

Raw file.

October 26, 2016.

10:15 a.m.

ITU.

World Telecommunication Standardization
Assembly.

Hammamet, Tunisia.

Hannibal room.

Com 4. Committee 4 Session.

Services Provided By:

Caption First, Inc.

P.O. Box 3066

Monument, CO 80132

800-825-5234

www.captionfirst.com

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

***.

Raw file.

October 26, 2016.

10:15 a.m. CST.

ITU.

World Telecommunication Standardization Assembly.

Hammamet, Tunisia.

>> Hello, hello.

>> Ladies and gentlemen, ladies and gentlemen,

please take your seats, so we are about to start.

Ladies and gentlemen, please have your seats, we are about to start. Ladies and gentlemen, please take your seats. We are soon to begin our committee 4 session.

>> Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. On behalf of the Vice-Chairs, myself, who introduced to you yesterday I welcome you to committee 4 of the WTSA 16, committee 4 is on ITU programme and organisation. Our agenda for today can be found as ADM 6.

I will want to take a couple of minutes to take you through today's agenda for adoption and for us to be guided by our way throughout the days until Tuesday next week.

So, for now, if we can have the agenda displayed on the screen. The agenda ADM 6, displayed on the screen. You may refer to that as well, ADM 6, as we try to project the agenda.

For the list of proposals that were received, which were available as DT1 on the pages 8 to 10 you have the allocation that has been given to committee 4.

Again from pages 11 to 13 we will be working, will be working group 4A and working group 4B who will be reporting to committee 4. Then we have the time plan as DT3, which runs from today to Tuesday. Usually morning sessions, but on the last Tuesday, we will have an

afternoon session as well. Then we have our general agenda as DT8.

So you will be guided by these documents all along the way. So in the general agenda, DT8, you have your location of documents and proposals, and as to what sessions we will be dealing with these documents. With that said, we will consider intercommittee issues as they come. But this morning, our main discussions and presentations will be on Study Group structure, and also some resolutions under committee 4.

With this, I ask that is there any comments on this agenda for this morning? I see no one asking for the floor. Can we adopt this agenda for this session? Thank you, with your loud silence of approval. Thank you very much.

Now, we move to agenda item 4, and as reference, on 4.1, this assembly receive reports from all Study Groups on the Study Group structure. 4.1 are reference documents on the proposals from all Study Groups.

4.2 were proposals that were received from regional organisations, and with this, we want to take three minutes each for each regional organisation to present their proposal on Study Group structure, especially if you look at 4.3, highlighting the number of Study Groups

that you are supposed to have for the next study period, as well as the allocation of blocks of works, especially on human factors, network management, home networking, video quality work, Internet measurement, as well as other movements as they may be peculiar.

So with this on, I will invite the African regional group to present their proposal on Study Group structure.

I see Uganda has the floor. Can we give the floor to Uganda?

>> Uganda: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If you could just give me five minutes to set up my computer briefly, and I'll get back to you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So Africa is not ready. Five minutes will mean we would have taken two proposals already. Can we go to the next APT if you are ready. I see Japan asking for the floor. Can we give the floor to Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This contribution describes APT common proposal on ITU-T Study Group structure and modification of resolution 2. Based on the 7 highlighted restructuring principle confirmed by ITU-T committee, APT identified no need for specific changes in current Study Group structure.

Regarding the work item in question 11 we propose

to transfer question 4 of Study Group 2 to Study Group 16, as a separate question. We also propose to keep all questions in Study Group 9 and in Study Group 11 as it is.

With respect to Study Group 2, Study Group 9 will result in increase of human resource consumption of TV broadcasting experts, Study Group 9 is very, Study Group group, all questions require cable TV broadcasting. And disband of Study Group 9 will mean that ITU-T lose one of significant study area of cable TV broadcasting, which may give strong impact to ITU-T on the membership. Then Study Group 15, Study Group 16 is more teleco centric and Study Group 9 is more cable TV centric.

If these industries were in the same Study Group, it could mean some delays in the work output due to high level of cross industry consumption, compaction.

The regulatory bodies are different for cable and teleco, and merge the two Study Groups would lead to increased difficulty for these member states. Regarding Study Group 11, Study Group 11 is working productivity on the current question supported by contribution 1 active participation. Distributing the question of Study Group 11 to Study Groups or Study Group 11 with any other Study Group causes negative impact rather than

benefits.

We should instead reinforce Study Group 11 especially to maintain and reinvigorate the strong banner of Study Group 11. It represents in the time of signalling and protocols, as well as testing and combating counterfeit. And enforce study on important impact topics on next study period such as IoT and 5G2020. Table 1 summarizes APT proposal on ITU-T Study Group structure to maintain current Study Group structure except transferring question 4 to Study Group 4, human factors, to Study Group 16.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Japan. I think we have all these submissions translated in all languages. And we have, you highlighted this in three minutes.

So we will move on to the Arab group, if there is no requests for clarifications or requests on the submission by APT. I see no one asking for the floor.

So can we have the Arab group to present their proposal on the Study Group structures. Arab group? I see no one asking for the floor. If you are not ready, can we move on to Europe.

Again no one is asking for the floor. Russia, RCC, if RCC is ready. Russian Federation, I will give the floor to Russian Federation, please.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. Our proposals are based on the existing structure of Study Groups, meet the needs of the questions that we want to study in the next study period.

Also, we believe that specific questions that are dealt with by the Study Groups could be modified in substance. This is linked first and foremost to the appearance of new technologies.

For example, in Study Group 11, which has worked very well over the last study period on questions of testing and measurement, we need to pay more attention to issues of testing and measurement for fifth generation systems, for tactile Internet, etcetera.

So, all of this within the framework of this Study Group and the concentration of issues of testing and measurements, this will help us to be more efficient in solving difficult issues as regards new technologies.

We would draw serious attention to Study Group 3 as well, where I would like to have the same concentration of questions on regulatory and economic policy issues. This will help all countries, not only developing countries and emerging economies, but everyone to have in their hands a toolkit for new types of telecommunications recommendations, which will give us

the opportunity for, to coordinate our solving of these issues.

So if we look at questions of economics, policy and regulatory issues, in terms of interoperability and testing, etcetera, then I think that this approach, this type of approach would allow us to have a new quality of telecommunications recommendations in the new study period. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russia. So is there any requests for the floor, for any clarifications or comments? No one seems to be asking for the floor. So, at this stage, if Africa is ready, we could take your submission. Uganda is ready. Can we give the floor to Uganda, please.

