Raw file.
October 27, 2016.
1430.
ITU.
World Telecommunication Standardization Assembly.
Hammamet, Tunisia.
Hannibal room.

     (standing by).

     >> CHAIR: Let's start, because we have a lot of

items to be dealt with, and limited time.

     Already announce you that if you are not good boy

we will not have a coffee break. So you know since the

beginning. If you are a good boy or girl, I can give

you coffee break. So depends on you really.

     Now, we start with showing our agenda for today,

administrative 16. Also you see on the screen. There

is quite a lot of matter to go. Once we have seen this

agenda we can see document 23 with a short reporting on the first session. So if you can show TD 23, they see -- Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. Chair, I take the floor just to remind one and all that the report on resolution 50, and the report on confidentiality were supposed to come back to this group. So I would like to see that included on the agenda. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: We have to receive a formal communication. Have we received the formal communication that? Not for the time being. Because this is a result of Committee 4, am I correct? Or where is coming from?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Well, Chair, it's based on the distribution of the documents in the first plenary. We observed that there were documents concerning the updating of resolution 50. There were also documents dealing with confidentiality. We don't see this reflected in the agenda that's just been distributed.

We would like to see these there. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I should wear a sign to our Working Party or not to come forward -- 50 and ... (pause).

50 is for tomorrow, because today we have already sufficient food. (chuckles).

Sorry, so no, I was thinking you were referring

to the discussion come for this morning. Okay, 50 is there, last but one item in tomorrow agenda.

>> Saudi Arabia: Thank you. And what about the new resolution, sir? Trust, and privacy.

>> CHAIR: Also for tomorrow, because the programme for today is sufficient heavy. So these remain for tomorrow. You have seen all the proposal agenda in TD, what was it, 13 or -- 16 or 6? For all the agenda. 13. Gen 13, that is the result of the agenda for all the meetings. If you see next week there is no discussion, because I think that there will be report from possible group.

So let's go now to approving, over looking at the report, brief report of the first meeting. As I say, this is TD 23. So you see on the screen, and you have in your computers. So we can go quickly, one, two, resolution 20 we report the discussion, we say that the Russia has presented at the same time their contribution 47, because it was related. We agreed that to have informal discussion report back at our meeting. We will ask the report thereby. After discussion, 40 was proposed to include on charging user of the Internet limited the resources on numbering, addressing, to resolve numbering address and after discussion it was

agreed to conduct again an informal meeting, and we will have a report in short time.

Resolution 29, we see the request, the clarification of the over the top, and other according to provision Internet to instruct ITU-T Study Group 7 to do, work should be performed.

So any observation, replacement as requested by Russia of operating, operator agency, any request for clarification or you agree with this short report? It seems you agree. So we can proceed, and maybe it's the occasion to ask informal consultation, maybe I ask someone to refer us where we stand.

>> Thank you, Chair, good afternoon.

We started off with an informal group discussion. It was very informal. Because of the overlap of interested parties, we ran the four resolutions in the same session.

So, briefly, Chair, on resolution 20, we have not had any opportunity to discuss, because of the time taken on the subsequent resolutions. On resolution 29, we have made some progress, certainly around the concept of origin identification information and colleagues there were very, very flexible in their approach.

We have also in resolution 29 looked at some of

the text around the concept of over the top, with respect to only telephone numbers. I know it's on your agenda for later this afternoon. So I must emphasize that what we were talking about was in relation only to Study Group 2, and what it had to do in the future.

With regards to res 40, we have, I think, success. We have looked at the proposal from Europe, and with input from colleagues from Arab States, Africa, and U.S. and CITEL, have got a way forward, and we can share that with you more formally at a later stage.

With regards to res 65, and the paragraph that contains some questions, because of its relationship to the concept of origin identification, we address the concept of origin identification first before we got into the, or tried to get into the substance of that paragraph proposed by Africa.

We have, I believe, sorted the concept of origin identification information, but we have not got into the substance of that text of that paragraph, as identified in your meeting yesterday.

Thank you, Chair. Happy to take questions.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any question? If not, since we start to feel, may I ask you to carry on and during this time an ad hoc meeting because you have advanced

sufficiently to have a ad hoc meeting. And for the time being with this recommendation, but after, we will be making a recommendation and maybe you can have a meeting already after the closing of this meeting if you are still alive.

Phil.

>> Thank you, Chair. If I am still alive at the end of your meeting, coffee notwithstanding, I'm happy to do the, happy to do the ad hoc, and indeed, I would suggest given the number of numbering resolutions that you have, that we would schedule a first meeting for this evening. And I would suggest 90 minutes after the close of your session, to enable colleagues to get some food, for what will be a lengthy but interesting debate on resolutions. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Don't worry, you have also the weekend. You have not to finish ...

(laughter).

.Today. So now many thanks for the time being for the work that you will carry out and for the result of the informal consultation I'm sure that is the best efficient way to do before creating the formal group.

It is my intention to do similar things for today resolution, I have to say, because I think it's better

to smooth the major things and after have a meeting eventually on the related resolution. Let's go to the agenda now. We start with resolution 61. As usual, very brief presentation and major request for clarification enough to go on and see what we can solve immediately.

First, African proposal for contribution 42. Someone from Africa region. Cameroon, please.

>> CAMEROON: Thank you, Chair. The African Group proposes modifications for the resolution 61, in order to strengthen the role of ITU in the fight against misappropriation and misuse of numbering resources, which is of course a way of perpetrating fraud, because of the difficulties that developing countries have, and who are the primary victims of this kind of illicit activity, and who have the very low capacity to deal with this kind of situation, and hence need important and sizable support from ITU to combat these practices.

The scenario that we propose here in an attachment works along these lines, as you can see. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Next one, Europe, contribution 45. Someone from Europe. United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Europe proposes in contribution 45 addendum 10, some amendments to resolution 61, that seeks to put in place some guidance

as to activities and actions that could be taken in the identification of numbering misuse. In addition, Chair, we identify some slight editorial changes within the main body of the text.

A final point to note in our presentation of this document is a further clarification of actions and activities that may be received and taken when complaints about numbering misuse are received on, where the origin of the misuse is deemed to occur, which we thought was missing from this original text.

That in essence are the presentation of the issues from Europe. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom. Next one is from CITEL, to make a proposal, document 46. Someone from -- Canada.

>> CANADA: Yes, thank you, Chair. Good afternoon, everyone.

Document 46 addendum 17 is on the behalf of the Member States of the inter-American telecommunication commission, CITEL. CITEL supports the continued studies related to misuse of international E164 numbering resources, and we also recognize the need for sharing of information to collaborate to counter misuse. This is a very important point, is the ability to share

information.

However, we also recognize it's important for this resolution to remain neutral, and not to get into aspects that would be considered national in scope, including terms such as fraud or fraudulent activities, can often relate to domestic law and in some countries may create barriers for information sharing. So that is something we are sensitive to, and to improve the resolution, we have proposed a revised text to address this issue, as well as minor editorials to help clarify the text.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Next one, and I think is the RCC 47. Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. We would like to introduce the proposal with regard to amendments being made to resolution, the resolution. First of all, we present clarifications on work done, particularly resolutions adopted by the plenipotentiary conference on this issue.

Our proposal is also aimed at reducing the risk of fraud using numbering resources, in particular our proposal contains a proposal to Study Groups, instructing them to work on improving procedures on the use of numbering resources and in settling disputes.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Now I open the floor for requests for clarification, possibility of convergence, anything like that. Is there any requests for clarification? Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Thank you very much. We have one question here, and that is something that is linked to use of terminology, certain terminology. But haven't we already adopted this terminology in the original document? And what is the true purpose of all of these proposals?

>> CHAIR: I think the true purpose is according to the resolution countering and combating misuse of international numbering results, I think that is the purpose of the resolution. The proposals are according to that.

Now, there are someone, maybe we can -- the African proposal, where request selected blocking or withholding of interconnection payments, I don't know if this concept can be agreed by the meeting. United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

I did have a question of clarification on the African proposal for res 61. Addendum 28 to document 42, there is a concept expressed in the recognizing of significant international market power. I was just wondering if

there could be some explanation as to what is meant by that term, and then I'm happy to answer your question at a later stage. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Someone from Africa can respond to the request to the United Kingdom? Significant market power. United Kingdom.

>> Sorry, Chair, I perhaps wasn't clear, the phrase that is in the document is significant international market power.

>> CHAIR: Significant international market power. Someone from Africa? I see Jordan is, wants to respond on that?

>> JORDAN: No, Mr. Chairman. I did make my intervention in Arabic. It seems that the interpretation was not accurate. This is why you misunderstood my interpretation. If you allow me, I can repeat it in English. Or if you wish to continue with question of Mr. Fair, it is up to you, Chairman, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Maybe it went through, I refer what the interpreter said that it is the terminology used for changing this resolution is not clear to you. Is that the sense of your intervention?

>> Jordan: My question was the words that African

proposal was referring in the existing resolution, which is the word fraud, and fraudulent, was already used in the previous text that was approved in the previous WTSA.

The new text that they are using to replace the word, the misappropriation, are already used in different text. So what is exactly the issue of requesting to make these changes? This was my question. I did not refer to why we submit a resolution, a contribution on the title of the resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, it is more clear to me now at least. Any response from, of these two requests? Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair. No, as mentioned in the contribution, in going over the language in the resolution 61, the term fraud has certain connotations within domestic law as we mentioned before. That is something perhaps we can work on the wording to improve the wording, such that we have got fraudulent misappropriation and misuse, we have got other aspects that maybe we can find consensus text on. But at this time we would prefer to omit the direct references to fraud due to the rationale we provided earlier. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada.

Any other question, request for clarification? I
see, so I asked if there were support or agreement to
include the selected blocking or the withholding of
interconnection payments as requested by African
contribution. As any opposition to this request?
United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. Good
afternoon, friends. We would have some concerns with
the provision regarding the blocking of payments. We
believe that today, most of those arrangements are the
subject of commercial agreements, and therefore, we would
question the need for such a provision. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chairman. Just to agree
with our colleague from the U.S. in his intervention,
for very much the same set of reasons, certainly for
Australia these are commercial matters, and not a matter
for the national regulator. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia. Senegal.

