

Raw file.

October 27, 2016.

9:30.

ITU.

World Telecommunication Standardization  
Assembly.

Com 4.

Hannibal room.

Services Provided By:

Caption First, Inc.

P.O. Box 3066

Monument, CO 80132

800-825-5234

[www.captionfirst.com](http://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.

\*\*\*.

(standing by).

(standing by).

>> CHAIR: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Can  
we take our seats, please.

Good morning to you all, and welcome to the second  
session of com 4 of WTSA 16. Com 4 is about ITU-T web  
programme and organisation and for languages, the  
channels 1 for English, 2 for French, 3 for Spanish,  
4 for Russian, 5 for Chinese, and 6 for Arabic. Thank  
you very much. So we will proceed on to our agenda which

is available as ADM 12 to be projected. Our agenda is being projected now. We will look at the approval of reports from previous com 4 session, our session yesterday. We will take reports from the ad hoc groups that were created yesterday if they are ready. We will look at the refinement of the mandate of Study Groups and across Study Groups, and then we will take on some revised WTSa resolutions under com 4. We will take reports from the Working Groups of com 4 if they are available, and any other matters this morning.

We are quite loaded, and again, I will appeal that we will be circumspect and direct to the point and to be able to achieve our goal this morning.

With this said, do we have any comments or questions on to this agenda? Okay. I see Saudi Arabia, United States and Brazil. Canada as well. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, everybody. Mr. Chairman, we see that there are certain contributions in this agenda with regard to updating resolutions 50 and 60. And distinguishing both of them, and I will clarify what I mean by that, first of all, we see that there is a change in the distribution of documents, as was agreed in the first session. For

50 and 60, in addition to the new resolution concerning privacy and trust, are the realm of group 4A.

This procedure is not consistent with the procedures and rules of the ITU-T, and namely article 81, which stipulates that the plenary is the one entitled to distribute documents on the subsequent committees. This is one.

Two, in item 42A of our agenda, we see contributions classified under one subject which is DOA or DO architecture. We wonder why these contributions were put under the DOA exclusively. We should take into consideration that these documents have not yet been presented and discussions have not been undertaken with regard to this DOA.

There are other contributions with regard to updating 50 and 60 which will be discussed within 4A.

Three, Mr. Chairman, there is a certain quotation of contribution in 42A of our agenda which are not consistent with the sub listings within this agenda item. I would like to say again that we see that certain items within 42A are not consistent with the rest of contributions that should be made within this item. I would like, Mr. Chairman, why is this 42A being presented the way it is being presented in our agenda, so why are

these items given to this Committee, although during our plenary these items were given to another body. Why don't we see other themes which were under the proposals of certain regions other than DOA here on our agenda, as we did for the DOA?

By way of conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I think that we should deal with all contributions on an equal footing, and I think that we should also take into consideration 50 and 60 in addition to the new resolution pertaining to privacy and trust, and they should be delegated to 4A as has been agreed during the plenary meeting.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well, Saudi Arabia, very well said. But if you could help me with the timing, I don't see that on the screen. I'll be grateful to have the timing as speakers speak so that we be guided by the time. But just to clarify and to assure you, the issues on 42A on DOA is not up for discussion.

They are compilation of resolutions that the word DOA can be found in. They are distributed between Working Group 4A and com 4. And definitely Working Group 4A will be reporting to com 4. It is a compilation. And we wanted to reflect that if the matter of DOA comes, you can find it in all these contributions.

However, we will be guided by the Council decision on DOA as in DT11. That was why it has been put here. It is not for presentation or for discussion. But it was just to give an overview of all resolutions dimensions DOA and what Council decision on DOA is.

It was just for information purposes.

So if this is all right with you, and if it is on the same matter that the countries who have requested for the floor, I'll appeal to you for you to withdraw your request. But if it is for any other reason, you could sustain your request. If for any reason, if it's about agenda item 42A, kindly withdraw your request. United States, you have the floor.

>>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, colleagues.

Our comment is on agenda item 42A but as it addresses a slightly different, different comments than our colleague. We do feel it necessary to come in now.

We do, we echo our colleague from Saudi Arabia's comments regarding this grouping. We believe that it, although we thank you for your explanation, we don't think it's useful to have an agenda item under specific areas of study on DOA. There are no proposals that are proposing a new area of study on DOA. In the context

of the various resolutions that are listed, DOA is being proposed as a possible solution for a number of different areas of study, including counterfeit, Cybersecurity, numbering, etcetera.

Our suggestion would be, rather than consider it a specific area of study, instead we change the agenda item to reflect counterfeit and talk about the specific proposals related to counterfeit, as our colleague from Saudi Arabia said, we can deal with resolution 50 and resolution 60 in the other place, in Working Group 4A where they were originally allocated, and address the issues of the new resolution on data privacy and trust as well as resolution 78, when we begin to talk about revised WTSa resolutions.

With respect to DT19, the coalition of resolution proposals mentioning DOA we prefer that get reclassified as a information document rather than as a DT, because again these proposals although they all mention DOA are related to different topics. DT19 also includes the reference to the Council document but we note that the Council decision was not about DOA. It was about the memorandum of understanding between the ITU and the Dona foundation which although related to the digital object architecture and the ITU's use of the technology is

slightly different than what is being proposed here.  
Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well. But just to clarify, if you will see resolution 78 it belongs to com 4, will be discussed later and 5C. But I have no problem at all. This was for information purposes, and for easy and guidance to both our discussions on DOA at com 4 and Working Group 4A. So if the meeting will agree, and to help go on to our main agenda items, I propose to you that we strike out agenda item 42A, if that is fine with you, and we will make everybody withdraw their issues, if it is understanding 42A. I see countries withdrawing. If it's about 42A, and we are striking it out. Struck out. Okay. If I see everybody out, it means 4G A is struck out, it is about 4A or it's about something else, if it's about 4A, it is already out. It is not on the agenda. Can we proceed, if it's about something else, okay, thank you. 4A is out.

42A is out.

So thank you very much, 42A is no longer on the agenda. Is there any other concern? Can we approve this agenda? Thank you. This agenda is adopted. We will go on that and we will take approval of the report from yesterday's session. We can reflect DT15 as our report

from yesterday. Document 15, to be reflected.

>> Projected.

>>CHAIR: Yeah. Please project DT15, on the screens now. So, are there any issues with page 1? Page 2? And page 3? I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you very much. I take it that this report is approved.

We can look at DT16 to be projected. This is a list of the ad hoc groups from yesterday's meeting together with the drafting groups, three ad hoc groups and three drafting sessions, and they are all due to report tomorrow morning. Are there any concerns?

Thank you. So this is as was captured from yesterday's meeting. So thank you very much for your approval.

With this said, we will want to ask from CEPT if they have a decision now on Study Group 9. Study Group 11, sorry, as from yesterday's meeting. CEPT. Yesterday you asked for more time to be able to consult members and report on retaining SG11. Is there a decision from CEPT now? It seems that decision is not ready. So we will go ahead.

Report from com 4 ad hoc groups. Would the ad hoc group of SG 9 restructuring, Mr. Chairman from U.S., is there any update you have for us? Okay, there is no



updates. The ad hoc group on allocation of block of work on management Working Party 2 of Study Group 2, SG 2 and SG 13 Chairmen, do you have a decision for us? I see no one asking for the floor. So not ready.

Okay. So the ad hoc group on allocation on QI11, okay, Uganda, you have the floor.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The group met yesterday. However, and had some extensive discussions. However, we have not yet concluded in terms of our response to you, and we hope to be able to report tomorrow as you had indicated. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, as well. Would the drafting session on new resolution on consumer protection, Japan, do you have it ready now? Or we wait until tomorrow? Okay, not yet. Drafting session, revision on resolution 73, SG 5 Chairman, no, thank you as well, and drafting session on resolution 76. Okay. Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have made good progress today, we have met today this morning. We have almost finalized about 50 percent of the document, and we hope that we are able to finish and present something concrete by tomorrow. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your good work.

We hope that we get a concluding report tomorrow.

So, now we will go on to our agenda item 4 and we will proceed to what was originally 42A, which is on IoT, privacy and security studies. We will want to take the three proposals as they were received. So Arab group. Arab group, you may introduce your item on 4.2. I don't see Arab group asking for the floor. United States, are you ready with your proposal? 48A15. Okay. I see Saudi Arabia now ready with 43 A3 2. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you very much, Chair. Mr. Chairman, we see that this matter will be discussed in the group 4A. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay, that is fine. We will take the United States' proposal. 48A15. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chairman. We think that, so this document as you can see, it's our views on aspects of ITU-T Study Group 20's future work. And most of the proposal references the report of TSAG and the report of ITU-T Study Group 20 to the WTSA 16.

Our preference would be to, through you, Chair, we would like to request that this document be considered

once again when we, during the plenary session, when we deal with the report of Study Group 20 to the WTSA.