>> Uganda: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, colleagues. The submission of the African group deals with mainly three parts. Our first consideration is with regard to the principles put forth by TSAG, principles, and key we would like to draw attention to is principle G on support of bridging standardization gap.

Our interest would be to have this expanded to have, we are proposing that it looks at specifically increasing the assistance to developing countries. We appreciate all the support that has been given so far. But we

wouldn't want this limited to capacity-building.

We are proposing that various effective mechanisms be explored, including usable electronic methods, capacity-building, information sharing, technology transfer among others.

With regard to the proposals from TSB on the restructuring, we welcome this. However, we think these need for further consideration to ensure that the disruption of work is not encountered, and in this respect we are proposing that TSAG sets up a group to study this further, and assess the strength and weaknesses of the current structure and organisation of the ITU Study Groups, evaluate recommendations of the ITU-T, and the implementation by the membership and the sector, and determine the optimized restructuring required, and then make any proposals.

With regard to the Study Groups, we are proposing that we still, we note concerns expressed by experts such as those presented during the global symposium, Global Standards Symposium, that raised concerns about effectiveness of experts to bring resolutions where the focus is so broad. We are therefore proposing that we still have Study Group 2 focusing on the numbering and addressing and identification issues. Working party 2

concerned with operational aspects in how many Study Group 2 operational mandate, we still maintain this. Then we are proposing moving question 4.2 to Study Group 16 on human factors. With Study Group 3 we are proposing a no change. We consider this very important to developing countries, as some of the other regions have already highlighted.

Study Group 5 as well we propose no change. We still also look at this as a very important area for us developing countries. Study Group 9, we are proposing a modification by looking at the transfer of QOS issues to Study Group 12, that's already handling such issues, because we believe that the expertise and bringing this together is very important for the working, for getting of quality product.

>> CHAIR: You are out of time, but if you take just a few seconds.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll conclude as soon as possible. Study Group 11 is no change. Study Group 12, slight modification as has already been mentioned above. Study Group 13, we also are proposing a modification in terms of having Study Group 13 lead on all issues of network management for existing and future networks.

The other proposal of modification is Study Group 16, where we are saying inside question 4.2 that we mentioned above with Study Group 2, concerning machine to machine accessibility issues as well as human factors. With that, Mr. Chairman, I submit and thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well. Is there a request for clarification or comments on the submission from Africa? I see no one asking for the floor.

We will proceed and I will invite the Arab group if you are ready to take us through your proposals for Study Group structure. I see Bahrain asking for the floor. I will give the floor to Bahrain, please.

>> Bahrain: Allow me to present the contribution by Arab States on resolution 2. We have first of all amended the Study Group 3 to include economic policy and regulatory matters, as we see this is important with the advancement that is going on in the technology world globally.

We have also removed Study Group 9. And amended some of the terms within the other Study Groups, not wanting to take more of your time, we have also had some amendments in Study Group 20, IoT, which is again important and we need to address the details of that

matter.

Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Bahrain, for your highlights, very brief and sweet. Do we have any comments or requests for clarifications from the Arab group? I see no one asking for the floor. Can we now turn to Europe on their proposals. I see France asking for the floor. Can we give the floor to France, please.

>> France: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Good morning, Chair. On behalf of the European group I'd like to introduce the proposals. We propose two documents, 45 add 1 and 45 add 6 in which our proposals to resolution 2 are all explained.

The first document defines the principles that should be applied when restructuring, applicable, general principles that are applicable, and which we feel the ITU should position itself. On the European side, very much attached to having ITU retain its role as the prime mover in these essential activities, catalyzer as for Telecom markets and also that the ITU remain within its fields of competency, that is new technological innovations and responding to different needs of sectors and a final principle, cooperation with other standardization organisations, since we are a part

of the ecosystem of standardization. Finally, cooperation with developing countries, within countries and within the ITU-T.

We made a series of proposals here that are included in addendum 6 on restructuring Study Groups, and this without going into detail basically would, it meant reducing a number of SGs which are currently operational. We think that in launching a new study cycle, this would be the opportune time to go from 11 to 9 SGs, by melding together a certain number of SGs, on a logical basis.

For example, 9 and 11, SG 9 and SG 11, we would propose to regroup them. Our proposal also has to do with another series of logical transfers, SG 2 would be limited strictly to its mandate, that is a numbering, routing service provision and so on. We would have a reworking of the different mandates of other SGs, for example, Internet of objects would be dealt with in 20. I won't go into any more detail at this point, Chair, on these proposals which will of course be discussed later.

I wanted to give you an idea of general thrust of our work, and the spirit within which we make these proposals. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, France. Is there

a request for clarification on this proposal or any comments? I see no one asking for the floor. Thank you very much. So we will ask for the inter-American proposal, I see Brazil asking for the floor. Give the floor to Brazil, please.

>> Brazil: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning to everybody. I will present the first document. We have in fact two interAmerica proposals, the first one based on discussion we had on last meeting of June and two parts, basically first one is structure itself and the movement question and the second one the change on the leading roles. To be very brief here, we have a NOC in terms of Study Group structure 3, 5 and 17 and 20, in terms of question of movement we have a mod on Study Group 2, and we are trying to focus it on its mandate on numbering, naming address and routing so moving working party 2 to Study Group 13 and moving human factors to 16, that's already been, some work has been doing there on this field.

Regarding Study Group 9, we are proposing to suppress it. We believe it's a very important work being done there, but we believe that on this new working period that we have would be more effective to have a most of this work being doing together with Study Group 16, and

we are proposing to move most of the question of 9 to the 16, besides some quality question that we are proposing to move to 12.

There is already focus on QOS. The same approach could be done to Study Group 11, we are moving the questions regarding quality of services, also to Study Group 12, but we are proposing to keep Study Group 11 as a whole because we believe there are a lot of important work being doing there on the protocol testing part. We have the counterfeiting discussion and also the tasks that is correlated to CMI programme we have running right now with 1 and 2 on duty.

Besides that, this is the most part where they have in terms of restructuring. Now when we look at the leading roles we have made some minor changes based on side discussion and in a brief summary, this is the first part of our proposal. I will pass to my colleague to present the second document that we have from the region. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So if you can give to the United States, the floor to the United States, should be under a minute.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, everyone. As the telecommunication ICT continues to evolve, we believe so must standards that

we are dealing with here at the ITU. We are familiar with many of the existing standards organisations, that deal with telecommunications and ICT.