>> SENEGAL: Yes, thank you, Chair. Well, I think
that these words were placed here because here we are
trying to work beyond commercial agreements. We are
talking about fraudulent use, trafficking. This is
indeed a way to protect ourselves today until we can

find a better solution. So here we are indeed going beyond commercial considerations. We really need to find a solution to this situation, which has a significant negative impact, especially on developing countries.

>> CHAIR: Jordan, you have other points?

>> JORDAN: Yes, thank you, Chair. We fully agree with what was said by Africa. We believe that even if we have to take commercial considerations into account, commercial enterprises have to apply the law of the country in question, and of the country -- if the country believes that it needs recommendations to help deal with this situation, well, we will have further laws and regulations to deal with this problem.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your brief intervention. United Kingdom, and after I close this point because if there is no agreement, I will leave to informal consultation. United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. As the European coordinator for addendum 10, we have indeed proposed the withholding of interconnection payments within our proposal.

However, it is not a activity that is proposed lightly, and it is recognized in our contribution that such an activity is the responsibility of the Member

State to consider doing. And indeed, we recognize that such an activity should be done on a case by case basis as opposed to a very generalized approach to the issue.

So there is text within our contribution to this item. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Since there are difference of opinion, I will leave to informal consultation.

Now the reason the RCC proposal, also they improve the procedure for resolving dispute relating to the use of number resource and to invite the Director of TSB who is normally the one dealing with, but what is strange to me is also in collaboration with director of government bureau to get information, the collect information and what they do afterwards, maybe Russia can clarify to poor Chairman who do not understand the involvement of the government Bureau.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, is this a question from the Chair? Very well then, thank you. Because you do ask us questions quite frequently. Yes, we are aware that the D sector also works on some areas linked to this such as reducing risk, linked with misuse of numbering resources.

We also know that developing countries do participate actively in this work, in the D sector. We

think this is useful.

But if the room doesn't support this proposal, we won't insist upon it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, also that will be part of the informal consultation. Are other item in this resolution that need the clarification before I ask to go in the informal consultation? It seems not, so we can move to the next resolution, is resolution 60. 60. So we have African contribution 42, please, Africa. 42. Someone from Africa region? It seems not. In this case we move to Arab region, because 43, and Africa will come back once they have decided who will present. Arab region. 43. Saudi Arabia, please. Thanks.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. I'm very pleased in the name of the Arab group to present to you the addition 23 to document 43, concerning updating the resolution number 60. Mr. Chairman, very briefly, this document reviews the various activities that were carried out in the standardization sector since the last Assembly, and activities have been updated. We tried also to update the draft resolution. In addition to activities related to Study Group 20, this resolution is asking from Study Group 20 to continue its studies, in order to recognize the identity for Internet of Things, and also we have

to inform the main Study Group of standardization sector.

We also have to put in place criteria in order to solve the problems of identification of Internet of Things, in order to face the various challenges to organise the interoperability for similar activities. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: In the time being, someone from Africa region want to speak on their contribution 42? It seems not for time being. So we go to Europe, and contribution 45. No success neither. Someone from Europe for contribution 45. United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

Addendum 9 to contribution 45 is the European proposals to amend resolution 60, noting that since WTSA 2012 in Dubai, there have been significant changes, and evolution in technology.

The amendments made to resolution 60 reflect the leadership role that Study Group 2 has in working on naming, numbering, addressing and identifiers, but also recognizes in making these amendments the text of the agreement made at TSAG in the establishment of Study Group 20, and the need for Study Group 2 to work alongside Study Group 2 to ensure that Study Group 2 meets the requirements made by Study Group 20.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Ask if Africa region, if not it means they didn't want to present in, but you are ready there, your text, so it is clear. So there are some difference proposal, mainly also the role of ITU-T Study Group 20, and ITU-T Study Group 2. And there is also the proposal on digital object and system, so are there any requests at this time for clarification of point that can be agreed? Apart this one, I see the conflict between 20 and 2. Any requests for the floor?

Clarification, seems that everything is crystal clear, good. So, what we are going to end it up so there are two different positions. Can I ask in this case the two proponents to get together to find, to try to find a compromise? Because really it's a question between the two Study Groups. I think both have a role, to me, my poor knowledge (chuckles).

But, can I ask that to have a informal consultation on that? It seems so. After, if it is not sufficient, we have some formal ad hoc group meeting.

Okay, with that, there are no further requests for the floor. I can move to next resolution, with the new draft resolution that was already, established global ITU database of national telephone numbering plans. I

think that was ... (pause).

As already presented yesterday, but I don't know if you want to have extra information, or if you want, someone wants to have a question, please, this is the moment. No asking permission, no further requests. So also that is following in the informal consultation and ultimately will go all in the package. As I say, my preference is to avoid duplication of text, if possible, to have a unique text calling all the point. Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm sorry to bring you back a little bit to the agenda. We have decided to present the African contribution, since no one from Africa seems to present it. So I'll take the opportunity if you don't mind to present it very quickly.

>> CHAIR: Please go ahead. You are also in Africa. So go ahead, Egypt. Egypt: Thank you so much. With regard to that particular resolution we have made some particular modifications, with respect to the inclusion of specific technologies, specific related to the Internet of Things to the IoT. We have added for example a couple of sections in the first page, bearing in mind a section referring to the IoT and the difference between object identifier and object address. A few articles

related to the recognizing of the DOA, digital object architecture, key features which includes aspects like security and privacy of data, some other features also in particular related to its suitability to the open architecture interoperability of heterogeneous systems. Also section, an additional item related to the existing work, ongoing work related to Study Group 20, in that particular dimension.

We have also mentioned under the recognizing further that the handoff system is a component of the DOA which has many benefits, including facilitating the interoperability of heterogeneous systems. We have added a resolves to instruct Study Group 20 section, to continue its activities on IoT identification and to lead ITU-T efforts in this particular subject, to develop the necessary recommendations regarding IoT identifiers and identification schemes, and to study ways and means to overcome the challenges of interoperability between and among heterogeneous identification schemes taking into account the hand off system in that particular context.

This is basically the essence of the core elements of that particular contributions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, since you are presenting, if there are any questions, please go ahead. If not, we come back to the, where we were, so ... we say that we present, we try to combine, and now we go to the next one. Digital activity in ITU-T on international mobile telecommunication, is from APT 44. Someone from APT, China.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Chair. On behalf of the APT I'd like to introduce this document. This is a new proposal from APT. We propose a new resolution to enhancing the standardization work under ITU-T and the international mobile telecommunication. As we know, in 2015 in May ITU-T established a focus group which is 2020 to progress the work of international standardization work of the 5G network. It is not really a part of the 5G network, standardization work. We are going to do something, standardization work to avoid duplicate work and overlap with other switch IPP. ITU-T focus group 2020 finished gap analysis at end of last year. We initiate 5G research on the nonradio side and network technologies in 2016 including the network architecture, network softwarization and network slicing and also other issues, and also network capability open is fixed mobile convergence, everything,

including for the focus group.

In addition, focus group also studied to cooperate with some open source activities on the prototype, development and standardization, this is new for ITU-T, I think.

The proposal is that APT would like to propose to adopt a new resolution, to enhance the standardization activities in ITU-T and IMT especially with the IMT 2020 in the next study period.

The target is that we are going to implement the standardization strategy and the research work on IMT 2020 in ITU-T and the TSAG and the related Study Groups in the next study period. To enhance the intercollaboration work between Study Groups such as Study Group 13, 15, 11 and so on, and to provide the total standard solutions to the IMT system and applications, to enhance the intercollaboration with other, between ITU-T and ITU-R, ITU-D and other SDOs to avoid the duplication and ensure full alignment and harmonization of the work programme, for both ITU-T, 3GPP T and other SDOs. I jump to the instruct part.

We are going to instruct the ITU-T Study Groups for example for the Study Group 13, we are going to maintain the IMT standardization activities in ITU-T and to

promote studies on the network requirements and architecture for 5G, network softwarization, to promote study and IMT front hall, back haul issue of transfer for 5G. For 17 to handle network applications is critical issue for 5G.

That's the proposal from APT. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any requests for clarification, point of enhancing this draft resolution. If I understand we by adopting eventually this resolution, we will very likely delete the corresponding resolution existing 38. The results of resolution 57, but this is more general for cooperation between the ITU-T and ITU-R. So maybe we can maintain 57. In the case we adopt this resolution.

The only thing I see that also you request the establishment of the GC by Study Group 13, I think that is in the freedom of Study Group to decide when is better to establish a GCA and normally is not coming from the Assembly. But the Assembly has the power to do whatever they want.

So, any question, request for clarification? Can we adopt in principle this resolution? Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question is for regarding the resolve to instruct TSAG upon number

3 to facilitate collaboration with other International Standards Organisations on open source projects.

I believe this action has been undertaken currently by TSAG group already. I don't think there is a need to introduce this into this resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: In fact, the open source is not directly linked with this resolution, I'm inclined to agree. TSAG has two meeting to discuss the problem and still is under discussion. That is my recollection.

Someone from China can respond to this specific request? Or can you delete the reference? China.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Chair. I understand the issue has been discussed in TSAG meeting. Why we mention the open source activity, I meant IMT 2020 standardization work. That is because due to, we discussed and we started at last two years and especially at 2016, we use some open source activity to development, to implement our standardization work. It proved very successful way to produce the work of the IMT 20 over 5G so which emphasize this activity for the open source activities is very important, it is quite useful for IMT 2020.

I don't think it is duplicate with TSAG or something. We want to enhance, we need to think about how to use the open source activities, open source software, open

source tools to progress our IMT 2020 of 5G works. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to congratulate the APT group for this work, and communicate that we support this contribution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Chair. We believe it would be premature to adopt a new resolution on this topic. The focus group on IMT 2020 will be completing its work shortly, and delivering its results to Study Group 13, its parent group. Therefore, we should await the results of that focus group and allow Study Group 13 the opportunity to decide what work needs to be done, and how best to proceed. We would also note that if this Assembly does decide to adopt a new resolution, it would be more appropriate to include all generations of technology from IMT 2000, so not just IMT 2020.