Further, there are some relevant concepts in this document that we think, which we would like to bring in once we do discuss the contribution from the Arab group related to privacy and trust. So perhaps we can delay our presentation as well, until we, until Working Group 4A when we discuss that other resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. So this is deferred for later. We can now take on the item BGD52. It will be projected on the screen from Bangladesh. Egypt is asking for the floor?

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chair.

I would just like to go back a little bit if you don't mind, I'm willing to present document A3243 addendum 32 on behalf of the Arab group. Or if you wish, we could keep it to the last of that, after, after BGD52. It's up to you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Right, thank you. Let me move to Bangladesh now, so that we could be sequential. Bangladesh, I see Brazil asking for the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Yes, Chair, thank you very much. I'm just having a little trouble understanding the way we

are working. I understood we were on item which was originally 41, 42B and now is 4 2A. But we are not being presented any proposals and they were deferred for a later time. What time are we going to consider these documents? I'm just having a lot of trouble understanding what is the procedure we are following here, if you could please clarify. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I see Saudi Arabia asking for the floor. We wanted to deal with these thematic areas, and with the questions that they are impacting as the title is for refine.Ment of the mandate of Study Groups.

So they are such proposals, if you go to what used to be 42A, on ITU privacy studies and there were proposals to that.

So, we wanted to take up the presentations which are related to these studies, and then we could take the discussions going forward. One of them as it is now will be IoT privacy and security studies, and then the other one will be regulatory work in SG 3. So the contribution from Bangladesh, as we are supposed to take now, will be related to regulatory work in SG 3. So this is what we are working with. So if this is the understanding of Saudi Arabia and UAE ... can you withdraw? I see Jordan coming in as well. We are now on Bangladesh.

So if you can allow Bangladesh to present, we will come on later, because Egypt asked for it being deferred.

Let's have Bangladesh. Thank you.

>> BANGLADESH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In this contribution Bangladesh supports the 11 questions proposed by SG 3 and proposes a new question be added on policy and relation aspects of quality of services and quality of experiences for ITU-T SG 3 for the new study period 2017 to 2020.

Even though SG 12 is working on technical aspects of quality of service, but is also distinct from policy regulatory issues, as it is the home for economic tariff and policy issues for telecommunications, and it is the fora for regulators so Bangladesh proposes quality of service and key need to be addressed in SG 3, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Bangladesh. So that was the proposal for Bangladesh. It will be taken on later, in discussion. Egypt, you may want to present now.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I wanted to clarify that I wasn't asking to defer the discussion. I simply wanted to follow the order that you have put for the document for the discussions.

With regards to the proposal from the Arab States,

on views on issues related to the ITU-T Study Group 20 structure, the Arab States administrations propose to add two new questions related to security, privacy, trust and identification and the evaluation and assessment of smart cities and communities. And in addition, it shows its views on how to strengthen the all of Study Group 20 and take into consideration any possible enhancements on the methodology of the work. We have seen some challenges during the past period in our particular work and accordingly, we are going to explain to the audience the rationale for proposing this particular question.

We have proposed these two new questions to be discussed right now at the Assembly, because we believe that it touches upon many different aspects which could be also relevant to other studies in other Study Groups, for example, issues related to privacy, trust, identification. It might be also helpful to hear the views of other experts at the Assembly.

In addition, that proposed new question on the evaluation and assessment of Smart Cities and Communities is also something for which we could have very valuable opinion from the Assembly. We preferred to bring these two proposed new questions for the Assembly for

particularly that reason. We are aware that this work could have been done at the Study Group level.

However, as I told you, as I explained to the audience, that we think that it is very important to bring all the opinions of the experts from also relevant Study Groups on board when we are discussing such matters.

Basically, the contribution just sets the stage, gives a little bit background on the decision to create this Study Group. It has been agreed at the TSAG in its meeting June 2015 to create Study Group 20. The structure was also approved at that meeting.

However, it was amended at the first meeting of Study Group 20 which was held in October, 2015, and you can find the agreed structure in TD 3 rev 5, it's also linked in the document, it's available in the TSAG documents.

I'll jump quickly to the proposed two new questions. Originally we had six questions, two Working Parties and one question which is question 1, related to research on the emerging technologies on IoT and definitions and general aspects. We are proposing to add two additional new questions, and to reorganize, reorder the mandate of the existing questions into a new set of different questions, simply to remove any overlap which has been

noted in the previous study period between Working Party 1 and Working Party 2 and also to try to simplify the method or means to classify the different topics for the questions under study.

So we are proposing two new questions, question 2 is on the evaluation and assessment of Smart Cities and Communities, mainly that particular question is going to study the general principles --

>> CHAIR: You have been out of time for a while. So if you could --

>> Egypt: Mainly it would study general principles related to the methodology to assess how ICTs can have impact on the city, and that will include issues related to the KPI. This work had been transferred from Study Group 5 to Study Group 20, and we have the dedicated a new question particularly for that purpose. With respect to issues related to security, privacy trust and identification, it is in our views that security and privacy and trust and identification issues should be done hand in hand with the experts developing IoT protocols and systems, and this is for merely technical reasons.

And accordingly we are providing that particular text which includes very detailed list of potential study



items with also very detailed tasks to be provided.

I want to stress on something that the proposed amendments to the ITU-T Study Group 20 structure is only proposed for to be noted in the, it is proposed for your consideration for the Assembly's consideration. This is simply to trigger potential discussions and have feedback. We are going to discuss thoroughly the structure of these particular questions, along with the mandates in the Study Group level.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt, for this submission. I give the floor for clarification on this proposal or any comments. I see United Arab Emirates, I see Jordan. United Arab Emirates, you have the floor.

>> UAE: Thank you, Chairman.

Would I nevertheless like to recall some aspects, during the debate on the items B and C we noted that the Arab group proposal 43A32 was cited twice under 4B and 4C. I don't think there is any need to include it under agenda item 4C. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So we will take Jordan now.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a quick question for clarification to the distinguished Egyptian delegate. In the last page of the contribution, article 5, it is mentioned that the request to instruct Study

Group 20 and in its first meeting after the WTSA to finalize the structure of and develop the appropriate text for the remaining question. How they are requesting the WTSA to instruct the Study Group 20? Through what? A resolution, or origin of the mandate of the Study Group 20? It is not clear to me. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. Egypt, if you can respond to this.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Jordan, for the question. Well, the whole purpose of demonstrating the structure of that particular Study Group of our work is simply to bring to the attention of the Assembly the way forward, our approach, our proposed approach of how are we going to restructure the potential questions of Study Group 20. So we are not asking for particular approval for the detailed text of the proposed questions.

We are simply trying to bring sort of an alliance to open discussion in the transparent way. We understand that the details of the questions are going to be handled at the Study Group level, but we thought it might be also a good opportunity to demonstrate for the rest of our delegates the views and the visions of the Arab States regarding the division of the work and how the different questions are going to be organized from our perspective.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. United Arab Emirates, you are asking for the floor again.

>> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Chairman.

Good morning, everyone. I do have a question that I would like to ask of you, Chairman. Are we currently debating 42B, or 42C? I would like a clarification, because it seems to me that we are addressing two questions, two different questions at the same time. Bangladesh has already presented a contribution 52, which is about another question. Now we are debating a question which falls under 42B. Would you be able to clarify this for us, please, Chairman, so that we can better follow the debate? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Right. To clarify and to respond to your initial request why the Arab proposal is under C, is because the Arab group proposed changes to the mandate of Study Group 3. That was why it was asked for it to be presented.

So we are at the presentation stage. We asked for clarifications on the presentation from Egypt on IoT studies. We are now going to go into discussions. We are only at clarification stage. We have not entered into discussions yet. We are not at 42B for discussions yet. If you can hold on, if it is just about

clarifications, we can go into the clarifications. We will take clarifications on Bangladesh as well, and then we can go into the discussions as 42A and 42C.

If you can withdraw if it's not for clarifications on Egypt. United Arab Emirates.

>> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Chairman. Please do excuse me if I'm taking the floor again to speak on the same question. But Chairman, we would like to have some clarifications. You indicated that the document which was presented just now by the Distinguished Delegate of Egypt was a document linked to the work of Study Group 3.

Nevertheless, to our mind, this is not linked to the mandate of Study Group 3. But there is another document which proposes modifications to be made to resolution 2, and this is linked to the work of Study Group 3.

We would like to be clear on the relationship between this document and the area of work and scope of Study Group 3. As far as we see it, there is no relation between these two questions. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Right, thank you, yes. There has been a swap. So sorry about the confusion. There is a swap of A28 which was supposed to have gone to 42C, and then

A32 which was also to have gone to 42B. Sorry about that confusion. So there is that swap. So I understand your question now. Thank you.

If this is clarified for you, so the A28 is addressing resolution 2. That will be tackled under 42C. Then A23 as presented by Egypt is on 42B. With this clarification is Canada still asking for the floor? Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, and very briefly, it's not an intervention on the substance of this contributions, but on the issue of the financial responsibilities of conferences particularly, the conventions 488 and 489. In the sense of a question whether or not in the decision-making process to increase the number of questions to Study Group 20 or any other Study Group, has there been any analysis of any potential financial implications for the union? And because it is in our view, Mr. Chairman, important to note that such considerations should be included in the analysis of the creation of new questions prior to any decision on the subject matter. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So Committee 2 will look at those matters. But for new questions as they are will be discussed on Monday as it is, so we are not

taking decisions on new questions today.