We also see that every four years at the end of every four years, we review the ITU-T structure, the Study Group structure, to find the most efficient way to restructure the Study Groups. Our experience has shown that the following 13 principles that are listed in our contributions in the CITELE contribution before you, we believe that allow a timely and technically sound standard, and that also support the structure that is concise and gives guidance to members and participants on the ITU-T's priorities and goals for the upcoming four years.

Mr. Chairman, I present to you for your review and approval this contribution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States of America. We have two countries, Brazil and United States presenting on behalf of the Inter-America proposals. So is there a request for clarifications? Or any comments on this submission from the Americas?

I see no one asking for the floor. Thank you very much. If we may turn to the agenda item 4.3, what we are talking about now, is we are talking about structure.

As we know, in our everyday life, for you to have a structure, you should have the foundation, and then you build on it, and you roof it, and then you can decorate it, you can furnish it.

We will use a similar situation to do this, to tackle these proposals. I had a number of proposals and from your submissions on principles which were agreed at the last TSAG meeting, and were submitted to this assembly. So we are guided by it.

There is an additional proposal from Canada, which will be dealt with together with the African proposal on Friday morning. With that as a background, we are guided by these principles as we agreed at the last TSAG.

So we move on to the number of Study Groups, and here I want you to refer to DT9. If you can display DT9, the document.

With this we have consolidated information concerning the restructuring proposals.

So we had, if you go into the first table, we heard everybody saying, or every region saying that except for Study Group 9 and Study Group 11, the others should be retained.

With this, we will thank you for your concerns, so from the start we have nine Study Groups which we

want to retain.

So on the number of Study Groups, we will be left to discuss on Study Group 9 and Study Group 11. Then on the point of transfer of work, this involves in addition to Study Group 9, 11, Study Group 2. Four others, it was about retaining their work, or other transfers of work from these three Study Groups to them.

We did not talk about there are two, we are talking about, when you are talking about transfer of work we would deal with these three Study Groups to make it easy for us.

These are the two things we want to achieve, the number of Study Groups as of now from your proposals, we have 9 as default, we settle on the agreements on these two and also on the transfer involving these three Study Groups.

So, I don't know if anybody wants any clarification on questions on this proposal. I see no one asking for the floor.

So first, leave us take Study Group 9, so we heard CITELE and CPT who are asking for the suppression of Study Group 9. Considering the proposals which have come from other regions, I want to give the opportunity for Study Group 9 to give us a sense of who are the need to retain

the Study Group in the Study Group period. So if there is a representative of Study Group 9 I can give you the opportunity. Japan has asked for the floor. Please give the floor to Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, thank you, Chair. On behalf of SG 9 candidates, Chair, for the next study period, Mr. Satoshi, I tried to share his view regarding the restructuring issue, with the SA of WTSA participant. SG 9 is a very vital SG and all the questions are highly associated with cable TV broadcasting technologies. Even for the study variation which is sometimes considered as generic, we accord the variation requires broadcasting related to the government and the expertise. Thus, splitting SG 9 into several Study Groups, for example taking core questions out of from SG 9 and moving to SG 12, may cause reduction of the work efficiency due to disparagement of expertise.

This will also result in increase of human resource consumption of the cable TV broadcasting expert because they will need to attend meeting of the different Study Groups, in particular question 2 is responsible for QOS measurement and control of cable television services, where the picture quality is calculated, in some cases based on the combined calculation technology consisting

of singular comparison or base band video between the original and transmitted signals as well as waveform of cable TV moderated signals transported over offshore cables. This means that operating of the lower layer are highly associated with each user. In addition, question 12 is responsible for video quality assessment technology, from the viewpoint of subjective and objective method. If we think that the we define appropriate criteria related to video quality assessment, we can't ignore the requirement defined by the cable broadcasting industry. Furthermore, if ITU-T terminates SG 9 as an independent SG, this means that ITU-T is going to lose one of the significant study areas, every broadband, cable, TV broadcasting.

Considering SG 9 to SG 15 or 16, 15 and 16 is more cable centric and SG 9 is more centric, if these industries were in the same Study Group it could lead to delay in work output, due to a high level of cross industry competition. Such situation reduce work efficiency within ITU-T Study Groups. There are some proposals stating that question 9 home networking of cable television services should be moved to Study Group 15. The study of home networking could be positioned as generic.

However, a home network connected to the cable television network sometimes require very special expertise, where not only IP signals but also RF based television signals are conveyed over quark share cable base, cable based home network.

In this case, the operating of the lower layer of television technology also highly associated to each other.

In several member states countries between SG 9 and SG 15 or 16 the regulatory body are different for cable and telco and a merge the two SGs would lead to increased difficulty for those member states. In conclusion SG 9 believe that maintaining SG 9 as an independent SG is the best option for the whole ITU-T, as well as cable television industry.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well for your appeal. And now I will turn to CITELE and CPT, listening to the request of Study Group 9, if they could consider their position on suppressing of Study Group 9. I see no one asking for the floor. Okay, sir. USA.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the delegate from Japan for explaining the reason why Study Group 9 should be retained. Mr. Chairman, we don't believe

that the work of Study Group the should stop. It should continue. However, Mr. Chairman, to restructure the ITU-T and to make it more efficient, particularly taking into consideration the number of participants in Study Group 9, the amount of output documents, and the regions that are involved in the participation of Study Group 9, we believe that the small group can very well continue to function and perform its duties under the restructuring that was proposed in our common proposal for CITELE.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well, United States. I see France and I see Russia, at 11 we will be taking a coffee break. Can we give the floor to France.

>> France: We would also like to take this opportunity to thank the delegate from SG 9 for his appreciation, which to now doesn't really bring any new elements into the picture, since these arguments had already been advanced during the work of the consultative group on telecoms, TSAG. And we had taken very careful cognizance of all of this. We really believe that we need to maintain, we are not proposing the suppression of these activities under this Study Group, television related activities are of course important.

But we think that they should no longer be dealt with in an SG, where we have few participants, and which doesn't produce very many recommendations. We thought it was more logical to divide part of the SG up. We think questions of quality of service, audiovisual quality, which are questions 2, 9 and 12.9 could quite logically be grouped together under 12, under Study Group 12.

So that that Study Group could deal with the entire field, including networks, in terms of quality of service and so on, according to its mandate. And for the other points, we are open to discussion to do some fine-tuning on the current issues under Study Group 9. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well. Can we give the floor to Russia now.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair. I'm speaking on behalf of the RCC. We have a neutral position, as regards the issue of keeping or reforming Study Group 9.

However, having carried out consultations, we have decided that it is actually better to keep Study Group 9 as a separate Study Group. We will further discuss the questions under study, and I think we could harmonize how we carry out the studies to make it more effective.