We do have to remember that we should be focusing on the nonradio aspects of this technology, as the radio aspects are covered in ITU-R. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, that is the reason why I've requested the presence of the ITU-R staff. But I do not see him,

because that was also my worry. There are a lot of work going in ITU-R. I want to avoid as far as possible duplication of effort.

I have now Jordan and Switzerland.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chairman. We also in Jordan, we support this type of resolution. We think that adopting resolution in WTSA will help us. It will guide the standardization activities about this topic. We support this contribution, and we thank APT for presenting this contribution to the Assembly. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Switzerland.

>> SWITZERLAND: Thank you very much. I just would like to endorse from Study Group Chairman, not Switzerland, talking as Study Group Chairman, and I think it's a very clear mandate that for the focus group, we know for the work continue to Study Group 13, that we focus on the wireline part and nonradio parts. I guess this is important to clarify in such resolution in order to avoid here any confusion with other sectors.

>> CHAIR: Now I'm pleased that the ITU-R counterpart is coming, just in the right time. And in fact, that is also my worry, let's say, to avoid duplication of efforts. In any case, this resolution prior adoption

needs some refine.ment. Drafting refine., there is a

question of open source that has been discussed at large,

the TSAG, agreement was not reached. I want neither to

put something that has not agreed at the TSAG level putting

on the other back door let's say. And there is a question

of avoiding overlapping with ITU-R strategies, and now

that we have the counsel of ITU-R, he will assist us

also on that.

I propose to stop the discussion, that needs some

further drafting, and see if we can come to an agreed

text of this resolution.

Now we go to other resolution, dealing always with

ITU-R, so I'm pleased that Colin is there, draft new

resolution interconnection 4G, 5G and 2020 networks,

here we speak about networks. So someone from RCC want

to introduce this contribution?

Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman.

Of course, we would like to introduce our contribution.

Our proposal is a new resolution, a draft new resolution

on the interconnection of 4G, 5G networks and beyond.

It is beyond the proposals which were previously

introduced from the APT. We focused our proposal on

studying the network part and our proposal, we noted

the importance of this work which has already been done. We propose further areas for study in particular with in caption with other standards development organisations, SDOs.

In our proposal, we propose to begin work on recommendations connected to network architecture, the principles of roaming, issues of numbering, charging and security mechanisms, and also checking on interoperability and interconnection.

It is proposed that the Director of the TSB continues with the necessary research activities, with the involvement of a large number of operators, and entities, and addressing problems and setting priorities in their work, to make a contribution to the expert group on the international telecommunication regulations, and also in our proposal there is an instruction to the Study Groups, in particular Study Group 11, and Study Group 2.

Thank you very much, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Any request for clarification, question? Germany.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, a clarification on instructs the Study Groups number 3, a number of topics should be covered among others, tariff

policy and regulatory issues. So it's not that, who is going to do this, but we have some concerns with regard to the tariffs and policy and regulatory issues being among those issues to be studied. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all I'd like to thank RCC for this contribution, but we have some questions for clarification, regarding resolves 2, that calls that some ITU-R's update should be necessary. We would like to know why is this necessary to put the resolve here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Portugal.

>> Portugal: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also would like to support the intervention of my previous, made by previous speaker concerning the introduction and the reference to the ITU-R's, we don't understand exactly why this reference is made. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Canada is concerned instructing the Director of the TSB to welcome item number 2 on ITU-R issues, I think that should be outside the scope of this particular resolution, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the clear message to the authors. There are also other points, because there are some aspects like roaming principles and I think this point maybe fall within ITU-R, mandate term reference. May I ask this occasion to the counselor of ITU-R to intervene on the resolution dealing with really the 5G and so on, has he any comments to make at this stage? Please, Colin.

>> Thank you, no, I have no particular concerns from the ITU-R perspective about the RCC proposal on the 5G resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you, at least that's reassure me, and now we can -- I see there are really difference of opinion, and needs some redrafting to get through as a resolution.

Can I ask again the informal consultation to try to find a solution, and if not, we come to some formal method.

With that, yes -- let's go to resolution, next resolution, resolution 49 on ENUM, we have two contribution, African, Arab state. We start with Africa, 42. Someone from Africa present. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. What we have added in this resolution related to ENUM is in fact that we

took into consideration the role carried out by the WIPO,

in order to settle disputes concerning names of domains,

domain names. And we have also to take into account of

the role of UNESCO in the field of cultural

diversification and linguistic diversification, and the

protection of languages and cultures. The ITU works and

cooperates with the WIPO and with UNESCO. We thought

about asking from the Director of TSB to look into the

matter in order to look at domain names 164, and also

in order to include the domain names in EANGOC, so that

administrative measurements should be included, and also

there is reference to take into accounts of EU 164. Thank

you.

>> CHAIR: Contribution from Arab state 43. Someone

from Arab state will present. Egypt again.

>> EGYPT: The same for Arab and Africa.

>> CHAIR: Algeria.

>> ALGERIA: Good afternoon, Chair. I have the honor

and pleasure of submitting a joint Arab States proposal

here. This is 42.3, proposed amendment to resolution

49 on ENUM. The changes made here don't really change

the objectives of resolution 49, as adopted in 2012.

But we just tried to impart a new impetus to this,

reflecting the enthusiasm that a number of countries

since 2000, we stress the role played by WIPO, and as far as the domain names are concerned here, the role applied by UNESCO for the promotion of diversity and cultural identity, and the fact that ITU also works very closely with these two international agencies of the U.N., and that this is a very important endeavor in the field of convergence, as we have seen over the past years. We feel that it's high time to bring all of this to a conclusion with very pertinent reflections. We ask Director of TSB to pursue studies already begun, and this is what we see in the document.

>> CHAIR: Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair. In reviewing the African counterproposal and the proposal from the Arab group, we have some questions for clarification and potentially some concerns as well.

ENUM within Study Group 2 has been, is simply a mapping technology. It is dispute resolution and other aspects are beyond the scope of this resolution, and this technology is simply a mapping technology from a domain name to a telephone number.

We have interim procedures that are working well. Hence, I don't really see the need to go through some of these updates. I feel the potential updates may

distract from the utility of this resolution.

Furthermore, we believe that work can always be progressed based on contributions, and do not feel the need for studies without the support of member contribution. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. In fact, all the sector activities contribution, if contribution arrive, the study progress, if contribution do not arrive, we can make a under resolution nothing will happen, because these contributions even, anyway, do you see the point raised by the delegate of Canada, so is he prepared to stay with the present text of resolution 49? Is any -- United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. We have questions that are comparable to those that our Canadian colleague has tabled. It would be extremely helpful for us to understand the linkage between the telephone numbering mapping function and WIPO's role and UNESCO's role.

If the drafters could shed more light on that, we would certainly appreciate it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Can someone from the author respond to this question? Algeria.

>> ALGERIA: Yes, thank you very much for the

questions. Concerning the second question, for interim procedures, well, when we cite this, it's just in order to come up with a standard that would be made permanent here. This recommendation would be pertinent for the system. Concerning the references that we added, following the work carried out and already accomplished in this field by ITU and other international organisations, to protect, respect of intellectual property rights when drawing up the ENUM project concerning UNESCO, let me just remind you that we are placing ourselves under the principle of the universality of the Internet. Everywhere for everyone, in particular for members of linguistic minorities, this being a tool that would allow us to expand the Internet.

>> CHAIR: This explanation satisfy the request for clarification from Canada and United States?

>> CANADA: As I was saying before telephone number mapping is a direct one-to-one mapping, renaming a telephone number. I still don't quite see the relevance here. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: I was hoping we got a solution, but it seems that we need also for that still further informal consultation to clarify the matter. If agreement is not reached, I stay with my old habits existing text prevail.

Okay. So we pass to the next one, and that is resolution on international mobile roaming, inter-American proposal 46. Someone from inter-American. I see the request, sorry, Jordan and Brazil want to speak on this? Or on the previous one? Jordan, please go ahead.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chair. Let me respond to the preceding question. This is a proposal made by two regional groups, and proposed by two states. Now despite this you have taken a decision regarding this. Are we not going to adopt this decision or shall we just continue to maintain this question under study?

>> CHAIR: Consultation, that is my decision, are you challenging this decision?

>> I'm sorry, I'm sorry, I must not have been listening. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I was afraid of that. Thank you. Brazil, please.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, everyone. I'd like to present this contribution, proposal for new resolution on the implementation of recommendation ITU-T I.D. 98 recognizing the importance of ongoing work and efforts of lowering international by roaming rates by taking regulatory measures when

appliable.

The proposal, this proposal recognizes considering the stages of the global economy, essentially regarding the international telecommunication market, it's necessary as long as possible the provision of approaches to the reduction of excessive revenue rates highlighting the need to encourage competition in the roaming market, educate consumers and consider appropriate regulatory actions such as the introduction of caps on roaming rates.

This new resolution, it's a very simple one. In fact, it's in the resolves part, in the resolves parts we can see that we are proposing that ITU-T Study Group 3 must continue to study the economic effects of international roaming rates and instruct TSB and in close cooperation with BDT to organise initiatives to raise awareness on the consumers' benefits of lowering international mobile roaming rates. And number 2, to study and propose comparative approaches to foster the implementation of ITU-T recommendation D98 and D97 and to lower the international mobile roaming rates among the Member States, by promoting capacity-building programmes, workshops and guidelines for international cooperation agreements.

It is quite simple proposal for resolution, and

thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the clear presentation. Any question, requests for clarification? Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, this intervention is made not the status of Japanese delegation, but status of Study Group 3 Chairman.

We have come up with two recommendations on international mobile roaming, and so we are going to study further this issue in the next study period.