If this is fine with us, I see Egypt, Bahrain, United States. This is for clarification so that we can proceed? If it's not on clarification on what Egypt presented, then you could withdraw so that we can proceed into the discussions. Egypt, you want to clarify, under a minute, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chair. Just very quick clarification for the concerns raised by our dear delegate from Canada. The first proposed question on the evaluation of Smart Cities, this has been an existing work on Study Group 5 and is being transferred from Study Group 5 to Study Group 20.

So there is new -- there is no new, totally new aspect which is currently being developed in Study Group 20, in that particular regard. With regard to the new question on security and trust, security, privacy and trust, also Study Group 20 has had a previous mandate according to TSAG, that it works on issues also related to security, and actually security related matters have been part of two existing, currently existing questions in Study Group 20.

What we have done is that we try to consolidate all these items which have been distributed over several

questions into a single question. So we think that there is resources will be the same, experts will be the same, either way the work is going to be done. It is a mere reorganization of the work. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well. I see Bahrain, United States and Japan, if it's on clarification of the submission of Egypt, I want to close the list. Bahrain, United States, Canada, asked for the floor again. The list is closed. Bahrain, you have the floor.

>> Bahrain: Thank you, Mr. Chair, good morning. A clarification, Mr. Chair, sorry for intervening at this time but as per the agenda I believe you have been referring to the Arab proposal addendum 28. I believe addendum 28 again does not talk about the role of Study Group 3. If you were referring to the role of Study Group 3, which is detailed in resolution 2, that is addendum 18 I believe from the Arab proposals, because addendum 28 talks about strengthening the role of ITU and ensuring data privacy. So that is again a different topic.

I pledge that the agenda be corrected with the right referencing so that people do not get confused. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, so I will ask the Secretariat to check whether that is 18 or 28. Thank you. We will come

back to you on that. Thank you very much. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Another point of clarification on a slightly different topic, so our understanding is that right now the contribution from the Arab group, contribution 43 A32 were discussing the mandate of Study Group 20. Our contribution USA 48 addendum 15 also discusses the mandate of Study Group 20. But it's in the context of documents 20 and 21.

We feel that in order to take this work forward, that documents 20, 21, this Arab contribution, and the USA contribution should be considered all together, and so our question is whether or not that is appropriate for this group, or it's more appropriate when we discuss it at the plenary along with those documents.

We do feel like this is a good group and we are happy to discuss the scope and all of these together, but we do think that the way that this agenda is, is a bit confusing for us to be able to accomplish our work. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: You are right, what has been designated to the plenary will be dealt with at the plenary but we wanted to give the opportunity of this allocation



to the Arab group to highlight it in this Committee, and then as we are going into the discussions on Monday on questions, then we could have much more time to go into deeper discussions.

But this was just to have clarification sorted so that discussions on Monday become easier. That is the approach as we have now.

Your documents will go to the plenary as it is.

With this, I still have Japan asking for the floor. Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I have asked this floor not by the Japan's delegation, but as the character of Study Group 3 Chairman.

My question is, relates to the previous intervention by Canada. I would like to ask to the Secretariat the procedural question. Yes, it's true that Study Group 3 has adopted 11 questions for the next study period, including one new question, okay. And I presume this new inclusion of this new question will be discussed during the WTSA.

But Bangladesh with their contribution 52 proposed a new question, that is to say is the 12th question. In this sense, I would like to know from the Secretariat but that each country has the right to propose new

questions directly to WTSA. This is my question. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Japan. So you wanted to move into the Bangladesh discussions. We hold them for now, and just to say to close the, sorted our clarifications on the submissions of Egypt on behalf of the Arab group on the new questions on IoT and security studies. So now, as you are asking for clarification on the procedure on new questions to the Assembly, yes, you are right. Every country can propose a new question to a Study Group directly. But as it is now Bangladesh has something which they have proposed to this Assembly. We want to give the opportunity for others if you have any clarifications on the proposals from Bangladesh so that they could respond to it. The floor is now given for clarifications on the submissions of Bangladesh. I see no one asking for the floor. Rwanda. You have the floor.

>> Thank you, Chair. I would like to ask clarification on Bangladesh contribution, on policy and regulatory aspect for quality of service and quality of experience. As I'm aware those policy and regulatory aspects for QS and QE are bringing standards in Study Group 12 especially in question 12, 12, all operational

aspects of the telecommunication network service quality.

Thank you. I would like to ask clarification why it is being proposed in Study Group 3. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I see Mexico asking for the floor. You have the floor, Mexico.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chairman. I would like to echo the words of the previous speaker, but I would also like to ask about the procedure with regard to the proposal made by Bangladesh. I heard that there have been some additional support, in accordance with the rules of procedure to discuss a proposal. There should at least be the support of another Member State for a proposal and I'm not certain that I have that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mexico. Bangladesh, you have the floor.

>> BANGLADESH: Thank you, Chairman, as we find out in Study Group 3 is basically for economic policy and strategy, so and according to that one, we would like to, study 12 is mostly on technical issues, and our, we submit these questions to WTSA because it's a gray matter of the interest and especially for the regulators, and to keep that concern in mind, we like to keep it in SG 3 and as it's in line with the mandate as well.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Just before you go away, Bangladesh, there was a question as whether you have support from other countries for this proposal. Are there any countries supporting you on this? Bangladesh, you have the floor. Okay, Bangladesh. You have the floor. Are there any other countries supporting this proposal?

>> BANGLADESH: I think Bahrain does.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, that was for clarification, we will take this up later on. I will give it to the Secretariat to really give the procedure on nature of such questions. Mr. Simao De Campos, please proceed.

>> SIMAO DE CAMPOS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

There are I think two questions that were made. One was on the adoption of proposals. The general rules give the steps in terms of adopting proposals. One of them is seeking whether there are members present at the meeting that have, that support that proposal. And then having identification of organisation, members opposing the adoption, and then debates relate to that. So this is in the resolution, in the general rules.

Also in the more general question of the procedure that is customary for the Assembly, it is true that the Assembly is plenipotentiary within the scope of the

definition of the work of the sector. However, it has been previous practice that the Assembly, because of the profile of the people that come here, many times we do not have necessary experts to assess very detailed proposals in particular the text of the questions.

It is customary to defer proposals of adoption of new questions to the Study Groups concerned. So we have many precedents taking in previous Assemblies where proposals for new questions were submitted to the Assembly, and the Committee 4 has reviewed the proposals, and transmitted them to the concerned Study Groups for further consideration. This has been the practice in the past. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well for this clarification. I hope this concludes the proposals and the clarifications as they were under agenda item 4. So we proceed on to agenda item 5. Revise WTSA resolutions under com 4. And we will take the first one on resolution 72, major concerns related to human exposure to electromagnetic fields. We have a number of proposals received. I see Brazil, Egypt and Jordan asking for the floor. Okay. I pause for Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning to everybody. First of all, a question for clarification,

I would like to understand why we are just skipping all the regulatory discussion that was supposed to do on item 4C. In fact, we understand that it is also a little mix here for example Bangladesh proposition, our understanding is talking about a creation of a new question, and if we understood correctly the idea of this item 4C was the discussion of the idea of the, if we should address or not regulatory measures on Study Group 3. Of course, we have a position on that Brazil side and we would like to align that what is the method that we should go on that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

This was supposed to give the, agenda item 4, was supposed to give us a very high level idea about the proposals that were received on these specific study areas. So this is to refine the mandate of Study Groups and in the refinement of the mandate of Study Groups, we will have time, the opportunity tomorrow to deal with resolution 2, which deals with everything about Study Groups.

So there is the opportunity of discussing resolution 2, and it covers the mandate of Study Groups, it covers the questions of Study Groups. On Monday, we have the time to deal with specific questions, which is also a

feed into resolution 2. But what we try this morning was to give the opportunity of proposals at a very high level to be presented, so that clarifications will be sorted and then when we get to resolution 2, those proposals which are really specific to resolution 2 could be handled by in the discussions, because these proposals have been presented already, you could have the understanding why those proposals were made and when you go into discussions, we don't take these all together.

So it has just been straight out just for time management reasons to take such proposals and get clarifications on it. So just as I indicated yesterday, we are building the house and we are taking it in steps. So you could see such certain pillars that are being shown now but it doesn't mean it will remain so. They are building blocks, will be tied to it as we go along. So this morning for agenda item 4, it was just to present and for delegates to ask clarifications on these submissions. Okay? If that is fine, Egypt, you want to ask for the floor on this? Okay, and Jordan.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, I think it might be challenging to defer discussions on these particular topics for later stages in the discussion. I mean when we discuss resolution 2. I believe that most

of the delegates have proposals, most of the regions have proposals on the mandates of different Study Groups. So that sooner we take up these particular issues, the better, in our humble views. This is one point.