So therefore, we would like to see it preserved,

as Study Group 9. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. With this, I want to give the Arab region the opportunity as well, then Africa, before we go to coffee break, if they so want to. Jordan.

>> Jordan: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning, all of you. We within the Arab group are willing and ready to reconsider our view with regard to SG 9. After listening to the presentation by the member of this group from Japan, I think we can discuss within the Arab region and the other regions on the best ways of making this group more effective and more focused. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I see no one asking for the floor. There is Japan again. Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much for the various discussion about, especially focused on SG 9. We heard a lot of different views on the SG 9. We identify some region in the country propose to merging the two Study Groups. But I'd like to ask committee 4 to clarify the clear rationales should be identified, and when we start the discussion restructuring Director has mentioned before there is no cost impact to keep the current 11 Study Group structure

from the financial view point and also resource point of view.

So if we can identify the real effectiveness and value to Study Groups we have to consider a more flexible solution. But at this stage, it is very difficult to justify the merit of the merging, and transfer of the whole SG 9 to, for example, SG 15, 16 are proposed. But as you know, SG 11, 15 and 16 are one of the biggest Study Groups, and as my experience to manage SG 15 for eight years, very big meeting may pose additional burden for operation. So if we can identify the real merit to merge even a small group from the viewpoint of the industry competition, still merging itself may reduce value to staying in ITU for the cable industry people. So my biggest concern is we do not want to have any concern to reduce the number of the membership from the ITU-T. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well, Japan. I will want to have a proposal as we go into coffee break that we give time, 15 more minutes for us to come with such a consensus on this. So considering that coming with a proposal that came in as set for APT and Russia who are no stance on keeping or disbanding Study Group 9 for the others who wanted it disbanded and considering that

others don't mind if it continues at work, I will want the United States of America to lead the interested parties to give us a conclusion on the status on Study Group 9 after the coffee break. United States, if you accept this, I will be happy. Please give the floor to the United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: My understanding is this is an informal group during the coffee break where we would find a solution to bring back to you after the coffee break, is that correct?

>> CHAIR: Yes, United States, thank you.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: I'll do my best, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Russia, do you still want to have the floor on this? Please give Russia the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair. As I said, we changed our neutral position, to a position where we would support keeping Study Group 9. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well. So you may join in the interested parties conversation. Korea is asking for the floor.

>> KOREA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to remind you APT position is keep the current structure.

That means the Study Group, independent Study Groups.
Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, that is the case. So thank you. With that, Kenya.

>> Kenya: Thank you very much, Chair. I would also want to really register our position, and indeed that of Africa, that our position is to keep SG 9. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Kenya. You may want to join in the conversation at coffee break. So we will take an early coffee break. This coffee break is also sponsored, so it could be a good one, sponsored by the United Arab Emirates, who are the gold sponsors, silver South Korea and bronze sponsor, they are the sponsors for the 60th anniversary of the ITU-T and CCITT, enjoy your coffee break and please come back soon at 11:15 with a decision. Thank you.

(break).

>> CHAIR: Welcome back. Kindly take your seats for com 4 to resume.

Welcome back from the coffee break, which was generously sponsored by the 60th anniversary of the CCITT and the ITU-T, 60th anniversary. We will want to resume with the decision of the informal group. So United States, if you could tell us what your decision was on retaining

or disbanding Study Group 9. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Mr. Chairman, as more of us are trickling in back from the coffee break, as you know, these type of decisions are always difficult to make, especially when there is more people involved and with various views, but there were three views reflected in our informal group. One is to keep Study Group 9 as is, as you know, the second one is to move some of the questions of Study Group 9 to other groups, and the third one is to look at it holistically, that all proposals should be looked at in regards to moving questions and suppressing Study Groups, not only Study Group 9 alone, as this would be too much of a narrow focus. Mr. Chairman, it was also proposed that more time would be needed, at least two days, and that an ad hoc be formed.

(Streamtext closed itself, starting new meeting)

>> CHAIR: We have a ad hoc group that will look at retaining or disbanding Study Group 9 as part of your terms of reference, then in the case of its being retained what questions will be for Study Group 9, and what questions will be moved from Study Group 9 and in the

case where Study Group 9 is disbanded how the questions will be transferred to other Study Groups. With these terms of reference, I propose that the United States, you carry on to Chair this group with Study Group 9. United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chair, so you have spoken.

>> CHAIR: United States is the Chair of Study Group 9. It is a pleasure for you to define this. We will inform you later about the logistics for the meeting, if possibly session from lunchtime today so that you could have by Friday, as you ask for at least two days, we could have a decision by Friday on all these. Thank you very much.

>> Friday morning.

>> CHAIR: Friday morning. We will move on to Study Group 11. If you refer to the first table on DT9, Study Group 11 was one that we had proposals for it to be disbanded as well. But with it, it is only coming from CITELE. Okay. It is coming from Europe as well. I want to give the opportunity and ask Europe that considering the dominating view of keeping SG 11, will they reconsider their position for SG 11 to continue its work. I see no one asking for the floor to speak for Europe.

I wanted Europe to respond. France, give the floor to France, please, thank you.

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chair. We have just come back into the room after the coffee break. We had prolonged discussions. Could you be kind enough to repeat your question? I know that we are on SG 11 and that Europe has proposed to transfer its activities, but could you clarify?

>> CHAIR: Yes, from the proposals received on the work of SG 9, for now, it is only Europe -- sorry, on SG 11, it is only Europe who is calling for Study Group 11 to be disbanded. I was asking that considering the dominating proposals from the other regions that Study Group 11 continue its work, would Europe consider its position that Study Group 11 continue its work as it is.

Can we give the floor to France now.

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chair. Okay. We take note of the position coming from the other regions, and as was indicated in our discussions during the coffee break, we want to fit this into the global panorama of the ITU-T structure, so we will review our opposition here, if we need to, we want to have discussion with other parties to see if they changed their positions. We can discuss

and see what the final makeup of the SG would be.

>> CHAIR: Okay, so we seem not to have a reviewed position from Europe, but for you to come back hopefully tomorrow morning with a decision on this, if I get you right.

If you could move on to the transfer of work.

We will start with, I see Russia asking for the floor. Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair. I would like to note an additional point, in terms of keeping Study Group 11. Many, there are many test specifications and these tests currently are divided across many Working Parties. We are trying to integrate our activities here, integrate technologies together. We can see new networks appearing.

We believe that in Study Group 11 we need to focus all work on test specifications, and on measurements that is under ITU-T. So this extra argument in terms of keeping this Study Group 11. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Okay, I see France asking for the floor. France.