I would like to ask Brazilian delegation, what is the intent exact of this resolution? Because we have already started the study and we are committed to continue it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Chairman of Study Group 3 for this clarification. The results of the text request to TSB to entertain something, really the request should be to TSB Director, that is editorial. But it is important, because TSB is only the Director.

Okay? And after Brazil, please.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chairman. Thank you, Japan, for the intervention. Congratulate for the job that has been done in Study Group 3. In fact, this matter is in discussion in Study Group 3 and our intention of this resolution is first, one, recognize importance of the

roaming issue and emphasize Study Group 3 mission and study this matter. In fact, the roaming issue is a very global issue, being discussed in all regions, and we think that this resolution could create, and could establish this matter as an important one in our global moment, and we think that this proposal can create visibility in this work that's been done in special because we still have some things to be studied, for example, M2M roaming, permanent roaming and other issues related that is of course is in the study of Study Group 3 but if we could emphasize it in the WTSA level, we think that it would be very useful. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Spain and Jordan to make a change.

>> SPAIN: Thank you, Chair. Chair, I would like to ask a question for clarification here. The second paragraph of the introduction, reference is made to high, wholesale international cost in relation to retail prices.

Now, is the idea here to include this idea specifically, or is this just a mistake? Because high wholesale prices don't just have to do with the wholesale levels, but they are also very high retail costs as well. Both are affected.

>> CHAIR: Respond immediately or listen for Jordan

question. Jordan question. Please, Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chair. I'd like to ask a
question. If we have further questions or other points
that we need to look at in this resolution, I think it
would be preferable not to use general terminology, as
the Brazilian delegate has said. There are questions
here linked to roaming, machine to machine, and so on.
I know that SG 3 has already studied questions on pricing
as well.

So I think that there are other points, there are
other questions and more specifically they need to be
addressed here.

>> CHAIR: Brazil, can you respond to these two
questions? In any case at the end, if there are difference
of opinion, I'll leave to informal consultation. Please,
Brazil, go ahead.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chairman. Responding to the
first question, in fact, this second paragraph it is
some kind of evaluation that we put here in the
introduction, it's not very linked with the resolution
we see, and of course there are many economic evaluations
that could be analyzed when we make in the statement,
of course we can discuss it. But I think it cannot create
any problem, in the proposal of the resolution.

Responding to colleague from Jordan, I think the importance of this matter in the WTSA level basically as I said previously is that roaming is still an issue, especially the implementation of D97 that was really written out, prove to be interesting to check and evaluated in the next study period. We just approved a new recommendation, and we think that it's very important to evaluate this implementation, and I think a message would say if we could have a resolution in this matter.

>> CHAIR: As I said before, at the end all the study are contribution driven, so we can make it under resolution but if there are no contribution, we will not progress in the study.

However, I agree with you, that it is resolution at WTSA level can enhance the spirit of setting contribution. I do remember since I am in this business since long time, once we have put some top priority in one question particularly it was at the time being I don't remember the Study Group especially and the Assembly has approved these resolution. At the end, no contribution to the Study Group, that's between, so that's only to give message, good resolution, but is contribution driven at the end.

May I ask Brazil, you to have informal consultation, because it seems that there are, there is no major opposition to the resolution. That is my understanding. But maybe some refining tuning is needed. At the same time, I ask the same for the other, I ask informal consultation, the proponent should be held in informal consultation to come to a solution if possible, and for that, he has to contact the people who are, has made the intervention, and people who are willing to join the informal consultation. After if the informal consultation do not succeed, we have a formal meeting during the weekend for you, your relax. Okay.

Next one, if you have no other point, will be, what will it be, resolution 48. There is U.S. contribution 48, requesting the suppression. By the way, we have agreed to suppress the previous 37 or not? Resolution 37, during the roaming. No. We have to come back.

United States, please go ahead.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. Happy to present the rationale for our proposal to suppress. It was drawn in part, in fact in large part, from the report that WTSA 12, 2012 action plan version 6 report, where the staff indicates that the work on I.D. Ns should or could largely be considered complete.

The shared goal, we interpret that the shared goal we have all had for many, many years of advancing multilingualism through internationalized domain names has fairly largely been met. As of today, there are 135IDNs in the route with 46 representing country code top level domains, CCTLDs, and 89 being represented by generic top level domains.

That is the rationale behind our proposal to suppress. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any opposition to this proposal? If not, finally we take a decision. No, Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. Chair, we have read this contribution, the proposed suppression, and here it is asked that studies be continued on internationalized domain names. When we read the Secretary-General's report, as submitted to the previous Assembly, we see that there are certain activities that aren't pursued by the standardization sector with the name of facilitating -- with the aim of facilitating activities under this resolutions.

So, we think that it may be advisable to ask the Secretariat to provide a brief report on the most recent achievements that have been obtained in this field,

especially since some reports that we have seen show that there is some support in developing countries for the implementation of this resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I have now Canada, Brazil, Jordan -- Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair. Just to say that we have reviewed the internationalized domain name work within ITU-T for some years, and we note that little activity has been low and furthermore that the adoption of internationalized domain names worldwide has grown, and we fully support the suppression of this resolution. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to thank U.S. for submitting this proposal, and to support it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chair. We also would concur with Saudi Arabia on this point. We believe that if we make a decision today, on the suppression of this resolution, without looking at all of the activities and achievements that have passed, we think we might be acting a bit hastily. I think we need to delay the debate on this question. Thank you.

(no audio).

>> Its aim and its ends, and seems to be the case here, if there are no Member States who are making contributions on this issue, and there are other mechanism by which this can be addressed, and they have been addressed, then I think that resolutions do outlive their usefulness and in that case they should be suppressed. For that reason we would support this proposal. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. Japan supports this contribution because recently there are few contributions related this area. So we would like to support this contribution. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Now I see the growing list, and as I said, I hate to have the Ping-Pong.

(chuckles).

So what I propose, to avoid the Ping-Pong, and as request by Saudi Arabia that the Secretariat provide a document with the activity undertaken, this both is in such plan of the standardization sector as well as in the report to Council on activity, and I think with these extra, we can after take a sound decision. Informal consultation by the way are encouraged.

United Arab Emirates, you want to speak or my clarification is clear what I'm proposing? Yes, it's clear. Good.

So, we ask you extra burden, and we will see what will be the result at the end.

Okay. Next move, as I said, very likely you will not have a coffee break, I'm afraid. Next one is, which one is -- 69. Oh. Access to end user Internet resources, that is a lot of fun. Okay. Contribution 42 from African and 43 for Arab state. Sudan. Please.

>> SUDAN: On behalf of Arab and African Group, Sudan will present modification of resolutions 69, nondiscriminatory access and use of Internet resources and ICTs.

We are going to discuss what has been adopted earlier in WTSA 2008 and updated in WTSA 2011, 12. However, it is still evident that there are still discriminatory actions, not only regarding access to Internet resources, but also extends to access to ICT facilities and services.

We have put in our consideration the resolution 20 of the WTDC 2010 Hyderabad called for access to ICT facilities and services should be of nondiscriminatory nature. Also, the outcomes of WSIS high-level event in Geneva, 2014, which especially addressed the transfer

of know-how and technology, as well as to
nondiscriminatory access in conducting activities in
that regard. Even though we still noticed that some
Member State still couldn't have access to such resources
and information.

     So, to conclude that the blue annex revised of
resolution 69 to address this new resolutions and
outcomes mentioned above, and to invite contribution
on these issues by the ITU-T members, membership to
support the prevention of such practices. Thank you.

     >> CHAIR: Understand that we have presented the
both contributions, Arab, common proposal and African
states. I have requests for the floor from Cuba, please.

     >> CUBA: Thank you, Chair. We take the floor to
support the amendment proposed by the African Group,
and, by the Arab group. As was explained by the delegate
from the African states, this text still is of great
interest and validity and should be maintained. We have
at hand here ten examples of cases where Cuba was not
able to access, I'm not sure if everyone is familiar
with this, but well, our foreign affairs Minister during
the U.N. General Assembly, when making his speech,
criticizing the blockade which is still going on against
our country perpetrated by the United States, two

examples, of blockade where Cuba cannot access certain websites. And this, though this text was approved in 2008, it is still necessary, and we propose therefore that it be maintained with the amendments proposed by the African and Arab States. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon. Thank you to those who have presented these contributions this afternoon. We have a small issue to raise, which we hope can be resolved informally. There is a reference in both of the contributions to the high level events which took place in 2014. The high-level event it was not an ITU meeting, but it was transmitted as a input to the U.N. review of the WSIS which took place in 2015. And which also talks about technology transfer.

We would suggest it might be better to refer to the United Nations General Assembly resolution. This would strengthen the points, and be a more appropriate reference to make, and perhaps some informal editorial work might be able to quickly help us find some appropriate wording. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. Just very briefly,

to concur with the previous intervention of our colleague from the United Kingdom, and I hope that there is going to be some editorial challenges, because as he stated correctly, the WSIS+10 was not a ITU event. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: I think really, there seems to me that there is no major opposition, proposed change, only some editorial improvement to the text. I think that is something that can be performed out of this plenary. But I see Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman.

I did not fully understand the intervention made by the representative of the United Kingdom. This high-level event was organized in 2014, and of course it was a question of reviewing what was done, and what was decided on by the United Nations General Assembly, in 2015. And I think that this provides a context for the decision. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I think that the United Kingdom and Canada say that the superior activity is a united nation General Assembly was made at the overall review and make the resolution at the end in one input to that was also the WSIS+10 review. But I leave to editorial improvement between the two parties, and because I do not see any

opposition in certain new text, only changing some wording. It to me is not controversial. But maybe I'm too innocent.

    (chuckles).

    Okay. With that, can I ask, who was that presented -- Algeria? I forgot who it was. Someone from presented there to get in touch with the ANC so they can find a solution. Okay? But that should be quick one, because to me there are no major opposition.

    Okay. Next one will be, what will be, it will be resolution 47. Count record top level domain name, and there is a contribution from Africa. May I give the floor to Africa, to introduce contribution 42. Nigeria.