The second point is that resolution 1 clearly gives a possibility for this Assembly to address and approve new questions. All the experts are here. All the experts from all the delegations are present here. It is a golden opportunity to actually discuss and engage in discussions related to these matters. This is point number 2.

We think that it might be, if you permit us, Mr. Chair, to bring at least start the discussions on these particular aspects as you have just presented in the agenda, if you permit us, and we will try to, with your excellent moderation of course, I'm sure that you are going to develop a consensus within the room with your excellent leadership.

So I would kindly urge you to reconsider, to open the discussion in this particular session. We think that, I do not think that high level discussion is actually what we are currently doing. I think everyone is prepared to bring some details in this particular discussions. Thank you, Chair.



>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Egypt. Jordan, UAE are asking, but I will appeal to you, we just have about 28 minutes to go. And we want to deal with the three other resolutions. This morning is just to whet your appetite, just to give the idea of what is going on elsewhere.

It was not for the discussions this morning.

It was just to open up all our documents and that is why one agenda item was struck out. We were just giving you an overview of the study areas, as the proposals that were linked to it. It was just to give everybody a good capture, so that when we move into other Working Groups, we will be moving into other detailed discussions, it will be easy for you to know that what's been said here is not different from what is being said in especially Working Group A. I'll plead with you, if it is on agenda item 4, if you can withdraw, for us to proceed to agenda item 5.

Agenda item 4 was just to give the presentations and to ask questions. So thank you very much, everyone, for withdrawing.

If we can move to agenda item 5, this will be discussed, beyond the presentation, so that we could take decisions on it.

Resolution 72, measurement concerns related to human exposure to magnetic, electromagnetic fields, we will take the first presentation from Africa. Algeria.

>> ALGERIA: Good morning, Chair. And good morning to all colleagues present.

>> CHAIR: Your document will be projected, 42A 9 rev 1. 42A 9 rev 1 to be projected. Thank you. Please proceed, Algeria.

>> ALGERIA: That is quite right, sir.

On behalf of the African Group please allow me to introduce 429 rev 1, dealing with the proposed modification of resolution 72 measurement concerns related to human exposure to electromagnetic fields.

The changes here essentially have to do with the work undertaken in three sectors of ITU.

(paper shuffling).

And the importance of concerting efforts with other organisations to avoid any kind of duplication of efforts, in the light of the urgent need to revamp our regulatory framework on behalf of certain developing countries, and also improve the protection of people exposed to electromagnetic fields.

We request the Secretary-General to therefore coordinate the pertinent efforts here, and the resolution

is to be sent to the next PP in order to have any follow-ups that may be necessary as regards resolution 176. Also parties are invited to take periodical steps to ensure conformity to ITU and other international organisations norms. Also to foster awareness among the public on electromagnetic fields and to cooperate in exchange of skills and competencies to allow for strengthening the regulatory frameworks in this field. That is the content of the document sir. On behalf of the African Group, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Algeria.

Is there a request for clarification on this, modifications to resolution 72 from the African Group? I see no one asking for the floor. Thank you very much.

So we move on to the Arab group, if you could present your proposal 43A91, if this is projected. Yes, I see Egypt. Egypt, you have the floor. Please project the document, Arab 43A.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair, good morning, everyone. I'm going now to present document C43, addendum 9 rev 1 which is modification on resolution 72 on measurements concerns related to human exposure to electromagnetic fields. Since technology makers are producing ever advancing technologies and as these

technologies depend on much more on electromagnetic fields and these fields above safe limits can cause health risks, taking into considerations the need of developing countries for the support to assess the risk of the electromagnetic fields, which also considered as one of the biggest reasons behind the digital standardization gap between developed and developing countries, the urgent need for regulatory bodies in many developing countries to obtain information on electromagnetic fields, measurement methodologies in regard to human exposure to radio frequency energy, in order to establish national regulations to protect their citizens.

The Arab States administrations propose to modify this resolution in accordance with the urgent need for standards and recommendation paving the road to the development of this field. Resolving to instruct the ITU-T in particular Study Group 5 to cooperate with ITU-R Study Group 1 and 6, and with ITU-D Study Group 1 in order to expand and continue its work on support in this domain. Requesting the Secretary-General to coordinate the activities carried out by three sectors and bring to the Plenipotentiary Conference for required action. Inviting Member States and Sector Members to conduct periodic review to ensure that ITU recommendations and

other relevant international standards related to the exposure to electromagnetic fields are followed and to cooperate in sharing expertise and resources. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Is there a request for clarifications or comments on this modification to resolution 72? I see no one asking for the floor. Thank you. We move to APT proposal 4 4A 19/1. Vietnam, you have the floor. Can we have this projected. Vietnam, please proceed.

>> Vietnam: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen on behalf of APT group, I would like to introduce the proposal, document number 44, 19, which is modification of resolution 72, concern related to human exposure to electromagnetic fields. Resolution 72 was adopted at 2008, revised and consented 2012 and since 2012 Study Group 5 has made progress in developing 7 recommendation which provide not only measurement but also numeric prediction, estimation and calculation techniques for assessing EMF exposure. There are also various, studies and mitigation of the exposure long term monitoring, and emission map has been developed. Those key outcomes provide high level framework for the assessment of human exposure to EMF.

So we propose to change the title of resolution to reflect the progress of the work have done so far.

Besides, the PP also update resolution 176 in 2014, and update resolution 62 in 2014 relating to human exposure to EMF, in which there is a need to harmonize the EMF guidelines to for regulators and policymakers to have them formulate a national standards.

Also in the last four years, there has been increasingly development in ICT infrastructure developing country which result in need of regulators, operators and public to deal with EMF matter, so that we, it is necessary to update this resolution to generally reflect those need, and development of the work have done so far. There are change in five parts, the first is title resolution, and the secondly, to consider part, to consider the need of the operators and installation, of installation of radio site to maintain the quality of service, and the need of public to know EMF level. Thirdly to recognize in part to recognize since 2012 in which I will not go into the detail. Lastly in the resolve part which we made some change referring to Study Group 5 and TSB Director and finally, we would like to invite members to apply ITU-T recommendation to international standard of assessing EMF level and inform

the public of its compliance.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Vietnam. So is there request for clarifications on the modifications to resolution 72 as proposed by Vietnam? I see no one asking for the floor. Thank you. We will take the Inter-America proposal 464146A15/1. Argentina, you have the floor.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. Good morning to one and all. I'm going to introduce the modifications made to resolution 72 on behalf of CITEL. This has to do with some changes to update the resolution. After well in the wake of the last standardization Assembly and considering the importance of infrastructure in the use of different kinds of technology. We wanted to avail ourselves of Study Group 5's work in particular those that have to do with guides, technical reports and so on, which are kind of a permanent updating and on-line updating effort. We would highlight the reception of risk on the part of people, the population, and which is even more than, more important than just measuring, to pay special attention to this topic of perception of risk of people.

And mention coordinated work with WHO, which is

the permanent consultation process. Also Study Group 5 of the TSB will hear the drawing up of technical recommendations for the measurement of radio frequencies that help diminish risk perception and publication, dissemination of technical reports. This was approving standards recommendation to combat these problems.

We wanted to emphasize these points in this resolution. Work continues to move forward here, and we highlight the importance of cooperation with other sectors. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Argentina. Is there a request for clarifications on the submissions of Argentina, to modifications of resolution 72? I see no one asking for the floor.

So we have a number of proposals for modification to resolution 72. So we will, I will ask that we take all these proposals into one consolidated one, that reflects the changes, and it will not be a new ad hoc group, it will go to the same SG 5 Chair who is handling resolution 73, to lead to get to drafting session done.

If this is fine by all the interested parties, drafting group, so if this is fine by all drafting, all interested parties, then we can then proceed on that.

So thank you for your agreements. So we have



resolution 72 being part of the drafting group which is for resolution 73.

Thank you. So we will go to agenda item 5B, on resolution 77, which is on standardization work in ITU Telecom standardization sector 4 software defined networking.

We have proposals from APT, RCC, United States and Canada. We will take from APT. APT 44A15/1. China, you have the floor.

>> CHINA: Good morning to all. Now I'd like to introduce this document resolution 77 is about the standardization work in promoting SDN in the past four years, the resolution 77 has played a very important role for the standardization of SDN. And also the work has been almost finalized, as that does not mean we don't need resolution 77. On the contrary, we need to enhance resolution 77, so that it become a strategy for the sustainable development of the ICT, and it should also guide the work of the focal point and focal group, focus group.

We also made some revisions to this resolution. Now I'd like to go through those revisions.

Considering the first development, fast development of SDN in the past four years and there are

also new technologies like container technologies, as well as many organisations are involved in the SDN standardization, and they also played very important role. So we propose that ITU continue to play an important role in this area. We also realize that ITU plays a very important role in promoting SDN architecture and needs, and it has developed a universal recognized standards. We hope that various groups can continue their work in the field of SDO, we hope that ITU can continue to coordinate the efforts among different organisations and groups, and continue to help with the standardization of SDN.

