate that Mark, and compatibility tests obviously don't give perfect results. They're not 100%, but if we're increasing the quality of equipment by 10%, it's already an improvement. We're establishing a dynamic direction in which we can continue to move in order to review new equipment arriving on the market, and as Egypt has said, the market should be following us, and not the other way around.

We can decide to form the market, to create that market, its attitudes, and as to the Study Group 11, this has been looked at, and in this area, and it is the Study Groups who know most about this and who have the most experience, and the test recommendations come from those Study Groups, and Study Group 11 being tasked with coordinating those results, can only improve and speed up our work. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. The next speaker on this is Uruguay. Can we have your comments, please?

>> URUGUAY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, thank you. Very briefly, I believe that we are forgetting exactly what is meant by the concept of market. It includes the consumer, Governments or administrations, and regulators should not forget the consumer, and interoperability and conformance are there in order to facilitate the market as a whole, and we must remember that the consumer has a role to play in that market, so Uruguay would support the CITEL proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Sudan, you have the floor.

>> SUDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, there is something that should be clearly understood, compatibility and the testing programme will not necessarily guarantee quality of service, nor will they reduce the amount of waste. As you know, there are excellent equipment which is in conformity, and that we must try to reduce the amount of e‑waste.

We must also look at issues of Climate Change, but there is an enormous difference between the situation in developed and developing countries in the area of compatibility, and this is why we must maintain the ITU Mark, and it must appear on all ITU sites. The ITU can base itself upon its experience in order to license certain laboratories responsible for testing conformance and interoperability, and such laboratories have the full legal responsibility.

The data obtained subsequent to testing could be made available in a data bank, and that data bank could bear the ITU Mark. FCC is a Mark which appears on all equipment and we could simply add our own. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we would wish to make comments with respect to the issues that have been raised by colleagues based on the contributions of APT, CITEL and interventions of other colleagues with respect to the conformance and interoperability.

Mr. Chairman, a number of issues have been raised. First of all, the question was raised as to why CITEL deleted 3 and 4, the cost and setup of facility and the location of testing facility. Mr. Chairman, the CITEL revisions take as its point of departure the four pillars of the KPMG study. Those four pillars were conformance assessment, interoperability events, capacity building, and regional testing centers.

The KPMG study made very clear that the testing centers were the last phase in the implementation of this programme. Therefore, the CITEL revisions are directed to the development of test suites in collaboration with industry and as well as in development of the conformance database that has already been initiated by the ITU.

These stages still need to be completed, Mr. Chairman, before we can talk about the location of testing facilities or the cost of such facilities.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, the KPMG study made very clear, and after all, the reason we quote that study is that was the basis of the business plan that the TSB was using for the development of conformance and interoperability programme. But it is important to note that in that study and in the quote of the Director of TSB, it was highlighted that for this to work, there has to be a partnership and collaboration with industry, and indeed, in Council 2012, the Director of TSB indicated that he was gratified that industry was preparing to examine certain ITU‑T recommendations in order to develop test suites that in turn could be the data from those test suites could be entered into the conformance database that is being implemented by the ITU.

The point being, Mr. Chairman, that industry is required for the successful implementation of this programme. Why? Because it is industry that will test recommendations against marketplace demands. It makes no sense, Mr. Chairman, to develop test suites against recommendations for which there are no use. This does not ‑‑ would not help any country that is faced with the kinds of difficulties that colleagues have emphasized.

Now, we would also acknowledge that some colleagues have said that they were prepared to substitute "users" for "marketplace." That could be satisfactory to us, but the point being, you require industry involvement, and in turn, these tests on recommendations need to be relevant to users, and to the marketplace.

So, Mr. Chairman, we then come to the Mark. And again, the business plan that has been developed by TSB, by KPMG, makes very clear. They said that the introduction of the ITU Mark should not be considered as long as test specification preparation activities are not fully implemented. And we are very far from a full implementation of those test specifications.