    >> NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is an African regional proposal for modification of resolution 47, country code top level domain, domain names and geographic names. This contribution identifies the recent challenges encountered with the recent round of new generic TLDs, relating to geographic names. AU expresses concern about a individual or private body assuming the personality of a country. This in a way compromises the sovereignty of that country. For the developed countries, they have many structures and facilities to combat any Cybercrime or any cyber

challenges, but that is not the case for developing world.

Africa region is proposing that WTSA 16 harmonize
in their resolution 47 to accommodate this. The WTSA
focuses on country code TLD. The recent expansion of
generic TLD initiated in 2012 by ICANN introduces many
new applications, some that have geographic implications
which require addressing various challenges, including
resolution of various conflicts, therefore special
attention should be given to the issue of geographic
generic TLD as a concept in generic terms, as they may
interest core area, as they may interfere with core areas
of interest of any states.

Could we imagine if during this programme that we
came this conference that you wanted to browse through
information about Tunisia, and where you click, you see
that dot Tunisia, the impression is that it must be
Tunisian government. But it could be anybody anywhere
in the world. This is a great concern that Africa feels
that it should be addressed.

It is talking about geographic generic, like you
may know we have the generic and the geographic. We are
aware that ICANN, government Advisory Committee and other
interest groups are doing some work on this. But when
the issue of sovereignty is concerned, ITU is a

organisation of United Nations and has greater relevance. We are aware that the issue of TLD is a global question. It is a domain name and as a domain name, it is global. You know that there is no way any domain name could be replicated.

We are therefore seeking that there should be an amendment to this resolution, first by adding at the name country code top level domain names and geographic names. And then we noted that one of the differences between the, like I have already said, the differences between the country code and generic, we noted this, and it is the proposal of the African regional group that studies should be continued in Study Group 2.

I am sure that nobody would be opposing to this, because where you have studies, you will be well-informed, and the proper decision could be taken. After the studies, maybe some other applications could also be exposed. And then well-informed decision will be taken.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Nigeria, for clear proposal. Now we have the contribution from the United States, who will go in the opposite direction. United States contribution 48, please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair.

Happy to explain the rationale for the U.S. contribution
which proposes to suppress resolution 47, and the
research that we undertook before submitting this
proposal indicated that there have been few to none
contributions from Member States to Study Group 2 over
the past four-year study period. It's been our
experience that country code top level domains have,
the problems that were initially encountered years ago
when resolution 47 was initially proposed, have largely
been overtaken by events.

That was the thinking behind our proposal to
suppress. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Any request for clarification, comments,
Thailand, first time you speak, so pleased to give you
the floor.

>> Thank you, Chair, Thailand would like to echo
and support the United States as the contributions from
the governments in ICANN to the government of committees,
the membership comprised of 167 administrations
worldwide, to regional commissions, African unions and
European Commissions, and ITU is one of 35 observers,
and we have the Working Groups which address this issue
and provide several mechanisms. We do believe that the
contributions among governments, relevant into this

matter, should be remain in the ICANN.

>> CHAIR: Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The proposal of the U.S. reflects the situation, current Study Group 2, Japan would like to express our support to the proposal from the United States. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair. As a long term participant of Study Group 2, would note that the contributions nonexistent on this topic in the last study period, and furthermore, and while we are sensitive to the concerns raised by Africa, we would note the we are within the ITU-T and with respect to work within the ITU-T, we have not seen much work on this subject, and we also note that there is a lot of work ongoing outside the ITU, and a lot of these concerns are addressed in other forums. With that, we would like to support the U.S. proposal. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. We would like to thank the African Group for having introduced this proposed modification. And we would like to align ourselves with them with regard to the importance of taking appropriate decisions to guarantee country codes,

and to consider them as GTLDs. This does not merely apply to GTLDs. It also pertains to domains. The second matter of GTLD. So we believe that this African proposal is appropriate and should be taken into consideration. I would therefore like to repeat that we support the need to protect GTLDs, and the second level of GTLD domain names. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Understand this is a support from all Arab region, but I have again Jordan asking the floor, if you say the same, please avoid. And Algeria also on the same things. Jordan?

(receiving no translation.)

>> CHAIR: There was no translation, sorry.

>> We support the proposal. We support what Saudi Arabia just said. We also thank the Afghan group for the proposal which they have made and the modifications made by Saudi Arabia to this proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. For the same reason that we supported suppression of resolution 48, we think that the lack of any contributions I think over the period of years means I think that the work of the particular resolution has been done, so we would support the U.S. contribution on suppression of resolution 47.

We would also concur with those who had spoken earlier that work is currently being done by the government Advisory Committee of ICANN on this issue, and that is where the responsibility lies, and encourage governments to participate in that work, and also on geographical indicators, work there is under way in WIPO in the WTO, and we think that any suggestion that it should be carried on the in the ITU-T would just be example of duplication. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Now I have South Africa, and since it is the first time you speak I will listen (chuckles).

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you very much, Chairperson, for that kindness. Chairperson, I believe Nigeria has spoken on behalf of the African Group, but I would like to also supplement, so as to emphasize certain issues about this particular proposal from Africa.

We do believe that there is merit to this proposal, because as African countries who are still experiencing the same problems that we have alluded to here, I find it interesting that the U.S. proposal is saying that their problems have been resolved because just a couple of weeks ago, we were in the African Internet Governance Forum where several countries including the Gambia

actually told us that they have been grappling with the issue of ICT name being located in another country and another individual controlling it and they haven't been able to come to a solution.

The argument about the fact that this is located within the GAC most of the countries here do participate in the GAC but we are talking two separate issues. We are talking about a international organisation, where actually governments are advising, and of course, whatever they advise can be taken or not taken. Then you are talking about the ITU which is a completely different organisation, because it's a multi-lateral organisation, where we enjoy the sovereignty of being states who can actually express our views and have them considered in a proper manner, and when it comes to decision-making, we actually have the same, we carry the same weight in terms of the outcomes that come from that.

This is why I think as Africa we decided that we have trust in this body, because we believe it is very legitimate, and can actually carry forth our ideas. And also when it comes to the conclusion, it will be the conclusion reached that is a consensus for all Member States.

I would like to go a little bit further, Chair, and say that over the years, we actually as governments listened to the different views by saying that probably when it comes, to, we know we have sovereignty, GTLDs at that point we considered that maybe a solution could be found in other areas, but experience has proven that instead of going forth, we are going backwards, because what is happening more and more is that individuals as said by Nigeria, and also companies outside are actually attaching their issues, taking country domain names and using their prefixes of their companies, thus by association meaning that if there are issues which go wrong, the association will be left with a country reputation of the country and the security of the country will be the one which is compromised, and the country will be the one which is made liable.

This presents quite a significant problems for us as African countries. I would urge the other delegates that we give thought to this because it is something which has quite negative consequences, and we would like the ITU to actually study this. This is what we are simply saying, that they should try to study, so that they can assist in resolving these problems that we are currently facing. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: I was pleased to listen to you, but was a little bit too long, I have to say, because I want to have short intervention, and because I know the position, I know clear in my mind, I think also the other delegate know. So now I have a long list, and I will give the floor only, please do not repeat the position, because I know already the position. But Germany, Europe has not spoken so Germany.

>> GERMANY: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and we thank the African Group to, having put on the table a specific problem that they encountered with this generic top level domain dot Africa.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, we are not, I myself, I'm certainly not among those who reject that the ITU has certain things to do with regard to the Internet being the author of famous resolution 101 many on pillars and at the same time that time was Chairing a group in the development Internet sector for developing countries.

The issue on the table is whether to amend this resolution, and one of the arguments well understood is let the ITU have a greater relevance than the other bodies, that has been named here, like the government advisory Committee and others. Unfortunately,

Mr. Chairman, my personal experience in the past 20 years
is that in the Internet world, these other entities they
have a greater relevance than the ITU, and therefore,
we would be very very careful to amend this resolution
with the aim to give an additional task to the ITU.

To be short, and I think this goes into informal
consultation anyway, we do not support the amendment
of this resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. But I understand that you do
not oppose the present resolution. But we will see what
is going on.

I have a long list. And I want to close the list,
because up to me now I have all the continent position,
but I will give the opportunity, those who have not spoken,
to repeat, for example, I have Emirates, we want to say
same position as Saudi Arabia, and Jordan was already
expressed before, please.

>> Thank you, Chairman. I would like to thank the
African Group for this proposal. I would like to say
that the representative of South Africa raised some
important points, and there are some issues that we aren't
so clear on and therefore we support what Saudi Arabia
said. We also support Jordan. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Suspecting. Bulgaria, please.

>> Hello, everyone, good to be back in the WTSA after four years and looking forward to the next four years of discussions and the next one. We would also like to thank both the African proposal and the U.S. proposal, and as it has become almost a habit since 2010 we would like to point your attention to information document number 7 from the plenipotentiary meeting in 2010 which explains the rationale about the governmental policy vis-a-vis domain name system and IP address allocation, which has direct connection to what we are discussing here today.

Our own internationalized domain name dot BG in Cyrillic by the way is fully operational and has its own policy which was written by participation of the broader Internet community including businesses, technical community, government, under the auspices of the Minister of transfer of ITN communication so that is another example where we can see how problems are actually being solved.

This is when you sit down and discuss with all the people who are engaged in these problems. As for the work mentioned in the proposed resolution by the African Group, and in the current existing resolution actually, our colleague from Thailand was very eloquent in

explaining how the GAC works, the governmental advisory Committee of ICANN that is, we are actively participating in this Committee. Anyone who has been there knows that the GAC has, is not only aware, informed, but also they have ways of expressing their views and participating in intervening and changing the policies about the generic top level domains.

Some people already mentioned that some colleagues mentioned that country code top level domains are policies which are defined in the countries, and that is the right way to go. Certainly support U.S. proposal and obviously as our German colleague said, under your wise Chairmanship you will point us very soon, probably before coffee break that we should go into informal negotiations. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I'm afraid you will not have coffee break. But informal consultation, yes, because I want to finish today agenda.