>> France: Yes, thank you, Chair. Just to give an idea of what Europe's position is based on here concerning SG11, indeed, we believe that a certain number

of questions have a more logical place in other SGs who are leading efforts, for example, testing. This could really be dealt with by SG 12, since it has the global competency for those kinds of issues.

Likewise, anything dealing with ITU Internet of Things could be transferred to SG 20. So that SG 20 has the global management of Internet of Things in all its facets, rather than dispersing things.

And for the rest, we could move to SG 13, some of these have already been transferred, or are already being dealt with more or less by SG 13. It is just a very logical move for us, that we will provide greater order in the structure of the SGs. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well. I will plead that we will take this in the transfer of work. For now, Europe is to give us a decision whether they are reviewing the situation. But we will debate further on the transfer of work per work items, as we go by for the agenda. I will plead with Russia and Japan to withdraw, so that we can carry on. When we get to the transfer of work, which involves Study Group 11, we could take that from then. So please kindly withdraw, Japan, as well. Thank you, Russia. So that we could make better progress. Thank you very much for accepting this.

If you could refer to DT9 on page 3, look at Study Group 2. There are propositions on, first of all, human factors, which is question 4.2. Generally, everybody tend to agree that it should be moved to SG 16. But we have the flavor that that issue move as a separate question.

I propose to you that we accept the proposal to move question 4 of 2 on human factors to SG 16, as a separate question.

Do we have an agreement to this? I see no one asking for the floor.

(sound of gavel).

Thank you very much. We have an agreement that question 4.2 on human factors be moved to SG 16, as a separate question. Thank you very much.

Now, we have Working Party 2.2 on telecommunication management and network and service operations. And there are propositions for it to be moved to SG 13. That is questions 5, 6, 7, to SG 13.

Then there is also the proposal to keep Working Party 2.2 too and questions 5, 6 and 7 in Study Group 2.

So it's more of three against three in this situation.

With this, we have heard all your arguments that you have proposed on this. I think that the debate will need much more time than we have for this morning. So with this, I will propose to you that, again, we go in for an ad hoc group that will discuss on the situation of Working Party 2.2, as it stands.

Would anyone be kind to offer to Chair this ad hoc group?

I see no one asking for the floor. But as no one is asking for the floor, can we have the Study Group 13 Chair, and Study Group 2 Chair, on giving us their opinion on the situation as it stands, so that it could even guide the ad hoc group in discussing this further, if they are in the room, SG 13 Chair and Study Group 2 Chair. I see SG 13 Chair asking for the floor. Please give Swiss the floor.

>> So I guess I have the floor now, good morning, everybody, good morning, Mr. Chairman.

Just question for clarification. Would you like here that ad hoc group is cochaired by me and Study Group 2 Chairman? Or would you currently just would like to hear from Study Groups some statements with regard to view from Study Groups, especially from me for Study Group 13, towards that kind of move. So that is currently

a little bit unclear for me. So please if you can clarify this for me, that would be very helpful for what I say further. I don't want to bore anybody with ... (chuckles).

>> CHAIR: Thank you. If you can proceed on your view on this, that would be helpful. Then for the Chairmanship, we could be guided, we know you can lead us as well together with SG 2 Chair, but let's have your view on the situation as it stands from the proposals.

>> SWITZERLAND: Okay, now I got back the floor. I just would like to remember here the Distinguished Delegates that for last TSAG meeting, Study Group 13 has sent a contribution which was a result of a Study Group 13 ad hoc group dealing with this topic, and the consequence was that Study Group 13 has feeling that we had during the last study period and already before an excellent cooperation on topics that are in common of both Study Groups such as would like to remind great cooperation and successful cooperation and joint activity on cloud computing management.

And I think from this perspective I think we greatly proceed, and we all identified that the scope of 13 and 2, Working Party 2, there are, indeed there are common set of interests.

But there are also several areas which are completely different. So from that point of view, Study Group 13 members, it's not the Chairman only, it's really I'm speaking for what the members have agreed here in this contribution towards TSAG, indeed if Working Party 2 participants, of Study Group 2, would like to join us, they are more than welcome. We would give, I'm sure we can give them a good host in continuing their work within our environment.

But, it is really if they like, if from practical point of view indeed just focusing on technical issues, I'm not sure, I have no overview on financial issues, on timing issues, whatever, I think from our point of view this is this great cooperation we have so far could be also continued in the future.

I think in this way, indeed if the Working Party 2 members have the wish to join us, they will be more than welcome.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, SG 13 Chair. If we can hear from SG 2 what's their views on the current situation on Working Party 2.2.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There has been much discussion in Study Group 2 about this issue, but we came in positions Working Party 2 membership most of

them was saying that keeping Study Group 2, Working Party 2 in Study Group 2 is advantageous for the Working Party 2 activities. It has very good cooperation with Study Group 13, and still it can cooperate with other Study Groups in different technology areas. And it has very good visibility with the external operating agencies, like the service corporation groups which have many operators inside. So Study Group 2 is very visible in the market about the management.

Coming to Study Group 13 maybe this visibility would not be as such, but still cooperation with Study Group 13 as the Chair, Mr. Chairman of Study Group 13 has said, it's going very smoothly and very well, as said by both parties.

So it's my personal opinion, Chairman of Study Group 2 would have no problems of keeping Working Party 2 with Study Group 2 and also would have some relation with Working Party 1 in such like finance and other issues. And there are some other points. But I think for now, this will be enough for the discussion. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much as well, and we can sense the cooperation between SG 13 and Study Group 2 as well. So among yourselves, the SG 13 Chair propose

already that you could lead to give us a decision on this.

So the terms of reference, if this meeting will accept is for you to give us a conclusion from ad hoc group how the transfer of work for Working Party 2.2 will be like by Friday, so if this is acceptable by you, both SG 13 and SG 2 Chairmen. I see Swiss asking for the floor.

>> SWITZERLAND: To clarify, you talk about coChairing this group with between me and Study Group 2 chairman, is it correct?

>> CHAIR: Yes, this is correct. Is that acceptable by Study Group 2 Chairman as well?

>> It's okay.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. If the meeting agrees, we have Study Group 2 and Study Group 13 Chairmen to lead us to come up with a conclusion on how the transfer of work of Working Party 2.2 is concluded.

Thank you.

Moving on, we will go to transfer of work again. We have already handled human what will be part of Working Group under SG and 9 and the video quality work as well. So we have made progress. Now we have to talk about Internet measurement. That if you move to DT9 again,

on page 4, there is the proposition from both CITELE and CEPT to transfer questions 10 of 11 and 15 to SG 12, as well as CPT asking for question 12 of 11 to Study Group 20, and add questions to Study Group 13 and that is about trying to disband if in that case.