We quote that, Mr. Chairman, in the CITEL revisions to Resolution 76. So it is our view, Mr. Chairman, that we are looking at the demands and requirements that colleagues have indicated that they need to satisfy conformance and interoperability, but we believe that we need to move forward on the basis of the work that has already been done, the business plan that has been developed to date, the involvement of industry so that the recommendations that will be tested are relevant, and we can talk about that, about users or the marketplace.

And, thirdly, Mr. Chairman, you cannot go from the first pillar to the fourth pillar without doing all the stages in between and expect to have a success, so that we would also suggest that to talk about test facilities at this stage, when we have not even developed the recommendations for purposes of conformance testing, would be clearly jumping way ahead of ourselves, and would not permit us to have a successful programme that we're seeking.

So, Mr. Chairman, we fully support the CITEL proposal. We support the interventions of colleagues of Germany and Canada and others who have spoken to this issue and to APT, and we at the same time, Mr. Chairman, we have listened very carefully to colleagues as to what the need of this programme would be, and we believe that the TSB is on the right course, but each stage needs to be taken in its turn.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. This is a subject that always gets a lot of interest and attention, and I think at the risk of overstaying our session today for a few more minutes, I'll open up for a few comments from Iran, Egypt, Japan, and Oman and that is the final list that will comment on this issue.

So Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, we have also listened to some of the ‑‑ to intervention of some of the distinguished colleagues. Chairman, we have no difficulty with the most of the comments made by my very distinguished friend and colleague. However it is far from what is put into the CITEL language used in the Resolutions. Chairman, we have no difficulty with the step as far as function of the Resolutions. We have no difficulty to refer to the involvement of industry, provided that industry demonstrate at least a sign of the cooperation. We don't want to put everything in abeyance until the industry decides yes or no, and if they decide no we will be at the mercy of the industry.

Chairman, we believe that we need to consider that here at this Assembly, according to the Director of the TSB, there are 100 countries. Why does the presentation than the Council and I think the Council has acted upon the decisions or conclusions of the WTSA 2008. We are now in the WTSA 2012. Depending on the outcome of that, I'm sure the Council of the ITU would also take ‑‑ consider and take that into account.

But, Chairman, we need to work on this issue. We need to take the intervention of some of the distinguished colleagues that we should do it in a step‑wise and that the reference to the market must be retained, perhaps with some qualification, with some time frame, and so on, so forth, and we take this opportunity to also agree with the proposal for the Russian Federation that Study Group 11 would be perhaps one of the most appropriate entities.

Nevertheless, the refinement of the work of the Study Groups are now under discussion in another Ad Hoc Group and we have to also wait for that. I thank you very much, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. Egypt, you have the floor, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman.

>> Is the English interpretation coming through? English interpretation is coming through.

English interpretation is waiting for the speaker.

[ No audio ]

Thank you, Chairman. Thank you, Chairman. I'd like to thank all the distinguished Delegates who spoke before me, and I would like to make a comment on paragraph J under "considering," where there is reference to the study conducted by KPMG and reference is made to the outcome of the study, whereas the ITU Mark is used ‑‑ that the ITU Mark cannot be used as long as there is no fulfillment of the testing requirements. This is clear in 1.5C of the document. There is a call for a Pilot testing project where there is a huge demand or demand driven by the market, and then the outcome of this Pilot test should be the indicator to determine whether the ITU Mark should be used or not.

And I think we should launch this Pilot project, and we should not remove the ITU Mark from the Resolution.

>> CHAIR: Are you done? Thank you very much, Egypt.

>> EGYPT: It has been mentioned that the industry is supportive of this Resolution and this limitation but we have seen high reluctance in filling the database for several years. Until very lately, we started very slow steps for this implementation.

So this would be taken into consideration. Additionally, if you recall Resolution 177 of the Plenipotentiary Resolution Guadalajara, we note that it was stated that the four pillars should be expeditiously and in parallel for implementation of the Resolution, so waiting one pillar after the other is finished is not in line with the consensus in Guadalajara, and also it have the big delay which is not in favor of developing countries and every other country, as well.