We also hope that ITU-T can consider the SDN orchestration technology and its impact on the operations supporting system. We also hope that the TSAG can take into account the above changes, and take necessary actions to continue their work, and continue to promote the collaboration and coordination with related SDOs.

>> CHAIR: We are already into the break period. So I will ask of delegates, if we can continue to 11:00 a.m., so you have a shorter coffee break to resume at 11:15, if that is fine with you, we could ask for clarifications now. But if not we could ask for clarifications and then we can close and take up the other submissions later

on. I see Egypt asking for the floor. Egypt, is this for clarifications? Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are actually a little bit confused. I don't understand why are we tackling the different contributions in slightly a little bit detailed manner for agenda item number 5, we have taken the contributors one by one, even shortly, and we didn't do exactly the same for the agenda items number 4. I don't understand. Perhaps could you please clarify the procedures we are currently following here?

Either we are going to defer the discussions all together, for all the agenda items, or in my humble view, we might address all of them also in the same manner. So I'm a little bit confused. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. Just to clarify quickly, the nature of agenda item 5 is very different from agenda item 4, very different. 5 is to the detail in tests. 4 is to the high level on thematic areas. So there will be new opportunity for these other in 5 to be discussed any other day apart from today, if they are so completed today apart from drafting sessions, so that is why we take in the proposals now, ask for clarification and then we can go into discussions if delegates wished.

But for 4, we have other opportunities for

resolution 2 to be discussed tomorrow and detailed questions to be discussed on Monday. So this was the shuttling so it was just to give a overview today on these specific study areas and not to go into the discussions or decisions today.

That is the difference between 4 and 5.

I don't know whether this clarifies it. But we already into our break period, and if you could allow for us to get clarifications from the presentation as it were then we could close for today. If Egypt and Jordan will withdraw, you insist on -- Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just for clarification, does that mean that whenever that is, tomorrow or afterwards, that means that every single contribution is going to be reopened, and every member needs to address the Assembly one more time reading his contribution one more time? Does that mean that, for example, under item, agenda item 4C, we are going to reopen the Arab contribution 43A5 2, the B GD52, 822, RCC 47A23 later on? Is that the procedure here? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, it will be open for discussions, because the proposals have been presented. If they have been presented in this meeting, then they wouldn't be

presented again. We will open up for discussions, because we have presented them and then there were clarifications sought. And you realize the amount of clarifications after your presentations that were sought. That is time taking. Now with the clarifications that people have, now they can go back and then in the discussions it can help in their decision-making, because you have clarified your points to them. This was the approach. Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chair. I'm sorry to take the floor again but you talked about suspending this meeting. Now we were supposed to stop at 10:45 and unfortunately, with the way work has been progressing and despite your efforts and the Secretariat to prepare and present the documents, so that we would go as quickly as possible, the fact is that I really have to ask you what are the future stages going to be, how are we going to work, in order to deal with all of these documents? You said that some of them will be introduced on Monday, some delegations have requested that these documents be presented to 4A. So I think we need to have everything very clear right now, before we proceed any further.

Could you or the Secretariat please perhaps prepare an agenda, a programme for committee 4 and others who

will be working here so at least during the lunch break today, we can study the document and we can orient our work, according to my humble understanding, the documents that have been looked at here should be dealt with as quickly as possible. We have already discussed them. We have a clear idea of their contents. We really need to have a clear agenda now to see how these documents that have already been presented are going to be distributed, because we don't really have that many more meetings. These documents are going to be presented in the afternoon session or not? Please, can we have clear orientation here? And thank you and compliments with your excellent leadership here. It's just that we haven't really been logging positive results here.

We have made scant progress here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jordan. If you refer to DT8, it gives the general agenda of Committee 4. It tells of all the times that we will meet. It tells about Study Group structure, what are the documents that will be handled. It talks about restructuring, which we tackled some part yesterday. Today we are dealing with refinement, it was not to take decision. If you look at that document, you will see that there is just a general presentation, but it is not linked to any specific matter.

When we go to 6, which is on Study Group titles, and responsibilities, there it is feeding into resolution 2.

So there again, you will see that now and proposals are really linked to specific items. So we will take the proposals there and these specific items will be discussed and these issues will be taken on for resolution 2. Then we go to 7, and you will realize that we have under 7 specific documents which are tied to specific items. And we will take this as well on Monday. But to again address Egypt, if you look at resolutions that are under com 4, they have no opportunities just as these issues under resolutions are being handled to be reconsidered anywhere.

They are taken at one time and they are dealt with it. So issues that are to be reflected in resolution 2, we are taking them in stages, because we acknowledge that with the amount of proposals that we have, we cannot have one session to be able to address them. Definitely people need time to understand what people try to put in their documentation. And is it not one stage is presented, it is discussed and the decision is made. So we are taking them in stages, yes, you have a brief and an understanding of the refinement of Study Group

mandates. You have the opportunity again tomorrow to discuss this further, if there are any other proposals linked to it, it will be presented. Then we can fine tune by Monday with the questions as well.

We are taking it in steps. Please, let's go by the steps so that it can be very easy for us, because what we are doing is to build a structure, and you don't build a structure with a roof in mind from day one by just bring in the roofing sheets to site.

So I will appeal to you, for you to be guided by DT8 on the general agenda for com 4.

So with this said, I think we have run out of time. But if there are any requests for clarification, I see Jordan asking for the floor, we could take it and then we could close. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Yes, thank you, Chair. I'm speaking on behalf of the Arab States. The document that you mentioned, well, has been studied by us. It is a provisional document aimed at establishing a kind of a roadmap. But it's a living document that we can change and amend at any time.

I would ask on behalf of my group that we review this document now on the basis of the results of the work this morning.



(microphone feedback).

And present it to our morning meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Right, thank you very much. For example, for today if you go to agenda item, you could not deal with 5B and 5C in total. So definitely we have to find time for these two resolutions. But if there is any request for clarifications from China, we could take that and we will know that China presented on this and we could take the other submissions later on. I see no one asking for the floor.

So, I will thank you and then we will go to any other business. Are there any issues? No issues. So guidance tomorrow is that we meet at 9:00 a.m. tomorrow, com 4 starts at 9:00 a.m., not 9:30, as we are used to for the past days. So 9:00 a.m. tomorrow for com 4, same room. See you all and have a good time. Thank you.

(break).

(standing by).

(standing by).

>> CHAIR: Good morning, everyone.

(sound of gavel).

Good morning, everyone.

Okay, good. Good morning, all. It's a pleasure to be with you again. Welcome back to this second Working

Group 4B session. Thank you all again for joining us here. First I would like to remind you how to use the microphone and ask for the floor. If you wish to ask for the floor, press the button just once. Then the light will start lighting. If you press the button again, you will be withdrawing your request for the floor. Do not press it twice unless you want to withdraw your request for the floor. Once I give you the floor, it will stop blinking and it is your turn to take the floor.

If you wish to take the floor, just once. And wait for your time, okay? After this clarification, I would like to present to you the agenda, which is document ADM 14. Our agenda is quite busy today. We have first to approve the agenda, to approve the report, we have to deal with the proposed new resolution IAP 7, resolution 59, 44 and 54 and then maybe any other business.

So, with this presented document 14, on the agenda of the second meeting, I'd like you to take a look, and approve this agenda. Thank you. The agenda is approved. We have also to approve the report of the previous meeting, the meeting that we had yesterday. You can see it on DT18. As you can see, DT18 is quite short, summarizing what we heard yesterday, some words on the opening, approve the agenda, terms of reference of Working Group

4(b), we had to include this in the report in the first report, the list of contributions proposed, there is a reference to this also. Then we started to discuss the proposed new resolution IAP 7 on SMEs. We also discussed resolution 44 and the proposed suppression of resolution 59. Then notes on the main aspects that we discussed yesterday, so test laboratories, interpretation and so on. Then it's finished.

Seeing this, I'd like to ask if there is any suggestion or if we can approve this report. Germany, you have the floor.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, Mr. Chairman, we had an intervention yesterday with regard to the financial impacts which was probably not clear, that I was speaking as Vice-Chair of Committee 2, rather than as Germany. We would have a paragraph to be added to this report in DT18, which I can hand over to you, but it deals with the budgetary restrictions regarding any decision of the Assembly on additional actions or needs. I can either read it, or if you would prefer it, I will hand it over to you, and you can include it in to this DT, and probably then publish a revision. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's up to you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany, I definitely prefer

that you send it to me and to the Secretariat. Then we include it in the report. Besides, there is a request to include all the financial implications of the approved resolutions and the decisions that we take in this Committee, from com 2 so I think it makes sense with the general rules of procedures of this plenary, of this Assembly.

Thank you. It will be included. So please send it to me.