I have Mexico, United Kingdom, Switzerland, Jordan again and France. Please be brief. This is the end of the list, because the idea to me is clear. Bulgaria is slightly different from Germany but please, go ahead, Mexico.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chairman. We would also like

to thank the proposers for their proposals. We would

like to say that Mexico is a country which is very sensitive

to the use of geographical indications in particular,

Mexico strongly has supported the trade related aspects

of Intellectual Property rights agreements which is one

of the most important instruments with WIPO and we believe

that the use of correct geographical indications in

Mexico is a big issue. However, there is evidence that

these topics don't get sufficient space in the ITU. We

believe that there are respective instances in which

we can achieve the results we require.

Mexico, we have used these instances at various

times. Chair, to be as brief as possible, we would like

to keep the resolution as it is without changes. Thank

you.

>> CHAIR: ...

(off microphone).

For Germany. United Kingdom.

>> Thank you, Chair, with regard to GTLDs of course

we agree that governments should have the right to request

reservation when it comes to significant geographical

names. We read the African submission very carefully.

We can understand some of the frustration that the African

colleagues feel about this particular issue. In fact,

I would say we can have some sympathy with them on this particular issue.

But as Thailand said at the beginning of our discussion, there is a proper and well-established process to address these issues, and that process is available to all Member States. We would be concerned that the proposal from ATU is not the right solution for this issue. In fact, there are risks with this suggestion, because if we invite countries to discuss these issues at Study Group 2, we would really be inviting them to the wrong place. There is a danger that would not help, it would actually cause confusion. It would lead to a waste of resources. It would not help to resolve the issue. Although we have sympathy on the particular issue that Africa raises we don't think this is the right solution. Regarding the proposal from the United States, we recognize there were problems in the past, with cc. L Ds -- CCTLDs, but those problems have largely been resolved. We note also there have been almost no contributions on this issue. Given the fact that in our work here this week we are seeing so many proposals for now resolutions, we think actually this is one case where there is a strong argument for suppression. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, in fact we are not following the

appeal of the Director to have less resolution, and to consolidate. We are creating more. We are going exactly in the opposite direction. But that is life. I have Switzerland who may repeat the African position but please go ahead.

>> SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair. I promise that I will watch my time allocated there. Chairman, probably these two proposals are not exactly in contrast to one another. The African proposal is about GTLDs that take on geographical names. Geographical names be protected from being used as GTLDs, whether protected by prohibition or getting permission from the affected countries, or continents, for use of such names. That position we support strongly. Then the proposal by the United States on suppression of this resolution. Chairman, you will recall that not long ago, we were looking at a resolution or rather a proposal of helping developing countries to be able to participate in such meetings.

From the submissions from South Africa, we learned that there are still countries that have this problem, which the resolution seeks to correct. But one way or another they have not been able to submit to the ITU, to the Study Group. I don't know what the reasons are.

But we know that there are countries that are experiencing problems due to this. It could be therefore that there has not been any submissions or there has not been any action to this, any contributions to the Study Groups on this issue is not necessarily because the issue does not exist, but it's because of other problems.

So therefore, Chair, I support the position as you rightly pointed out the African position on both of these proposals, that is not to suppress and also to look at this issue of the geographical positions being, names being used for GTLDs. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Jordan, for the second time.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chairman, for giving me the floor a second time. After listening to all the interventions I'd like to explain certain things. I've listened very carefully about the need to avoid duplicating work, and also squandering our resources. In my opinion, there is no way to compare these things. What can be done by other organisations is not similar to what is been doing in the ITU.

Therefore, these activities, these solutions, these reviews should be done first in the ITU. And as this proposal supports, that we continue work in this field, this is exactly what we want. We wouldn't be to

be compared to work being done by other organisations or other entities. They do not the same, they do not have the same methodology and the same considerations as we have in the ITU. Thank you, sir.

    >> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. I have, now I close the list, I have prior requests and I stop the list at what I was saying, because after is the way out, the last speaker was France. And the other one please wipe out because I make the conclusion. France.

    >> FRANCE: Thank you, Chair. It's an honor to be the last on the list. I'll be brief. We have already heard a lot of arguments in favor of at least maintaining this resolution. I think in the light of the problems that have been elicited here that without duplicating what is being done by other organisations, that we take a look at the progress that has been achieved here, and that we update this recommendation. I think that will be the best way to proceed.

    >> CHAIR: Okay, France. I think you have just shown us the way to continue our efforts here.

    Since you were the last to speak, you will be the ideal person to take charge of this. I hope you agree with that. France?

    >> It may be my colleague more than me.

>> CHAIR: No problem says the Chair, French delegation then. I would ask Senegal and Saudi Arabia since you have already taken this decision to desist unless you want to add something to the same argument, because I think everyone's positions are clear now. Thank you.

Thank you then. Contact the French delegation then to find a solution here, someone has to summarize the discussions, and as soon as we have two opposite positions, we can't opt for one or the other. I have to ask a neutral party, and France is neutral here. Let me ask France to lead these informal consultations. I was speaking with my French colleague and that is the reason. Now we have to, I'm afraid that we will not have a coffee break. I'm really afraid for you. What is the next, the next one is nice one, resolution 64.

We have three contributions, first one is from APT and document 44. Someone from APT can introduce these contribution 44.

We are taken by surprise.

Also the next one will be contribution 45, from Europe. Final one 47 for RCC. Someone from APT can present 44? It seems not. I go in the time being to, they consult between themselves, I ask Europe to present

45.

>> United Kingdom, please.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. On behalf of CPT, it is an honor to present this contribution to the meeting. Europe has reviewed resolution 64, and we believe the collaboration with all relevant stakeholders is essential in the deployment of IP v6 and that the enhancement of technical skills is an important issue.

Given the need to reduce unnecessary bureaucracy we believe that the Director of the TSB should have flexibility to report as appropriate on this issue. We also propose that the ITU website that provides information about global activities related to IPv6 should be updated, we think that will be a very useful task. We propose amendments to resolution 64 to that end. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the clear presentation. Now someone from APT, I still try. No. So RCC, please. RCC. Seeing no one, present the other contribution, good. Malaysia, please, from APT.

>> Thank you, Chairman, good afternoon to everyone. I'm going to start to bring a update on resolution 64.

In recent years IP V has become an important requirement via various technology advancement. Some

countries have been actively transmitting from IP V4 to IP v6, where others are still in the early stages of the adoption. The right strategies have to be embraced, and implemented in order to foster a smooth transition to IPv6. Further it's critical that this programme be continuously monitored until it's fully deployed and goes operational.

Some key points to note, transition IP V4 to IPv6 is slow due to numerous reasons, among them the members' ability to successfully implement or lack of demand from operators. The deployment IPv6 will firstly obviously Internet of Things IoT, IPv6 addressing is required for new technology deployment such as 4G, LT and SG. 5G, I said. To put additional IP V training programmes for engineers, to consider sharing information results of the IPv6 in transition. To consider a traditional, a national validation programme for ISPs, and finally to consider issuing a mandate or directive on the offering of IPv6 services. This modification we deem important which are to be included in resolution 64, as it will benefit Member States. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to go through the resolution doc. We have added in D, I'd like to draw your attention to considering. There are members with sufficient technical skills in IPv6. However there

is a delay in IPv4 to IPv6 for various reasons such as waiting for members successful implementation and lack of demand from operators. Further down, H, the deployment of IPv6, Internet of Things, requires huge amount of IPv addresses. I, new communication infrastructure such as 4G, LTE and 5G network will require IPv6 support for better communication.

Further down in resolves that point number 4 to initiate IPv6 training programme for engineers, network operators and content providers which can enhance their skills and further applied at their respective organisations.

I invite Member States and Sector Members we have added number 3 to consider from making commitment on the IPv6 transition, progress and do public communication to share the results of IPv6 transition, and invites Member States, added 2 points consider IPv6 validation programmes for Internet service providers ISPs and other relevant organisations and finally to considering a issue or mandate on offering IPv6 services for governments, ISPs and relevant organisation as appropriate. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman.

Sorry for the slight delay. We will try to very briefly introduce the proposal from the RCC members. Along with general editorial changes, the RCC members are proposing an updating of 1 and 2 of resolves, so that it's in line with the current situation, in particular we are proposing assessing and collecting statistics on transition to IP6. IPv6. And together with this, in section, instructs the Director of the Bureau we take into account resolution 63. Some other important points are, the proposed text which should facilitate the deploying of IPv6 taking into account the possible application for Internet of Things devices, which as we know may be deployed in great numbers, and the IPv6 version protocol should ensure that those address resources to such a large number of devices.

Another important proposal to our mind is the addition made under the section, invites Member States and Sector Members, where it is, says take into account the support of IPv6 should be done not merely at the level of equipment, hardware that is, but also on a programme level through software tools and Internet services. So in short that is our proposal in a nutshell. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any requests for

clarification? I draw all your attention that some of

these proposals have financial consequence, and some

may be dealt with by other sector, for example, I'm aware

that the development sector is actively acting in IPv6

matter, and the training, capacity building is more for

the development sector than for the standardization

sector.

But this is observation by experience let's say.
Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all

we would like to thank the three regions for the proposals.

In a general sense we support what has been proposed.

But echoing what your views regarding APT proposal we

would like clarification regarding the training

programme that they are proposing, and the possible

financial implication regarding that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. United States.

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

Good afternoon, colleagues. We also would like to start

by thanking the three regions for their contribution.

Like yourself, Chair, and the comments from Brazil we

won't repeat, but we had a similar reaction to the

reference to a new development programmes. We thought

perhaps a way forward for that was to change the word,

in the APT proposal, from initiate, and change it to, to support the BDT. Then we change training to training programme more generally or something along those lines to accommodate.

We also had some questions about invites Member States to of the APT proposal. We are unclear what is meant by a national validation programme. But we are not so sure what that would look like. We would like additional clarification. And also invites Member States 3, rather than discuss a mandate or directive, it would be our preference for something along the lines of considering how various government procurement requirements can encourage the transition from IPv4 to IPv6. Those were a few specifics. But our bottom line is that we support the general sentiment of all three of these proposals. We think that with a few edits, these APT, these final APT edits would be acceptable to us. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair. Thank you to all who submitted proposals on this. IPv6 is of interest to us in Canada. We continue to work through our adoption. I believe we are approximately nearing 40 percent at the moment.