Additionally, as my colleague just mentioned, that the KPMG study has put an outlet for run the programmes in parallel, by making this Pilot project so that we have ‑‑ it should replace effectively or should complement the visibility study. It's like the Pilot project is like a visibility study in reality so it purports doing testing the Mark in the Pilot project, kilt will have to evaluate the sequences that our distinguished colleague has raised.

The same applies also for building test laboratories. Building a laboratory with test certification takes a long time. If we wait for four years and start building collaboratives it will take time. Still we need to have experience and save time, building capacity, building the lab step by step will be very beneficial for pursuing with implementation of the Resolution.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I take it that by your submissions, especially the African Common Positions and the Arab positions have also been brought up in these submissions. I will move on to Japan and Oman and then we will set up ‑‑ we will get into the decision phase on what to do with this Resolution, thank you. So Oman, you have the floor, please.

Sorry, Japan, then Oman.

>> JAPAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. So as I mentioned before the Japan supports the APT position, such as the Mark should be kept as it is and also the ‑‑ but the implementation of the ITU Mark programme should be waited until a much later stage of testing specifications and testing facilities.

And also, the description of the test center, the facilities, it should be kept as it is. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Oman?

>> OMAN: Thank you. Chairman, I will not be taking too much of your time. As far as the ITU Mark is concerned, we support the views that call for the retention of the Mark, and we do not support the total removal of the Mark until such a time where an agreed solution has been arrived at, and I think we should allow for a voluntary testing period, and by doing so, we'll have satisfied all the concerns that have been expressed so far.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Oman. Now I think we have listened extensively to many submissions on this issue, and we will move ahead to form an ad hoc Committee to try and perfect the document submitted by ACP, that document ACP35, bearing in mind Council's position on this issue, and the fact that we are capable of having parallel processes running, and not to hijack this Resolution and its benefits, especially to developing countries, by waiting and stringing things out for every one of the pillars to be completed. I think we should look at trying to get some parallel processes going on so that we can come to the point where we may be able to use the ITU Mark as the Council indicated that it should be postponed until several things have been done.

So an ad hoc Committee to be headed by ‑‑ yes, to be headed by China, because they submitted ACP35, with strong support from all the countries that have made contributions, so we can first of all make sure the Council position is not watered down. The issue of test facilities to be considered, and also the Study Group 11 ‑‑ whether Study Group 11 should consider the issues regarding the ‑‑ yeah ‑‑ that's right ‑‑ whether it should go to Study Group 11 or any other Study Group.

And also, to see how we can fast‑track this Resolution, and what it calls for, within this next four years, because this thing has been hanging on our neck since Johannesburg, and it's four years now. Very little progress can be reported. But it needs to be fast‑tracked, and the issue of ITU Mark should be put in its right context.

Deletion, obviously, is out of the question, as expressed by many countries here, and also Council has not indicated that ‑‑ to happen, according to their position. So if TSB can give us some information on the availability of space for this ad hoc Committee, to be headed by China.

Yeah, okay.

Okay, before we move on to the other subjects, I'll take three submissions from Iran, Egypt, and China. Thank you.

>> IRAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. You have read my mind. I fully support your suggestion that if distinguished Delegation of China agree, they taking care of this issue. However, with respect to the timing, Chairman, currently we are very, very limited in number. We are two Delegates only and we wish to request that at least it be postponed until Saturday afternoon after 16:00 hours. All of the time Mr. Chairman has already been taken and we don't want to have a parallel meeting because we are very, very much interested in this issue, so we request you kindly and the Secretariat not before Saturday afternoon, 16:00 hours. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, that will be taken into consideration. Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I support the decision by making our distinguished colleague from China to lead this Ad Hoc Group and I share Mr. Arasteh from Iran about the necessity to have the meeting outside of any other Ad Hoc Group, specifically 4A so that we can participate with enough resources. Without lengthy resources you can't participate with enough resources for this meeting. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. China, you have the floor.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The delegate from Germany asked a question in the afternoon, why Study Group 17, JCA, put it into Study Group 11. I need to give a simple implication ‑‑ explanation.