Any other requests for the floor regarding the approval of the report? I see none. Thank you. After this meeting, we have, we only have two meetings scheduled. In the interest of time, I would like to make an appeal to you to keep your intervention as brief as possible. As I said yesterday we have only one hour and 15 minutes for 4B so we are very limited on time. Yesterday, we were able to discuss many things relating to resolution 44 and 59, as well on the new proposed resolution IAP 7.

Today I would like with your help to move on getting some results and some consensus on these matters. Then please we shall start with the proposed new resolution IAP 7, as you can see in the agenda. We have to come with a conclusion regarding the issue of SMEs. IAP7 is

a new resolution. I requested that a informal discussion take place between interested parties, and I'm hoping that this provided a good result. I would like to invite Argentina to take the floor to hopefully share with us some good news, regarding the consultations that Argentina had. You have the floor, Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chairman.

Good morning, everyone. As you correctly mentioned, yesterday when we introduced this new proposed resolution to add admit SMEs and proprietors into the work of ITU-T some countries did express some concerns with regard to the topic. Therefore, we held consultations with these countries, at least with those who we could locate in the room. We tried to come up with a consensus position, because as the resolution or the proposal indicates, our interest is in encouraging the participation of the small and medium enterprises in the work of the union.

While we did have some points of agreement, we are working with the legal advisor of the ITU and other concerns were pointed out with regard to this. This issue needs to be addressed in the, some of the issues need to be addressed in the Council too, because there is a lot of issues related to membership with the plenipotentiary resolution 187. We think that a

solution might be to include our concern in the final report of the Assembly, and that is what we submit for the consideration of the countries here present.

I'd also like to highlight that we asked or are concerned that there is still such resistance to the topic of including small and medium enterprises in the work of the union, since this is a sector which is so dynamic in the area of telecommunications and ICTs. Therefore, we would request that in future meetings and first and foremost in Council meetings, the topic be addressed as required, so that we can make progress on it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Argentina. Actually you summarize it very well. We still would have some issues on competences of this Assembly, the competences of Council and the Working Group on human and financial resources, as we understand that questions regarding proposed trial periods should be dealt in those instances, as financial and human resources. As a way to proceed, we have prepared some lines that can be included in the Chairman's report.

I'd like to read it for you, so that we can have maybe with your comprehension this at the end of the report. I'll read it very slowly. With respect to IAP

46A18, the meeting recognized the importance of the participation of SMEs in the work of the union. At the same time, it recognized that these issues covered by resolution 187 and as such membership issues are not in the remit of this Assembly. In addition, the concerned Working Group on financial and human resources has been considering the issue on an ITU-wide basis.

Consequently, Working Group 4B agreed to close the discussion on the proposed new resolution contained in the, in IAP 46A18, and to invite the Council to address the issue of participation of SMEs in the work of ITU and especially in the work of ITU-T with urgency.

This would be the text, and also you can note that a similar approach was taken in com 3 with respect to the African comment proposal on resolution 31 on participation of associates and academia.

After this reading, I would ask you if there is any objection that we proceed in this way, so we would close on the debate and include this issue in the report as I read. Do I have any comment from the floor in this regard? As I see none, thank you so it will be done. Thank you very much. I think this is our first decision and I'm very glad for that. Thank you all.

The next item of the agenda is resolution 59 and

resolution 44. Since they are very linked, and remembering that on 59 is regard proposed suppression of resolution, of this resolution, and that this resolution, parts of it the operative part of resolution 59 be included in 44, because they are, they can be related. Then I'd like you to propose to start by resolution 44, and when we reach the issue of 59, I will flag it and then we can start again a discussion, if there is a need to suppress or not the resolution 59, and embed it or not in resolution 44.

First, so let us start. I would like to remind you also that we have a working document, is the working document number 1 for your reference. It has been posted yesterday night. As I promised yesterday, I have worked with the Secretariat to come up with a consolidated proposal that takes into account the receipt of contributions and the discussion, fruitful discussions we had yesterday, on some of key issues in the modifications of the resolution.

I have posted this document as working document, and this is the way I want to proceed. This working document is document number 3, working document 3. Let's first do a quick first reading, so that you can be familiarized, so you can familiarize with the document.



Screen. The first thing I would like to highlight is the structure of the document. As you can see, it's a quite long document. In this resolution, as it currently stands, collating the various proposals we end up with five pages of introductory text. That is to say considering recognizing, recognizing also taking into account and so on. We also have four pages of operative text, that is to say resolves, instructs, and invites.

These are then added to an action plan. The good news is the consolidation is fairly easy with the annex, with the action plan. I hope that it won't take long for us to discuss and to view it.

What I propose is that we start right away with the resolves spot. Let's take each paragraph in turn, if you can agree with me on taking resolve spot first in this text, so I think we will have a good glimpse of what we want to have in this resolution by starting with the resolves. It's right on page 5.

In this part of the text, I would like to discuss and to have your considerations on point by point, so number by number and cover only the changes that was proposed by many regions. Let's go to resolves 1. No proposal on resolves 1. So I think it can be kept as

it is in the original text. Resolves 2, just a inclusion of a especially ITU-D. Then under resolves 2 is letter i, if you have some comment or suggestion, please do so by asking for the floor.

Secretariat is reminding me that some proposals on deleting i and ii, and here as you can see, we are keeping the i and ii, just making all the suggestions, all the inclusions. I would ask you if we can keep it, or any suggestions, if you are comfortable with the suggestion we are proposing, we can go further.

I see none. So iii is the question submitted by RCC. As you can see, we have some square brackets on it. Yes, okay.

I have some time to read the phrase and then we start to discuss.

Thank you, United States, you have the floor.

>>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As we discussed yesterday, the United States has some questions about this, and we are a bit concerned with the language on test laboratories, particularly with regard to the TSB's role in establishing those test labs, because it's still unclear to us what the level of expertise is within TSB to establish those laboratories. And as we noted yesterday, work on specifications for

test labs really is an issue that is already well under way within Study Group 11.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. I listened to your comments and to many of the comments in the informal consultations noticing that this may be concern for many. I proposed a different text, and as you can see, it is in square brackets, so that ITU and TSB would not be the one to establish the centers. But then ITU would help countries, help developing countries to establish national strategies, to develop strategies so that countries could do this, not ITU-T.

So if you see on what is on square brackets, that is the idea that we mean. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. As asked yesterday, first of all, thank you for the clarification of this text. And but still, we have some concerns, and that is basically in line with the United States. For me, the meaning of assist is a little bit, a little bit unclear to us. We wonder that TSB has enough expertise to do this work.

Yesterday, we got our explanation that "assist" means consultation. But please, for me, consultation is a little bit better at least. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan. When I read assist, I think the meaning at least for me would be on helping developing countries on establishment of strategies, on developing strategies, so it's not ITU that will develop these strategies, but ITU would serve only as an advisor. But it is not ITU to do this. And I can agree with you on that. It is not at all ITU or ITU-T to do the work, but only to serve as a consultancy. I have Russia and Argentina. Russia, you have the floor.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. I haven't really managed to get to grip with these microphones. The reasons behind this proposal was the word, assist, providing assistance to countries, in enabling such laboratories as can be provided by the sector. We believe that the sector, T sector is a leader in the ITU in the area of standardization. We don't have any other mandate. Therefore, our sector can provide assistance to countries, Member States, in choosing which recommendations to use and implement for specific forms of technology and for specific areas of work.

Various documents which the T sector publishes in this area, and other competencies or skills, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. I would like you to limit your interventions to one minute. Otherwise it

will not be possible to cover the list. I have Argentina, Ghana, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Germany, and then I close the list. Argentina, you have the floor.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. We also agree that the word "assist" is clear and this is the usual kind of work that the ITU carries out, when it collaborates with developing countries.

We support your suggestion that we include the theme of development of strategies for developing countries, and I think it would make it even clearer, this paragraph, so we wish to maintain the text.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Argentina. Ghana, you have the floor.

>> GHANA: Thank you, Chairman, for the opportunity. We would also like to go along with your suggestion, because the word assist is clear. I mean assist could be that development or even a business plan for developing country in terms of what kinds of labs is acquired, what kind would be required among countries and what are the specifications that have been included in the development of the labs. These are all assistance that the TSB or T sector could provide to the developing countries in the establishment of testing labs. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Ghana. Saudi Arabia. You have

the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. Briefly, we support the delegates who have already taken the floor, when we talk about assist here, this is the kind of terminology we usually use. I think we can keep the paragraph with the modifications that you have proposed, and also mention developing strategies. I think this wording would cover all of the concerns expressed by delegates. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. South Africa, please.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you very much, Chairperson. Good morning. Chairperson, unfortunately, I was experiencing a bit of a difficulty, so I did not get your suggestion, but I think I'm hoping that your suggestion is that the development of strategy is also accompanied by the development of the test labs, so we are not taking out that particular issue. Maybe you can clarify for me, because I see that the words that are in brackets, developing strategies, so I think if for us you are saying that you assist developing countries on developing strategies and also, and also in establishing, because I think that we are at different levels of development. So we would like to be covered

on all angles, wouldn't like the focus to be just on strategies, because there are countries who have already gone beyond developing strategies. I would like to be assisted in terms of now getting the development further.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Well, thank you very much, South Africa. I think that I can understand your point. So we can, instead of to establish, we can include in establishing, maybe this can be clearer in the text, that it's not again ITU to do this. ITU would assist to provide assistance in, to provide assistance to developing countries so that it can, they can establish the test through national strategies, that they will establish, that they will develop.