First of all, we take the Internet measurements. There has been an update on these two questions. These two questions before TSAG, Study Group 11 combined these two questions, proposing to this Assembly as a revised test. So from the position of SG 11, these two questions will now be continued with a new test. So having made this progress, and for us to take the opportunity to look at this new test, which is on Internet testing, I want to propose that we have an ad hoc session on this Internet measurement, and the terms of reference if they can be projected, can we project the terms of reference for --

So here we have to look at the ad hoc group has to look at two things, to review the proposed test which is now known as QI11 as provided in document 10, and assess whether the new QI11 codes fits better into Study Group 11 or Study Group 12 mandates.

In case there is overlap, identify which are part of the work should be performed by SG 11, and which by

SG 12. And if possible, revise the current question I11 test. This will be the mandate of the ad hoc group on Internet measurement. This is my proposition. Is there any objection to this? Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. I am not speaking on behalf of Russia but on behalf of the RCC, not only from Russia but from the RCC, this is a common position.

I agree with you that we need to organise a Working Group, a ad hoc group, but we have already organized this type of group many times, so I'd like to recall a few things that have been achieved by these Working Groups.

Firstly, in terms of allocation of questions to SG 11, particularly the European proposal this concerns at TSAG, at the most recent TSAG, we concluded that it is really reduces the Bureau's costs, but it increases the cost of Sector Members, because especially -- specialists need to come three times more, as many distribution of questions, so therefore we propose all questions on testing and all questions on measurement to bring them together in one Study Group, Study Group 11, who then deals with this.

Second point in terms of question 10 and 15, we

have looked at this for quite a long time already. We have organized a special group chaired by China. He perhaps could tell us what they ended up with after their discussions, and how they got there, because in terms of issues of benchmarking, which this leads to, we have already discussed benchmarking. And SG 11 at their last study period submitted ten recommendations. This is an excellent foundation to continue our work further, because benchmarking for new technologies is not only questions of cost, etcetera, it is a discussion of a life cycle of networks, it's a issue of coverage, and this is new.

But we have the foundation. So therefore, I agree with your proposal to organise a ad hoc group but we have already organized such groups quite often. I would like to ask what we are working towards this, with this ad hoc group, and also representatives of other Study Groups as well. Again, I would highlight our proposal that we can finish work with these questions that have not yet been integrated in terms of all specifications and measurements. Let's give them to Study Group 11 so they can work on it.

I think this will be a very successful approach. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, RCC. Just to align your submission, the quest is on Internet measurement and not really about general testing as a proposal there is.

So the mandate of this ad hoc group is on Internet measurements. And we could take up other submissions during the ad hoc group because we wouldn't have time to discuss this any further in to detail, but to clarify on the mandate of this ad hoc group, this ad hoc group is reviewing the tests, QI11 as it is now a combined test of the two questions, which others have suggested for a transfer.

The progress with these two questions is that they now have a new test as QI11, so we can no longer talk about those two questions. Rather, let's talk about its being made as QI11. So if you agree on this, now we have QI11, we have to assess at the ad hoc whether it fits better in the scope of SG 11 or SG 12.

So that is the first to consider. Then, the second part is that if any part of the work is supposed to be done by SG 11 or by SG 12, which part should be done. The ad hoc group may want to revise this QI11 test, if they so wish.

So this is the terms of reference for this ad hoc

group. I see Japan asking for the floor. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. First of all, I would like to congratulate to you the assignment of the very important Chairmanship of com 4. I would like to express position of the Study Group 11, as I'm the Vice-Chair of Study Group 11. As you mention, the measurement but the original proposal from CITELE and CEPT is move question 10 and question 15, and Internet measurement is a work item under question 15. If we are talking about moving the Internet measurement, that is a very dependent topic, moving the question, moving the work item. I would like to clarify this point.

The original title of the question 10 is service network benchmarking measurement. If you look at contribution 9, this document include very detailed information of the question 10, under question 10 developed several recommendation that is PST and ISC aviation services still with benchmark testing, that is a very much protocol work, testing work, under the question 10. If you look at work item under the question 10, there is one work item, it's service testing framework for videoconference service. User to networking interface of next generation network, this work item

are delivered by Japan contribution based on the specification that is interpreted with the organisation. That is also the very protocol work, not QS measurement issue.

If we are talking about Internet speed of measurement that is the work item under the question 15, and the question 15 the original designed study that remote testing environment, and this scope is not only the QS measurement. Furthermore, the TSAG meeting, in the previous TSAG meeting, create the Correspondence Group to discuss how to differentiate a task, in terms of the QS measurement between the question 11 and question 12, and I hope we see the report of the Correspondence Group, if we want to discuss moving the work item or the QS Internet measurement.

So I would like to clarify the moving the question and moving the work item discussions are very different. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Okay, so I get from Japan that the discussion of moving the work item and then discussing the detail of the work item are very different. So the in the terms of reference of the ad hoc group they are two different steps. But we don't want to deal with this in pieces. We want to deal with it as a whole.

So that we don't create various ad hoc group, so this ad hoc group will look at the test of QI11, and look at where it sits, where it's part of it as in SG 11 or SG 12, or whole SG 11 and SG 12 and if they need to revise the tests, they have the opportunity as well to do so.

I hope this clarifies your concern and addresses it. If this is acceptable by you, then I will propose to you we have the terms of reference which have been projected. Now we would need a Chair for this ad hoc group. Among various consultations, I propose to you that Uganda Chair this ad hoc group. If this is acceptable by you, we could take it further. I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you very much. Uganda, you are set to take this Chair of this ad hoc group.

You have the floor.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When the Chairman speaks, we can only say yes, we accept. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So this makes us very good, we have some 30 minutes to look at agenda item 5, which is on resolutions under com 4.

We want to take the first one, resolution 73, if it can be projected, which is on information and communication technologies, environment and climate

change.

That is from the proposal from APT. APT, you have, Malaysia, you have the floor on this resolution.

>> MALAYSIA: Good morning, Chair. Good morning to everyone. Thank you for inviting me to speak.

I'll speak very briefly on resolution 73, which is information communication technologies environment and climate change. ICT telecommunication is a high pace even fast evolving industry, that consumes a very high amount of electricity and potentially generates a large amount of greenhouse gases, E-Waste while serving the needs of the users in the country.