On the first day of WTSA, all the Study Groups reported their progresses, including SG11. In the past four years, that's the previous study period, study Group 11 focused on 5 questions in the testing area, developing countries and developed countries all send their Delegates to promote the testing related programmes. They proposed many suggestions to send the conformity and testing related issues from Study Group 17 to Study Group 11.

If you require further explanation, I suggest you look at document or contribution 10, and contribution 9, and then you can find your answer. I thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Well, I think these will be further clarified at the ad hoc meeting on this particular issue, and that's one of the things that must be decided, 11 or 17.

Okay. Nigeria, please, and then United States.

>> NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good afternoon to all colleagues here. Mr. Chairman, your conclusion was certainly a very good conclusion of the meeting, certainly of the Ad Hoc Group is the best, because it's a very important issue to us in Africa. We've raised this issue ‑‑ we actually proposed this programme from the very beginning, before the WTSA 08. It is important that we find a solution to bridge the gap that already exists in the standardization process.

The ITU Mark is something that we proposed from the very beginning, something that we definitely support going forward. I think it's useful to have an avenue where we can build confidence basically on the conformance and the conformance of the telecommunication equipment to standards, and indeed, any where we can check and test that important operation. The ITU Mark is used to give a confidence on the Mark carried out by established laboratories which would say particularly it does not have to be African laboratory, but a list. We also should have laboratories within our own jurisdiction we can work with and build skills of our people to be able to learn how to test and how to develop ‑‑ how to build a test suite and use a test suite. These are part of the skills gap that we hopefully should be bridging by this process.

At the same time, I want to promote and support cooperation between ITU and other SDOs in this area, but certainly, we will want to support the continuation of the work on conformance and interoperability by the ITU. So your conclusion, we support that entirely and we will be participating in the Ad Hoc Group for further consideration of the proposal. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. .

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Nigeria. United States, you have the last on this one.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we fully support the creation of the ad hoc, and through you, Mr. Chairman, we would wish to express our appreciation to our colleagues from China for Chairing that ad hoc. We would also join with our colleague from Iran in proposing that the meeting take place on Saturday after 16:00 hours. We also are finding ourselves stretched with the number of ad hocs currently being conducted. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. These points have been noted, and TSB will ensure that we accommodate all that. Thank you very much.

I thought we're done but China wants it for the last time on this issue, so China, go ahead.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of APT members, China submitted this Common Proposal. Many opinions of APT countries are well illustrated in this proposal. You want China to Chair the work of this ad hoc Committee. This is a very tough task. We are honored, and we will try our best to fulfill your target. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. We have no doubt that you'll the a good job for us. Thank you.

So now we quickly move to...

 I'm sorry. The report of the Ad Hoc Group that did the merger. If the Chairman is available, can you quickly run us through the report? Thank you.

>> EGYPT: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to briefly introduce to you the working document 1 for Working Group B of Committee 4, but before I start, I would like to express my deep thanks to the TSB Secretariat Mr. Mauree for all his assistance and support. And in the beginning also, I would like to state a comment mentioned by Korea during our discussion. Korea requested that its proposal not be included in the Resolution, as it was intended as a suggestion to TSB Director to establish a 2 to 3 year plan to implement the Action Plan in Annex of Resolution 44, and this plan should be reviewed every year.

In addition TSB should have an overview of the way regional needs and requirements are collected now and examined if a mechanism to better collect these needs and requirements and reflect them to the annual BSG operational plan could be found.

Now going to try to summarize all what we have done during the meeting, the proposal C64‑A10 was used as a baseline document to merge Resolutions 17 and 56 inside 44. I would like to highlight the main issues, because they are a lot. First of all, articles from the WTSA Resolution 17 and 56 ‑‑

>> CHAIR: Just a second, please. I would like to implore the diligent translators, interpreters, to bear with us for maybe another 5 or 10 minutes, please. Thank you very much.

>> EGYPT: Shall I proceed?

>> CHAIR: Go ahead.

>> INTERPRETER: That's fine, Mr. Chairman, but no more than 10.

>> CHAIR: Point taken.