Germany, you have the floor.

>> Germany: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, very brief, we would agree to assist, and of course we also agree to your proposal, which is in square brackets. We would agree to assist, provided it's a mechanism of assistance to developing countries that are usually used in the union, are followed, and there is no parallel development sector opened in the TSB.

For example, as mentioned in other parts of the resolution, the original offices should be used, for

example, and of course everything which is assistant should be in very very close coordination with the BDT. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. I think that we have some of your thoughts in the rest of the resolution. The last speaker would be Egypt. Egypt, please be brief, so that we can go to a conclusion.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We also support your proposal for this notification. I think the word assist is clear here in this paragraph because the role of the ITU-T sector is used to assist the developing countries and all any Member State for such activities. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. I would, we have to come with a conclusion regarding this resolves, I was not expecting to take so long time discussing it. But the discussion was very fruitful.

I would ask you if after all the clarifications that we heard from many countries, if those who expressed concerns before are comfortable on the phrase that we have now, and after the, after what you heard, if you are comfortable on the word, on the words that we have now.

United States.



>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: We have spent quite a bit of time already speaking about the first half of this sentence, but I think we do have some concerns with the second half with regard to its specificity on the issues that these test labs will be used for. And when we look at, for example, Study Group 11 and specifications for test laboratories, it's much broader than simply IoT and its application. I think we would appreciate some clarification on why we are specifying IoT and applications only. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So okay, thank you very much. I think we had sufficient time to discuss it. I would ask you to join with your colleagues, the United States and the proposals of the regional text to join together and come after to provide me maybe a joint solution so that we can have a final text for this, we cannot spend all the time in just one resolves and we still have a lot of work in this resolution to fill.

So, please I would ask you to make an informal group and then come back to me with a solution maybe, maybe in the next minutes, maybe you can try to solve this before we have this, we have the conclusions of this session. We have the proposal to delete the former resolves, what was resolves 3.

Okay. No request for the floor on deleting this. The next one, just an inclusion of the developing and the word equipment and. Is there any proposal on 4? 5 and 6 is the new one. To study the possibility of generating additional revenue for ITU-T and so on. Is there any comments on that? Actually, I would like to remind you all that ITU-T is still doing studies in this regard, so this isn't any kind of new thing. I think that we can keep it.

But still regarding on 6, we thought that contributory, when units wouldn't be the right word here, and then we, I would like you to view if contributions, voluntary contributions would be better, better accepted, the voluntary contributory units that was before. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Chair. Regarding the number 6, we think this should be discussed as ITU-T financial plan, and this should be not included in this particular resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: The proposal would be to delete this paragraph, and to have this possibility of generating additional revenues in the ITU-T financial plan and not in this resolution. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. We of course

fully understand the intervention by the Distinguished Delegate of Japan. But in this particular case, and under this resolution, we are asking for interpretation services to be provided for the meeting, when it comes to the opening and closing meetings, and this within the standardization sector. In other words, we want to see more financial resource put at the service of the interpretation services.

This could be reflected in this resolution, and in the financial plan as well. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Cuba, you have the floor, and then I have to close the debate on this.

>> CUBA: Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Go ahead, Cuba.

>> CUBA: Yes, thank you. On this particular aspect that we are discussing, we think that it's quite correct to implement this as it stands, at this stage of the study, we are talking about additional sources, when we talk about the studying of the possibility. Afterwards, it could perhaps be left up to the Council. But we can indeed here talk about studying the possibility.

Now, in resolves, we see resolves, but we don't see who should be tasked with these different things.

We kind of infer it but we are not very explicit as to, I'm talking about the previous one, that began, assist. When we talk about assisting, who is going to assist, and who is going to study here. So in these two points, I think we need to be more specific. We have to spell out who has to do these things, who assists, who studies. I don't know if it's a wording problem, but just saying resolves to study, resolves to assist, is not enough. I think we need to be, make this more clear, make it clearer, as who is going to study, who is going to assist. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Cuba. It seems clear to me that who is going to study the possibility of generating new revenues is the Secretariat. It is the TSB. Maybe we can have this in other parts of the text, maybe instructs the TSB to do this. I want to remind you that TSB is already doing this. So either we put this in this resolution or in the financial plan, is something that it is still there, this is still being, has already been done by the TSB. Germany, Egypt. Thank you. Germany, you have the floor.

>>Germany: Chairman, thank you very much. I would agree to your conclusion that it's already done, and I don't see the necessity, I don't see it's necessary

to have it here. I would also remind the Distinguished Delegate of Saudi Arabia that the appropriation given to the TSB are dealt elsewhere in this resolution. This is an extra topic dealt elsewhere. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. Egypt and then I'll pass the floor to the Secretariat for further clarifications.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. While we consolidate with the opinions expressed by Saudi Arabia, it is very important for the T sector to study any possibilities for any potential new revenue sources, having it in the resolution highlights the importance of that, and we expect to see further mechanisms as a result of that particular possibility of that particular study, when we are implementing that particular resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt.

>> I wanted to make some clarifications with regard to the financial plan, which was mentioned just then. Now this plan is about the resources from the regular budget, and the voluntary contributions, additional resources which enable the ITU's management to implement certain activities, which are not covered by regular budget resources. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Allison.

So since this is studies being done and we can see that in terms of searching for new revenues, the ITU-T is already searching for new resources, I would like to ask you if you would be comfortable on having this issue dealt in other part because I think it seems that it's quite tenuous, and it's not so obvious that this part of the text would be closely linked to the BSG.

So I would ask you if you would be comfortable on deleting this paragraph 6, and now we are quite sure that this issue has been done in other resolutions and even in the structure of ITU-T. Russia, you have the floor.

>>RUSSIANFEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. We would suggest that paragraph 6 should be in this resolution. At the same time we have heard opinions saying that naturally the financial situation of the union and in particular our sector does have a influence on its work and on the development of standards.

Moreover, in the resolution of the plenipotentiary 123, it touches on aspects including proposals by Member States to study the possibility of having voluntary contributions to bridging the standardization gap.

Therefore, it is our opinion that we should reflect

the financial aspect in resolution 44 of our Assembly.  
Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Please let me try an exercise here. I'd like to move it to instructs TSB. By moving this to instructs TSB, I think we clarify the question made by Cuba about who would be doing this study, and I would like also to include bridging standardization gap activities, so that would be very focused on what are the activities that would be destined. Would you be comfortable with this phrase, instructs TSB as it is proposed by me now?

United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: I would like to note that under plenipot resolution 158, this issue is already covered and it's under the responsibility of the Secretary-General. While we understand the clarification being sought here, this seems to be duplicative of resolution 158. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States. I don't see any kind of harm if we duplicate this ITU-T activity for generating new revenues, since it's, it instructs the BDT -- the TSB Director. South Africa.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you very much, honorable Chairperson. We would like to thank you for your

suggestion, and I think it actually clarifies the difficulties as explained by Cuba and other delegation. We just also wanted to add that this issue for us, it's not peculiar.

I think that it actually does belong here because even if you look up at the number 5, the way we are talking about the budget and also getting some further resources, it is not abnormal to have this located within the ambit of the standardization sector. So we are quite happy with the addition that you have provided for us. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I'd like to close the discussion, and reach consensus. Can we leave the text as it is? Would it be, would there be any other concern, major concern regarding leaving the text as it is?

Thank you very much.

Can we move, resolves, the last resolves is regarding interpretation. It was also one of our main discussions yesterday. Please take a look on the text. Can we approve it? Bahrain, you have the floor.

>> Bahrain: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I do have a slight comment on this one. We have discussed yesterday the importance of having the interpretation during the



Study Group meetings. It was very key that people understand the discussion going on in the plenary and on the Working Parties. I would therefore like to propose a slight amendment to this text, if you would allow me, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you very much, Bahrain. Just to remind you all that there was overwhelming support yesterday all in favor for this interpretation. I'd like also to remind you that we will send, we will be sending this, all definition implications, we will send a report to Committee 4 and the Committee 4 will have to forward to Committee 2 as well on all the aspects related to financial implications of our approval resolutions, approved resolutions.

I would like to ask you if it's everything okay, if we can go forward with the text that we have in front of us. Bahrain, so if you have text to suggest, can you give us the suggestion that you have, so that we can include it. Bahrain, you have the floor.

>> Bahrain: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to propose that the text reads as follows. The interpretation shall be provided based on the request of participants at the whole of the plenary and Working Parties of Study Groups, and the whole meeting of TSAG.