To the point here, some of the points raised, one on statistics. I believe this was in the RCC proposal, just to note that there is a lot of statistics shared amongst various organisations, including the regional Internet registries, IPv6 adoption tools, for instance we are grabbing the figures for Canada, so they are quite widely available.

But generally, we can work that language, I think potentially we have a way forward. On training, again, draw your attention to the existing instructs to, which includes a training clause and potentially that is something more on wording, where we can work through that.

But to avoid duplication with training ongoing outside the ITU.

Finally on the invites Member States, Canada works to lead by example to some degree, within our federal government we have worked to try and build in IPv6 in our procurement clauses. To that end, RFPs and whatnot have been adopted. But there has been national validation programme or a mandate that is potentially just something with language, but it should definitely be voluntary.

With that, I'm happy to work through the text with

the proposers. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With regards
to the three proposals from the three regions, Egypt
would like to thank the three regions for their
contribution.

We have a inquiry regarding the applicability of
the IPv6 for IoT solutions and applications, because
we think that while IPv6 of course is important, it might
not be the only solution used for IoT and Smart Cities
and communication application systems and services.
Accordingly, we might be a little bit comfortable by
slight modifications in text. For example, in the
considering section, we would say that the deployments
of IPv6 could, we might say, may, or might, facilitate
the Internet of Things solutions, with regards to the
RCC proposals, under the resolves section, we should
also note that the IPv6 deployment could be a potential
solution.

We need to take care that, because other systems
in the IoT could not be based on IP at all. So in that
sense, I would be cautious in linking directly the IoT
sphere with the IPv6 in terms that we need more addresses.
Actually IPv6, have been studies that demonstrated that

IPv6 in itself could not be suitable actually for IoT given that it has large overhead compared to the energy, memory sizes of the devices used in the IoT systems. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your technical intervention, having attend Study Group 20 I share, but without being the Chairman. That is personal thing. The Chairman has no idea. But I want to defend the three sector and as I say the development sector, Mr. Sunu was here at the opening and I do not want to take out the bread from his mouth. (chuckles).

So it is one of the programmes of the BDT and I think it's necessary to modify, editorial, I see as a conclusion, no opposition of the proposal. The only editorial change, may I ask someone to have informal consultation to come to solution for the next meeting. I ask in this case maybe Canada. I didn't consult him, but let's try.

>> CANADA: Yes, thank you, Chair, we would be more than happy to help out on this, thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: For the time being informal consultation. If you need to have informal, let us know. We have to announce the formal meeting of the numbering recommendation. We are announcing because I'm afraid

we are not finished. After 64, we can proceed to resolution, new resolution over the top service, there is resolution from Africa. Someone from Africa will present this contribution. Cameroon, please.

>> CAMEROON: Thank you, Chair. We are pleased to make this presentation on behalf of the African states. It should be pointed out though favorable to the diffusion of ICT especially for developing countries the trans international characters of OTT activities raise some problems, whether this be for Telecom operators who often have national authorizations, and whose services are directly in competition with OTT, with the consequences on their revenues, or with states. This also has consequences on the states, sometimes leading to severe fiscal losses, and hands a barrier to developing a digital tissue on a local basis, also leads to problems with funding universal service.

Now in the light of the technical innovations that have occurred, and other ITC developments, it's probably true that the diversity need for added value will disappear in developing countries and inequalities will in fact not be narrowed but will grow wider.

We propose under this new resolution that studies on the economic impact and budgetary impact of OTTs in

particular on, in developing countries, be carried out and their recommendations and guidelines of a appropriate nature be put forth. Recommendation invites different Member States to participate in this endeavor. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your presentation. As you say these five region proposal having also financial and other consequence so now I open the floor for questions, clarification, discussion, any clarification needs on, please the floor is yours if at all possible. Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chairman. I would like to thank the African Group for studying this topic which is very important. In my opinion, despite the fact that the resolution will help us reach the objective, we might need some amendments. Despite all this, we think that the resolution is excellent. We support it.

But Mr. Chairman, in many of the interventions, you reminded us of the financial impact. We cannot say every resolution has a financial impact and this is the role of the commission 2 to study. We have to work, and if you remind us all the time of the financial impact, we might avoid giving new ideas. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. We were requested for your information by Committee T to give all the resolution

having a financial impact, sorry to say that the convening

of conference in OTT has huge financial impact, for ITU

and for the Member States. So sorry to disagree with

you. But you want to reply immediately because you will

never agree with the Chairman, please go ahead. Jordan,

please say the Chairman is bloody stupid. Go ahead.

(chuckles).

>> We are friends, Mr. Chairman, I'm not saying

anybody is stupid. Even if we disagree, we still are

friends. Thank you, Chairman.

((off microphone).

>> Are you expressing your open, your idea, are

you talking on behalf of Italy.

>> CHAIR: To give all the financial implication,

because they cannot know themselves, so that is the reason

why I'm raising. (off microphone).

United States.

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

We would like to thank the Africa Group for its proposal.

We think that they are raising some interesting ideas

related to some challenges that they are having with

respect to OTT services. That being said, we believe

that it's premature and perhaps inappropriate to have

a new draft resolution on OTT, for a few different reasons.

First, we find that OTT services, because they address the content of communications, and applications that are flowing over the Internet and over the telecommunications infrastructure, and do not address, do not have to do with the functionality of the telecommunications infrastructure, that this is an area that is perhaps outside the expertise and the mandate of the ITU, to be able to address.

In addition, we note that there is some ongoing work in Study Group 3 in question 9-3, to study some issues that are related to OTTs, and also some work under way in ITU-D Study Group 1 looking into some aspects which are aiming to identify policy tools to facilitate the availability to consumers at local and national levels of competitive IP based services and applications so called OTT services.

We believe that these two workstreams are focusing on very narrow and very specific aspects of OTT that may be appropriate and may be helpful to address.

The scope of the new resolution that is proposed we are concerned is far too expansive, and potentially covers issues that the ITU really does not have the expertise to address.

Further, one other aspect of the African proposal

that we would like to call into question is this new
proposal for a world conference related to OTT services.
This to us is, it's way too soon to request such a thing.
We would like to state right now that we do not support
it. While we are willing to have some further
conversations, the United States wants to make it clear
that we do not support a call for OTT regulation or a
new resolution related to this particular topic. Thank
you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Japan wishes
to echo the intervention of the United States and we
have some concern on the proposed resolution. In
particular, this resolution invites to focus on taxation
issue, that I think ITU don't have the mandate on examining,
studying national taxation aspect. Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Senegal.

>> SENEGAL: Thank you, Chairman. The arrival of
OTTs in the telecommunication ecosystem is creating a
unusual situation which has never before been seen in
our countries. We are all in agreements that the
inclusion of these services now has democratized access
to digital services, we can all agree on that. But it

does have consequences.

It is a model which particularly comes from the exterior of a country, not from its interior, it's not from a domestic source. How can we manage this? This is a sector which contributes enormously to the economic development of our country but how can it now be interrupted now by a external source, while operators have a status which is recognized in our own countries. How can we not seek to look at how this could be a difficulty for us. If we reflect on this subject now, we, representatives of state who are most impacted by this issue, we need to be aware that our participation in the work of the ITU is often subject to budgetary issues. So we can actually come to you and discuss these issues with you. This is a issue which is disrupting our ecosystem and our situation.

We are requesting you as representative of our countries what solution are we going to come up with, but when we go home we don't have response. Considerations taken in the ITU in order to respond to this problem are important.

We note that this is a disruptive influence on our economic situation, and as our situation generates not just a issue of taxation but it's also a issue of a impact

on a economy and telecommunications environment which is now being disrupted by players or actors who are not in our environment and whose status is not known.

We believe that this resolution should be adopted and that it will allow us beyond this consideration to provide responses and to justify a response to this issue in the ITU, this great organisation which has mandates to bring back responses to our countries. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have some comments to do. First of all, OTT services are one of the hot topics in Telecom World today, especially because of the impact in the Telecom side, but on the other hand, how they are stimulating the traffic and data revenues. In special when we are talking about OTT, I really believe that ITU has a very important role in this matter, because it's the main Telecom body in the world. And I think that a resolution could express this importance.

But taking into account the proposal of the Africans who are very thankful for the proposal I think that this resolution express just one side of this coin, that's the sustainability issue of OTT.

But there is another side, is that the freedom for business and the develop aspect and stimulating of new content and things like that that are important in our

digital society today. That is why we think that this current text should be modified in terms of concept, but the idea of a resolution we support. We think the new resolution should be based in the recognition of importance of OTT issues, but instructing ITU-T in specially Study Group 3 I already mentioned, already have a question related to study the question, and propose recommendations related. In summary Brazil supports the idea of a new resolution, but basically the text I think should be radically changed.

>> CHAIR: Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm speaking as Sweden, I'm also as coordinator with N CPT on this OTT topic.

We have read this draft resolution carefully. As we have heard and according to the introductory part of this proposal, the major concern behind it seems to be to deal with and to resolve and to quote the impacts on the revenues of teleoperators in the developing countries, and on national tax revenues.

CPT recognize that OTT services can lead to loss of revenue for some national companies, and that this can lead to short-term loss of revenue for government. However, OTT services provide innovative new services

that meet consumer and business need. Therefore, we believe that any future study on OTT must consider not only the negative impact on traditional service providers, but should be based on a balanced approach and consider different aspects, including the added value for end users from a greater supply of services.

With regard to the operative parts of this proposals we have some questions for clarifications. In the second instruct section, there is instruction to TSB. As was raised before, we wonder on which basis ITU-T could be able to address taxation aspects, in relation to this issue. CPT considers that taxation aspects are not a topic for ITU.