>> EGYPT: As I was saying, Resolutions ‑‑ articles from Resolution 17 and 56 were included after discussion and modifications, whenever deemed appropriate under the recognizing part, the recognizing Section, the noting Section, the taking into account Section, the resolves Section, and the instructs TSB Director Section.

New items have been added on the "invites Council" Section. I will only mention a couple of those. The first was to encourage the establishment of a specialized panel for stimulating innovation which aims at stimulating global collaborative innovation, having the objective of Bridging the Standardization Gap between developed and developing countries, in addition to supporting the contributions emerging from developing countries to be standardized at the ITU, should they be proven to be of value to societies and communities.

Another item also added under the "invites Council" is to increase the ITU‑T budgetary provisions for fellowships, interpretation and translation of documents for TSAG, ITU‑T Study Groups, and regional Study Group meetings.

Also a couple of additions of new items for the resolves Section. That the ITU‑T in collaboration with the other sectors as appropriate shall develop a programme to assist developing countries in developing methods that facilitate the process of linking innovations to the standardization process.

And another Article to support with an available or otherwise contributed resources and on a case‑by‑case basis the coordinated of ITU Study Groups and encourage cooperation and collaboration of these groups with other regional standardization entities.

A lot of ‑‑

>> CHAIR: I thought you were giving us just the highlights.

>> EGYPT: Yes, thank you, Chairman. Also, a new instructs for the TSB Director has been added, and the Uganda's proposal was added to this part, and I would like to mention it for the floor.

To take the appropriate actions for each you ITU‑T recommendation, having implementation aspects to consider the need for developing implementation guidelines.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, the report is present for the distinguished Delegates for further details. We have added a couple of new actions in the Action Plan annexed to the Resolution, and we have deleted programme 4 in the same Annex, and thus programme 5 is now programme 4.

And finally, I would like to bring to your attention and to the attention of the Delegates that the new provisions for Resolution 44 has some budgetary implications to be considered by Committee 2 as follows: First, that the item increase the ITU‑T budgetary provisions for fellowships and interpretation, and translation ‑‑ this is one budgetary implication. And the second, the issue raised by Uganda which aims at developing implementation guidelines for new ITU‑T recommendations. This is my report Mr. Chairman for the meeting for your approval. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed, Egypt. On behalf of the Delegates in Working Group 4B we'd like to thank you for a very good job done.

I think we have a few more minutes before our cut‑off, so if anybody has any comments on this report as has been delivered, if we can have it very quickly. Otherwise ‑‑ yeah, the report is online in the working documents.

Working document 1, please. I'll take a quick one from Brazil, followed by Egypt. Thank you.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We'd like to thank Egypt for leading this group. It was hard work and it was well done but the mentions to all the documents that were merged into the final text should be done. It's not only the Arabian document and the documents from TSB. This document, this final document, heavily influenced by the CITEL document which is 38/A3, also the APT document 35/A2, also the African document 56/A6, so they should all be mentioned in the report. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Point noted. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: One comment regarding the budgetary implications. I do not think the budget of the TCB of the standardization Sector is very small and the ITU in general. It is only 8% as stated by the Director of TSB so the language must be very clear and very strong about allocating enough budget to the standardization Sector to complete its deeds, including issues related to developing countries. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So we'll look at the document and make sure that that point is very well made. Now, Iran, you have the last.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Very briefly, could it be possible that this document be issued as a DT document? Or why is it just as a working document? It would not be a DT at the appropriate time? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I'm reliably informed that by the time it gets to Com 4, it will be a TD document, but right now it's a working document. Thank you.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, thank you in very much for your contributions. Resolution 76 and issues associated with it always are very interesting, and takes a lot of time. So thank you for your indulgence, and staying till the end of this session, and giving all this important contributions.

As has been indicated, there will be an Ad Hoc Committee to look at this so we can wrap it up. Certainly it will be after 16:00 hours on Saturday and TSB will make sure of that so keep checking the notice boards. With that I bring this meeting to a close and I thank you for your participation.

[ End of meeting at 17:37 ]
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