That would be my suggestion. It would make it simpler and it would cover the plenary and the Working Parties of the Study Groups as necessary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. We recognize the importance of interpretation. But and since revenue is an item to study, so we have a concern that revenue, study may fail, so we have a concern that, in this resolution, in this text, may have too much impact on the finance of ITU. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan of the Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We do support the proposal presented by our Distinguished Delegates from Bahrain. We see that restricting the translation or interpretation for the closing plenary of the, closing plenary of the Working Party is not practical.

We see that the proposal from Distinguished Delegate from Bahrain is okay and we support it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I would like just to propose that instead of whole, we would say entire. I don't want -- I think it is better for us if we don't want, if we don't open the debate on the general issue, as we heard this yesterday. I think that we have to go

directly to the text and not base our comments on principles but now we have to because, it's the text. With these comments and proposals coming from Japan and Bahrain, can you take another look so we can move on and try to approve it?

Are there any further comments from the floor?

I see none. Thank you. It's approved. Can we go further? Yes, now we have further, further resolves that ITU regional offices, number 1, and actually this text was just moved. It was already there. We just moved it. Same with 2. Number 2, any comments? In 2 there was only one addition, which is on number 4, or IV4. Okay. I see no comments.

Now we are on invites the Council, invites the Council number 1. Any comment? As you can see, there are some minor modifications, just minor proposals coming from the, from regions, that we just included there, or we made a move, as you choose.

Now we are on instructs directors, instructs 2, instructs 3. Then you see deletions 4, 5 and 6. Can we move? Move ahead, thank you.

Minor modifications on 6. Oh, sorry, Vietnam, you have the floor.

>> Vietnam: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We see that

you propose to delete resolve number 5, and it is not moved to any other part of the resolution? Resolve number 5. To arrange for drafting a set of guidelines on the application of ITU recommendation at national level. I would like to ask --

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you.

>> Vietnam: Clarification on the deleting of this resolve. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Vietnam. Sorry for interrupting you, I pressed the button before and I can't see you from here unfortunately. Yes, we actually moved it and it's now on 7. It's on the screen now. The point regarding guidelines is on 7 now. So take a look, if it's actually, it covers the idea of having guidelines.

Okay. Thank you very much. So you see that many modifications we have on the original text are simply based on movements of the text and paragraphs, maintaining the core of the issues. We are done with 7. 9. This is just a move as well. This is 12:20, I need to ask the interpreters, if we can have ten more minutes so that we can move a little bit in this session.

>> Yes, Chairman, ten more minutes is fine.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. Sorry, can we have the screen? Okay, thank you. 14 we have already

discussed and agreed. 14. No comments on 14.

On instructs ITU-T, again we have a move, on instructs ITU-T Study Groups 2, just move. Okay. No modifications, till number 4. No problems on 4, I think.

Now we are coming, yes, to resolution 59. As we remember from our yesterday discussion, the proposal coming from CITELE is to suppress resolution 59 and include with minor amendment into the resolution 44.

There were some concerns in this regard, some prefer to keep resolution 59 as it is, and not moving to 44. And here as you can see, is in square brackets for your consideration again. United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to clarify the purpose of this modification in response to some of the comments that we heard yesterday.

And as you will hopefully note, this language is proposed to be taken directly from resolution 59 into resolution 44, and the purpose is we view the enhanced participation by telecommunications operators in developing countries to be a vital part of broader efforts to bridge the standardization gap. And so our goal here is to make a closer link between the bridging the standardization gap activities and the enhanced

participation by telecommunication operators here.

Our goal is simply to highlight that importance, and make it a core part of resolution 44 here. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Well, thank you, United States. From my readings on resolution 59, I see that not everything were actually included or embedded in 44. So I would like to open 59 and see how can we deal with it. We had a long discussion yesterday on suppressing 59. We could have many supports on that, so we have to close this debate very fastly.

It's not there? Sorry. So I'd like you to read carefully on the resolution 59. This resolves to encourage, resolves to develop mechanisms, and there is a 3, resolves to raise the awareness and so on.

I'd like to ask the floor for comments, if you are still after the explanations from the United States from CITELE, if you have the same concerns that you had before, by viewing after the, what is shown on screen on 59, and on 44. I will need your views on that, so that we can try to find a way to proceed to suppress it or to keep as it is, as you can see on the screen, with the three paragraphs. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Well, in principle,

we understand and we appreciate the comments raised by our dear colleague from the United States. It is of course understand that the participation of the Sector Members definitely helps in bridging the standardization gap.

However, we see that this is not the only thing. In particular, for example, the participation of SMEs linking innovations to the standardization process linking start-ups, the issues of IPRs and though it is not addressed in the ITU in that particular aspect, that particular resolution, however, there are many, many factors which help addressing the standardization gap and is related somehow to the participation of the particular type of members/industries, if I may say.

That is why we think in addition to also the reasons that you have mentioned that also not all the articles related to the 59, the main resolution, is reflected also in the proposed additions. We would prefer to keep resolution 59 intact as it is. It is focusing on the participation of the Sector Members. This is good.

Otherwise, we might risk opening up different aspects of the participation of other type of members, perhaps the possibility also to encourage new type of members to participate in our work, if we are really looking at effective and efficient means to bridge the

standardization gap. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much, Egypt. So I'll give the floor now to Cote d'Ivoire, Ivory Coast, please, you have the floor.

>> Cote d'Ivoire: Thank you, Chairman. We would like to associate ourselves with the comments made by Tunisia, I do beg your pardon, by Egypt with regard to this item. We are in favor of keeping the resolution 59. So we support the comments which were made in this regard. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you very much. After listening to all the contributions, I would like to keep resolution 59, and delete the inclusions of 59 modified into resolution 44. I think this is the best way to proceed now. I'd like to seek comments, if everyone would be comfortable on that, I would like to proceed this way. And keep 59 as it is. And then we go ahead.

Okay, thank you.

Next, 5, share information in utilizing ITU-T recommendations. Any comments from the floor? Okay.

Then we have the annex. We don't have time to deal with it unfortunately. I would like very much to discuss the annex with you, but as we don't have time, or if we could have at least five minutes, if it's okay for



you, I can stay for ten minutes and I'm sure we can deal with the annex in the next ten minutes, and also if the interpreters could give me ten minutes, I'm sure we will be done with it.

>> Yes, we can, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Good. Thank you very much.

Let's go to the annex, please. As you can see, the annex, there are just minor changes. I'd like you to see it, and besides on programme 2, yes, so as you can see, we have some of the core issues that we discussed before and even we discussed in the resolves, that are included in the programme, in the annex.

So this is one of it regarding the strategies and establishing national laboratories, and since we decided on that before, we would have just two to copy the decision on programme 2. Yes.

What is in bracket, in brackets, is my suggestion for you to consider, and what is right above is the, what is right below, is what you, we mentioned before, the conclusions that we had in our previous discussion. I think it will be better for us to keep the second, would be a new paragraph for that, but keeping the ideas that we discussed before. Are you okay with that? Can we go ahead? Okay, thank you.

Next, programme 3, human resources. As you can see there are many editorial modifications and suggestions only.

This core issue was debated yesterday, regarding guidance and support for undergraduate and postgraduate courses. We discussed and we had no comments yesterday. I think we can go forward.

The last programme is the last just a minor modification on deleting. Okay? Well, that's it. Thank you very much. As you can see, we still have some changes on the considering parts of the text, and as I told you, it's a huge text and five pages of considerings.

I'd like to move section by section again. Considerings, is there any comments on considering parts of text, on page 1? I see none. Recognizing, recognizing also. I think it's faster when we resolve the resolves, the operative part, so considerings, and actually, we couldn't see many differences on the different regions in terms of considerings and notings, on different notings that all regions proposed.

Taking into account, taking into account is moved, we are on page 4, yes. Okay. Thank you.

And the age is where you see a deletion is actually a move, it is in another place. Recalling. The last

recalling addition is the relevant conclusions of the Chair says. Okay. Is there any comment from the floor regarding any part of this considerations, from page 1 to 5?

I see none. Okay. Thank you. So I think the document is approved. Thank you very much for your cooperation in this regard.

So I would like that we could cover the other resolution, but it will not be possible to do this today. We have to move forward quick, because you know unfortunately, we don't have time in 4B to further discussions.

And, well, okay, so just summarizing, we had conclusions on the IAP 7, it was a good conclusion. I thank Argentina and CITEL members for its cooperation in this regard. We had dealt with the 59, and also thank CITEL for your cooperation on the decision that we took here. Thank you very much for that.

We also dealt with 44, and this is the way I would like to proceed regarding the resolution 54 in our next meeting which will be tomorrow. We will have principles debated, and then we will provide you with a working document, and then I'll bring the working document for us to discuss in the plenary, in our session. Okay?

Well, our next meeting will be on Friday, will be tomorrow, at 2:30 from 2:30 to 3:45. Thank you very much. Have a good lunch. See you tomorrow.

(applause).

(session adjourned at 12:37)

Services Provided By:

Caption First, Inc.

P.O. Box 3066

Monument, CO 80132

800-825-5234

[www.captionfirst.com](http://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.

\*\*\*