Then in instructs section to TSB and BDT, firstly we wonder whether it's possible for this Assembly to instruct BDT. Secondly, we are concerned about the explicit link in the proposed text between the standardization of OTT services. We are talking about retail services. Technology standardization of OTT services, and the link to the economic impacts. Recalling that this is WTSA, we would ask to get some clarification on what kind of technology standards are considered by the contributor of this proposal, keeping in mind that the issues that need to be addressed, the

negative impacts on the revenues and tax revenues particularly.

This link between technology standardization and the economic impacts would need to be clarified. Finally, we are concerned as yourself to arrange a world conference. I wonder whether the cost of such an event has been considered. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. We would also note that there is work currently under way on this topic in ITU-D and ITU-T. As Brazil said it is a hot topic. Our administration in Australia has commenced a review of OTT, and we would concur with our colleague from Sweden that a balanced approach is necessary, because there are many elements to this, while it does provide challenges, there are also a whole range of opportunities offered by OTT services.

We also have concerns with the resolves part of the draft new resolution, particularly the leap at this stage towards a regulatory response. We have concerns with the reference to taxation, and also to the convening of a world conference, both from the point of view of the expense that that would entail, as well as using that conference to develop standards at this stage.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Saudi Arabia.

>> Saudi Arabia: Thank you, Chairman. Saudi Arabia supports the draft resolution. Issues relating to OTT services are issues which have been debated at length and broadly both within the ITU-T and amongst operators. When reading this resolution we might note that it is a invitation to study this issue, so as to come up with a solution which establishes a balance between the operators, those who are responsible for infrastructure, and the OTT service providers, they can't provide these services in the absence of infrastructure which is provided by operators.

There are various issues linked to the provision of O.T. D services on a regulatory level, and we as a Member State hope that we are going to be able to study this issue, within the ITU-T.

Particularly, as regards loss of income, costs for operators, here we would like to express our support for this resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Canada.

>> CANADA: Yes, thank you, Chair. I will try to be positive here. Canada views OTT as a great platform for innovation. We have seen many new services that have

come about, many as a result of great user demand. We
have seen OTT services that cross voice, video, messaging
and many other potentially new and innovative aspects
of communication.

I am hesitant here to cast a net around all OTTs.
I think potentially there is some aspects which may need
to be considered. However, this seems overly broad, and
potentially premature. We have yet to see OTTs fully
develop as a broad base technology.

To that end, we don't necessarily feel it's
appropriate for this resolution to be, to go forward
at this time. Furthermore, the cost implications as
others have noted, as well as, I would note there is
a significant amount of work for the TSB Director, and
we feel that it's best that this work be developed through
contributions of Member States. Thank you very much,
Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Mexico.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chairman. We would also like
to thank the group for having introduced this document
on OTTs. It is a very important issue today not only
in the telecommunication sector but also as regards
content. We believe that in Mexico, we are always in
favor of competition, and this is always for the benefit

of users so they can access better services, innovative services, at better prices, more affordable prices.

But looking at the text of the resolution, we see that there are lots of duties being laid upon the BDT, TSB, and calling for cooperation with academia and institutions and so on. We believe that the ITU has good participation of academia members and also Sector Members representing various organisations who they have been working with for some time. Not merely on the OTT aspect but there are various study questions open on this issue which are being spoken of by other speakers. There is also the issue of organizing world conference on standardization of OTT services. We believe that the ITU already has various fora which periodically are held and continue to analyze certain aspects of OTT and will do so in the future.

The organisation of workshops and seminars for developing countries, well, this year, various such meetings have been carried out in our region in Latin America. We think there is something which is currently being implemented without any problem, promoting the coordination of action, here we believe that this happens in Study Groups. Finally turning to the other instructions to the director of the BDT, we believe to

the World Telecommunication Development Conference has already set forth the instructions quite clearly. The document is important and interesting, yes, but we believe there is no need to have a resolution in the way it's expressed in this document. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mexico. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We support the draft resolution presented by the Distinguished Delegate from Cameroon and from the Africa Group. Mr. Chair, we see that study of the economic impact of OTTs is very important for the welfare of the, for investment in the developing countries. Also, we see that the impact on the local networks due to the traffic done by OTT should be studied. Mr. Chair, we think it's about time now to have this resolution in order to study the import, this important issue.

We would like to have this resolution in place. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Being one of the proponents clear to me. UAE.

>> Thank you, Chairman. I'd like to thank the African Group for having submitted this proposal. In my country, we are aware of the importance of OTTs as regards innovation. But we must not lose sight of the

fact either that OTTs have a role as regards the use of communication networks. That is why we support Saudi Arabia and Jordan who supported this proposal, so we too support this proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Jordan will speak now, in support also, so please, Jordan.

(laughter).

(microphone feedback).

>> I will speak in English because it seems that whatever I, whenever I talk in Arabic there is some misunderstanding taking place to your ears, I don't know why. (chuckles).

Actually, I just asked for the floor to respond to some of the comments that I listened to from the floor. I am surprising to listen to some comments saying that this issue is still not mature enough.

I remember when we came to the ITRs in 2012 there was a lot of contribution asking the countries to consider the impact of the OTTs, and at that time, the argument was that this is still issue is not mature, we should not stop innovation, we should not tackle the content issues. So there was some agreement that the ITR should not include OTTs.

Now I listen to some contributions from

distinguished speakers saying that we should consider this in the ITRs, on a international telecommunication regulation. So this is the time to consider the issue of the OTT. Are we going to wait another five years for another WTSA or for coming ITR to address this issue? We are requesting some certain studies from the T sector related to the OTTs issues. I share the same view from the distinguished speaker from other countries that maybe we need to do some refinement or tuning to the text exactly to avoid misunderstanding on what exactly we intend by this resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: I thank the delegate of Jordan. I'm going to speak in Spanish. So as to find out if you can understand me better through the medium of the interpreters.

Papua New Guinea.

>> Thank you, Chair, for giving me the floor. I would like to concur with my colleagues from Africa, and I would like to support this proposal that's been put forward, and we believe that this is an important issue, and it has got two sides, the negative and positive impact as some has mentioned. We believe that within this Assembly, we would like to propose that this be

considered, and support our colleague the group from Africa. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: I think I have to close the list, because we will continue, now, Senegal and Algeria definitely will support. There are differing opinion. Consultation is needed. Everyone recognize that OTT is a fundamental problem and need discussion and solution. The way to obtain the solution is differing.

Someone, Mexico has said there are policy forum maybe, other thing like that, that can be an instrument for that. But I leave launch the idea but definitely the study because as I said several times, I'm repeating myself, the standardization sector finally is contribution driven. If contribution arrive to appropriate Study Groups, the work will progress.

With that, I am afraid I leave informal consultation, find a solution, find something that is agreed by everyone, because what I want to obtain always is consensus, not one side prevailing to the other.

Having said that, I go now to the practical point, because we have still, Senegal and Nigeria it is okay because I know that you are supporting the African position. You want to speak? I am obliged to give you the floor if you want to speak. Please go ahead.

>> Yes, thank you, Chairman. I wanted to recall the number of contributions that have been on this subject, in 2012 the subject was put on the table in Dubai. Then in Committee 3, we can't count the number of contributions there were on the subject. There is even a draft resolution which is considered not be mature yet.

The problem is that African countries are facing a problem. They really have a need to develop the digital economy and Internet access for everyone. We need to invest in infrastructure and at the same time have a stakeholders, I think that the aim of this resolution is once again to raise awareness of the absolute need to be able to provide a status to these actors.

>> CHAIR: I do apologize, Senegal but interpretation is going to end. I would just like to say that I understand the problem. I was in Dubai. I recall that the issue was raised. I participated directly in the work of Study Group 3.

I must unfortunately conclude the meeting, because the interpreters have not been provided with a break, and do need to announce too that groups will meet on numbering resources tonight. They will consider resolutions 20, 40, 29, 60, 61, and 65. And the RCC/4 resolution, at half past 6, in room A. If Committee 3

has finished, it's meant to finish at half past 5, then
you could go to the amphitheater room too, as you wish.
The amphitheater room meeting will be right away. But
the other meeting will be half past 6.

I know your position and I'm aware. Any further
requests for the floor. Yes, United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. I
apologize for taking the floor again, and especially
to the interpreters, as they like us have not had a break
yet. Mr. Chairman, I note that in this session alone,
I believe I count 12 informal consultations were created.
The United States is a bit concerned about this method
of work. There are some resolutions for which there is
maybe just one or two lines that need to be tweaked,
some editorials which are appropriate for the concerned
parties to work out amongst themselves.

But for some of the others, it seems like we may
need something a little more formal developed. I would
think in particular this draft new resolution on OTT
may be one that we need some, a bit of a more formal
group to discuss as well as some of the edits to some
of the larger resolutions.

We would request, Mr. Chairman, that we perhaps
rethink how we are doing some of this work. We would

really appreciate if we could do it as transparently as possible with documents posted to the ITU website, with meeting rooms confirmed, and to ensure that all of us are able to participate in those discussions that are most relevant to us. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Be assured the United States of America, my intention is to ask for the numbering, first allow some formal consultation to solve easy point and after to have a formal meeting, and you are asking when we are meeting again, that is exactly what I was scheduling. So you will have formal meeting immediately after the -- tomorrow, we will ask report of the informal consultation, if maybe there will be none, and there will be no results, so the result will be to have a formal meeting of groups during the weekend. And that is my intention. It is okay for you?

Can I ask if you prefer room A at 6:30 or room, as soon as com 3 finish, amphitheater. Let's put amphitheater as soon as they finish so that they will not disappear. But they need some coffee. 6:30, room E. Okay, for the numbering. The rest will be announced. I will prepare already meeting for the other groups, and maybe will be one, maybe will be several. Depends how informal consultation goes on. Thank you.

(meeting adjourned at 1732)
     Services Provided By:
          Caption First, Inc.
          P.O. Box 3066
          Monument, CO 80132
          800-825-5234
          www.captionfirst.com   ***
This text is being provided in a realtime format.
Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or
captioning are provided in order to facilitate
communication accessibility and may not be a totally
verbatim record of the proceedings.
     ***