On top of this, end user devices also become an essential part of the everyday life of the people, with ICT telecommunication devices getting cheaper and abandoning choices we see replacement rates for these items becoming more frequent. With reducing carbon footprint and effects on environment by the result of this, several use cases have been practiced and evaluated. It is important to calculate the behavior of people and corporates to achieve these aims.

At the end of the day it is important to note that green doesn't necessarily mean that it can cost more. Many of these perspectives are derived from change in

attitude and ways of daily lives and ways of corporate doing business in their aspiration to be more profitable and efficient.

Let me now tell that you we have done some changes, I'd like to walk through these changes, and amendment done to the original resolution. In the section, instruct all ITU Study Groups, we have included to identify best practices to encourage government organisations and private corporation to take a more proactive approach to what is implementing environmental friendly policies --

>> CHAIR: Sorry, Malaysia, just to have it projected, you can continue as they project your charts as you go through it. Please project the document from APT on resolution 73.

>> I'll repeat it again. The additional amendments were to identify best practices to encourage government organisations and private corporation take a more proactive approach, towards implementing environmental friendly practices, policies and practices and to share use cases and key success factors. Secondly to identify policies and initiative that support successful enforcement. Purchase that are perpetually sustainable and result in minimal or no cost implication to

corporations and community. Lastly, to identify and promote successful energy efficient new technologies in renewable energy at alternative energy sources, that are proven to work for both urban and rural towns in size. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Malaysia. Ladies and gentlemen, this modification has been available for some time translated in all six languages.

Is there a request for any clarifications or comments on this resolution 73? I see no one asking for the floor.

Do we have an agreement to have this? Agreed as modified? I see Canada and I see Argentina. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much for APT to make such a proposal in making changes in resolution 73.

Canada has some concerns regarding item number 4, which we believe that ITU-T Study Groups should focus on technical work and associate standards to help improve the environment and climate change and not to work on a policy and enforcement matters, which we believe it is a national matter. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you, Canada. Argentina, you

have the floor.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. We would also like to express our satisfaction with this proposal from Asia Pacific. We think that we really, this does update the resolution. However, we think that we can even make further changes on certain points, taking into account the latest discussions that have been held in the advisory Committee and in SG 5. Perhaps some of the concepts that were invoked in those instances could be included in the text as they are not present at this time.

And we are ready to work with people to do this.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well, Argentina. United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We do have a question for clarification through you, Mr. Chairman. First, we note that instructs number 3 would be fully duplicative of question 6 of ITU-D Study Group 2, which is on ICT and climate change. We would seek clarification as to whether we are concerned of, with such duplication.

With respect to instructs number 4, we fully support the comments made by Canada regarding the enforcement approaches that are anticipated under this instruction. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States. So, there are concerns with this modified resolution. Fortunately, we have the able Chairman of SG 5 with us in this Assembly, and before he accounts for his work probably on Friday, we will give him more work to do.

So he may have to lead a drafting session as I propose to you, that it will take time to review the proposals and the concerns as we have received them from the floor.

So, if this is acceptable by you, we could have resolution 73 going into a drafting session with SG 5 Chair leading it.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to thank for the submission of this proposal, and we support the idea and we would gladly work on the drafting session to make this happen. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil for accepting the proposal. Tunisia, you have the floor. Kindly give the floor to Tunisia, please.

>> TUNISIA: Thank you, Chair. I'm sitting near the Tunisian delegation but I'm speaking as Chair of Study Group 5. So just to confirm that I would be delighted to lead this group to work on resolution 73. We can never refuse a request from the Chair. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So if we have an

agreement, that goes into a drafting session. And hopefully, to take advantage of the Editorial Committee, then if you could have a result by Friday, that will be very useful for us.

Thank you. We will move on to B under 5, which is a new resolution has been proposed by the RCC on studies concerning protection of users of telecommunications ICT services, and RCC, if you are ready, you can have the floor to present this new proposal for resolution. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair. We would like to present the new draft resolution concerning protection of users of telecommunication and ICT services. This proposal has been prepared to, based on decisions from the plenipotentiary conference and also taking into account the work of the development sector of the ITU, particularly as especially the concern expressed by developing countries about a lack of standardization in terms of protecting users in terms of unit works.

Currently, as we develop new services, including data transmission networks, measures concerning user protection are becoming more important. Thus we believe it is important to activate some work to draw up some

corresponding ITU-T recommendations allowing us to solve a series of issues ensuring the rights and users of telecommunications networks are protected.

In the draft resolution we propose Study Groups to carry out this type of work in the next study period, particularly Study Group 3, Study Group 2, 12 and 17.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well. If you could have this proposal projected, and so I will ask if there is a request for any clarifications or comments on this new resolution. I see United States asking for the floor, Germany. So United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Good morning, Chair.

Thank you, RCC for the proposal. I'm glad that TSAG results are looking into consumer protection. As my RCC colleague said there is already work ongoing work in D sector, and there is a plenipot resolution on consumer protection. So we believe that this resolution doesn't add anything. So it's mostly duplicative. We also think that some of the proposed, proposal in the new resolution are more of a oriented to domestic policy and they require domestic laws and regulation and which are not international in nature. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Germany, you

have the floor.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Chairman. While in agreement with the previous speaker, we believe that some elements of this proposal are already dealt in question 6.1 in ITU-D Study Group 1. Of course, our aim should always be to avoid duplication of work, and also maybe conflict of competence.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, the resolution title is about protection of users, but in the text, I think a number of issues are proposed to study like fair competition, tariffs, business models, quality assurance, security and the provision of services which we believe do not necessarily relate directly to the user protection.

We consider this to be very very difficult to deal with all this topic where you can write books on each of the topics under consumer protection, so we have some concerns with this resolution. I think there is a need to, for discussing and revising probably the text before it can be approved. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Germany. We will take Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you very much, Chair.

Thank you to the RCC for proposing this draft new

resolution. Canada would share some of the concerns raised regarding duplication of work with in particular ITU-D question 6 of Study Group 1. We also have some concerns that this resolution enters into potential aspects that are considered national in nature, and not ideally suitable at the international level.

With that, we would add our voice to the concerns being raised. Thank you very much, Chair.

>>CHAIR: Thank you very much, Canada. We have Japan, Saudi Arabia and Jordan, Brazil. I don't have so much time or we don't have so much time, considering that we have the almighty, the biggest resolution to deal with, resolution 76. So if you could spare some time for that. If you could be very crisp with your submissions. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. Japan would like to support United States and Germany and Canada's position. We also have concerns in the resolved Study Group 3 to study consumer protection policy including fair competition, business models, quality assurance and security and so on.

Consumer policy is out of the mandate of Study Group 3. Also most of them are the national issues, and not suitable for an international standard. Therefore, we

don't think it's necessary to develop a resolution regarding consumer protection. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan. We will take Saudi Arabia.

>> Saudi Arabia: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, we would like to congratulate you on appointing you to the Chairmanship of this meeting. In short, Saudi Arabia supports the draft resolution, and we would like to say that issues related to building quality and security are closely related to development.

They also relate to the technical aspects of standardization, and believe that this really belongs under SG 3 and also groups 12 and 17. With regard to duplication of the activities, I believe that the draft resolution 6, close cooperation, so that we can avoid duplication. That's why Saudi Arabia supports this and calls for its adoption. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Saudi Arabia. We will take Jordan, Brazil. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We in Jordan also support the need for a resolution like this. The protection of the users of ICTs and telecommunications requires reference work that supports this. Now the studies in development will certainly be of relevance

to the work of SG 3. That's why we need background recommendations and reference recommendations that we can resort to when we want to adopt recommendations that are issues that require further work. But it is important to grant importance to the priorities of the countries within the work of SG 3.

That's why we are in full support of the position of Saudi Arabia. We would like to thank RCC for submitting this in the first place. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jordan. I would like to close the list. We have Brazil and Russia, Egypt. We don't have too much time. You have about 8 minutes to close. Usually I don't like to ask interpreters for additional time, so if you can kindly be very brief so that we can deal with the last agenda item. Brazil, you have the floor, briefly.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We will be very brief, on a general sense Brazil believes that user protection is ever a important topic, in the sense we would like to thank you RCC for this proposal. We believe it's discussion in ITU-T we believe it should be done there. On that general sense we support this proposal, but we have some concerns especially on the resolves part when we are talking about the Study Group 3, 2,

12 and 17 relationship that we would like to discuss further with RCC, so we can get a common task that is more clean on this part, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. We have Russia and Egypt. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Chair, thank you very much. We will of course be brief. I have two points that I would like to express, before perhaps we can move into more detailed discussion in the future as regards this proposal.

Firstly, we are somewhat surprised, perhaps colleagues from the Bureau, we could ask you to comment or clarify what do you mean by, what do the colleagues mean when they say these standardized section is overlapping with work from the development sector? Do we understand correctly, that here we are discussing drawing up standards, and as much as we understand the work of our sector, we develop standards that once they have been approved, the D sector needs to help to implement them across the world.

D sector does not draw up standards. Secondly, comments as regards the national requirements, in our proposal, it is exclusively focused on international services because in recent years we have observed a lot

of abuse of international telecommunications networks. The national aspect is only focusing on after developing international requirements, Member States again voluntarily, because it will be a recommendation, can harmonize this with their national requirements.

So this is a long and drawn out process of work, both with the ITU-D sector and with other Study Groups. Thank you very much.

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

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. First of all, I would like since I'm taking the floor for the first time to congratulate you on your excellent leadership of this session.

And second, Egypt supports this recommendation, and thanks RCC for the proposal. We, however, also want to add to the list of Study Groups under the resolves section item close number 3 Study Group 20 also to the list of relevant Study Groups. And Study Group 3, it is mentioned that it reads that ITU-T Study Group 3 were appropriate with the ITU-T Study Groups 2, 12 and 17, we would also like to add Study Group 20 to that particular list.

We would also like to mention that the protection

of the telecommunications is actually something that is very important to all the telecommunications users all over the world.

So this is, we can hardly see this as something of a local context. We think this is very relevant to our international standards so we highly support it. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Egypt. So many propositions, some very much in favor of the new resolution, and then there are concerns as well and the desire to amend the text, as a text, and among all these proposals and speakers, there was one lady who shown through, was Japan. With this I plead to Japan to give us your lady to bring us the gentlemen to bring us a fine text on this draft new resolution. So Japan, if you be kind enough to accept this proposal, as a drafting group, or in the meeting as well. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: I'll do my best, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Right, thank you very much. I know the gentlemen will treat you well (chuckles).

Thank you very much. With this, with the indulgence of the meeting we will go into resolution 76, which is proposals from all regional organisations. So we have

as many as six proposals. Considering that this resolution which is on studies related to conformance and interoperability testing, and developing countries and future ITU programme is of big interest to everybody, around the globe, we will want to project the proposals that we have received.

If you can project the proposal, and then the proposals from the six regions and then we have a consolidated text, and in the consolidated text we will, we can then reference what every regional organisation wants in those texts.

I will ask the indulgence of the meeting, that we can create a drafting group for resolution 76 as well, so if this is acceptable by you, because it has to take much more time from now. I see no one objecting for, to my proposal. Thank you very much.

The Chairman for this the last BT SC I remember Egypt, I remember Mr. Arami taking up with this resolution, will you want to have fun with it again?

>> With pleasure, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Right, thank you very much.

I know you are familiar with this resolution, you did a good job of it at the last ITU SA. So it will be good for you again to handle all these six proposals.

Thank you very much for the accept terms. We have a minute to go. Any other business? Any other requests? The United States asking for the floor. So interpreters I will beg for ten more minutes. It will be much less. But let's give United States the floor if they so wish.

>> Okay.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: It will be less than a second, Mr. Chairman. First of all I'd like to sincerely thank you for your excellent stewardship of this meeting this morning. May we kindly ask you, sir, through your kind counselors to produce a TD listing all the ad hocs and Working Groups that we have created this morning? I think I've counted up to six, but I may have missed something, with the Chairs. Thank you very much. And bon appetit.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States. We will want to be very much organized as such, and to list all the drafting groups and the ad hoc groups and the time of meetings and their rooms that are available for you also, that it could really help with the discussions for us to have a more fruitful decision going forward.

They will be shown on the screens, in the corridors, yes, from lunchtime going forward and posted on the website.

Thank you very much. As there is no requests for the floor, I will thank you for your proposals, your discussions, and especially your cooperation during this first session. Have a good lunch. See you tomorrow morning at 9:30. The meeting is adjourned.

(sound of gavel).

(applause).

(session ends at 12:32)

Services Provided By:

Caption First, Inc.

P.O. Box 3066

Monument, CO 80132

800-825-5234

www.captionfirst.com

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

***.

>> Ladies and gentlemen, can I have the loud speakers of the room, please? Ladies and gentlemen, your attention, please. Ladies and gentlemen, your attention, please, thank you. Just to let you know that we have reserved a room for 1:30 for the ad hoc on the Study Group 9 discussions. 1:30 today. Thank you.