

Raw file.  
November 1, 2016.  
1430.  
ITU.  
ITU telecommunication standardization  
Assembly.  
Hammamet, Tunisia.

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.

\*\*\*.

(standing by).

(standing by).

(standing by).

>> Ladies and gentlemen, ladies and gentlemen,  
ladies and gentlemen, please take your seats. We are  
about to resume the session. Please take your seats,  
thank you.

(sound of gavel).

>> CHAIR: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.  
Welcome to the 7th meeting of Committee 4 of the WTSA  
16. Committee 4 is on ITU work programme and organisation.

We resume our meeting with our agenda, available as ADM 30. For the 6th meeting, we ended up at agenda item 5, with a number of issues which are pending, and we will have to go back when there is results are in. For now we will be dealing with agenda item 6, 7, 8. Then we will come back again to the issues which are pended. Agenda item 6 is on Study Group 20 Working Party structure. Considering that the discussion on Study Group 20 is still ongoing, I propose that we hold on to this agenda item, and then we will come back to it when the results of Study Group 20 is in, and then we can take it all as a block.

Thank you. I see no one asking for the floor. So we will proceed on to agenda item 7 which is on TSAG and matters, the first issue which is 7.1 is TSAG group on restructuring. There is a proposal from the African region, and it is available as 42 A3 2/2.

Africa, you have the floor. As being projected on the screen, I see no one asking for the floor. So if you are not ready with this agenda item, we can move on to 7.2, 7.2 is a proposal from the RCC available as 54/1.

54/1. So, I see RCC asking for the floor. You have the floor.

>> Thank you. Good afternoon. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, please allow me to introduce the proposal of the, of Kazakhstan which is supported by the RCC on proposals for updating the refining and classifiers of economic activity and production by type of economic activity in the area of telecommunications ICT. This contribution considers the need to update classifications of technical and economic information in the area of telecommunications and ICTs, at the international level. The proposal consists of the fact that we are requesting the TSB of the ITU together with the BDT to step up its coordination with other international organisations in updating international classifications of technical and economic information in the area of telecommunications and ICTs, using the harmonized concept in that field, adopted in ITU recommendation. Secondly to assist Member States concerned in attracting highly qualified specialists for the purpose of correcting errors and discrepancies in national and departmental classifications of technical and economic information and statistical forms in the area of telecommunications and ICTs, taking into account international experience in this area.

Thirdly, when developing international

classifications, for telecommunications in ICT services to recommend the use of the latest version, version 2.1 of the central product classification CP C of the 11 of August 2015 as approved by the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs statistics division.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Is there a request for clarifications on this proposal as submitted by the RCC? I see United States asking for the floor. I will want to close the list. So if there is request for any clarifications, I want to close the list. Then we can take them. So, we only have United States. The list is closed. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Chair. Good afternoon, friends.

We thank our colleagues for the contribution and would just ask for clarification. The classification activity that they are requesting be done is this intended to be an addition to the mandate of Study Group 2? That is the first question.

A second question for clarification, Chair, if that is the case, will this be considered in the ad hoc that is dealing with resolution 2? Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. RCC, you have the floor to respond to this query.

>> Thank you very much for the question. Firstly, we have a proposal that is a contribution from the RCC, and it's on requesting the TSB together with the BDT to strengthen the coordination with other international organisations. This proposal is about, and it's on updating international classifications of technical and economic information. Further on, our proposal concerns other work. Of course, as to whether or not this is going to be worked on by Study Group 2, is of course for this meeting to decide. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. But we want a very clear proposal, because this is not clear to us, and then the query from the United States has not been responded to. Is this proposal requesting that classification of Telecom services be included in the mandate of Study Group 2? Is that the request?

Russia, who wants to respond? Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes, thank you very much, Chairman.

We would like to try to clarify the situation. Although we did not write this proposal, we know what

it is about. Kazakhstan noted that the classifiers for services, national services and those used in the ITU, are different. Sometimes they are not in line with each other, which means that it's more difficult on a national level to account for economic activities in the area of telecommunications and ICTs, and at an international level, it makes it more difficult to undertake work connected with statistics.

And finally, on modernizing legislation in the area of international telecommunications, so the proposal of Kazakhstan was to request Study Group 2, which is leader in the area of telecommunications services, to assist in cooperation with other Study Groups, in the development sector to minimize the discrepancies between these various classifiers. Thank you very much, Chairman.

I hope that we have been able to help the meeting.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia, with your explanation. Let me propose a way forward. That as it stands now with this proposal and the clarifications, I will kindly ask that this proposal, it's further refined with a pointer for it to be considered at the next TSAG meeting, so that it will be part of our summary record that we will recommend that this to be dealt at the TSAG level.

Is this fine with everyone? I see no one asking for the floor. So.

(gavel).

Thank you. This proposal will be part of our summary record for it to be proposed to TSAG for it to handle in its next meeting. Thank you very much.

We will go to agenda item 8, WTSA resolutions under com 4. So here, we are taking 8A. I see Uganda asking for the floor. I suppose it's on agenda item 7, but we will come back to it.

So we will go to, we are now at agenda item 8, and 8A, we are agreed that these presentations will not be done, and then it went into an ad hoc, a drafting session, and then there is an output document which is DT81, which was led by Bahrain.

So if Bahrain is here, they could take us through the ad hoc drafting session on their resolution on the ITRs.

I don't see Bahrain in the room. So we will hold on to this as well and then move on to 8B which is on strengthening and diversifying resources on Telecom standardization sector of the ITU and here there is a output document DT97. It is on the UAE. UAE, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, if we would like kindly to defer the introduction of this results of this consultation, I think there was agreement reached, so if you kindly defer the introduction of this agreement, it will be highly appreciated, Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. So we go on to 8C. 8C is a new resolution on quality of service and it's available as DT101.

We have Uganda, you have the floor.

>> UGANDA: Thank you very much, Chairman. And good afternoon, dear participants and delegates.

We had a drafting session to consider the two proposals from the inter-American proposal and African common proposal, on the similar subject of raising awareness and best practices and policies related to quality of service. We were able to come up with a clean text that doesn't have square brackets, and this is presented for your consideration. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: This is good news. Thank you very much for your work and everyone who participated. So we have a draft new resolution on ITU-T initiatives to raise awareness on best practices and policies related to



service quality, as projected on the screen now.

Do we agree to transmit this to com 5 for translation into all languages, and for approval at the plenary? I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you very much.

(sound of gavel).

We have a new resolution on quality of service. Thank you very much.

Let me ask from Uganda, is this something that has financial implications or not? Uganda, you have the floor.

>> UGANDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Most of the proposals are looking at continuing with Q SDG and possibly having some workshops in collaboration with ITU-D. So yes, there may be some implications. I stand to be guided, however.

>> CHAIR: Right, thank you. We have noted this, and Secretariat will look at it, so we can see its appropriateness to Committee 2. Thank you very much for your report. I see Russia asking for the floor. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. We would like to ask a question, and have some clarification with regard to this draft new revelation

because as far as we understand it, these two contributions were not introduced at the meeting. We have just heard about informal consultations and then drafting. We would like to clarify the fact that we could not unfortunately participate in the drafting session. Nobody from the RCC could, because there were quite a lot of such groups.

The current text of the draft resolution in our opinion breaks with the compromise that was achieved in resolution 2 on the scope of the mandate of Study Groups 11 and 12. In this current formulation, we cannot support it, because otherwise, we are going to put our experts who are going to work in our Study Groups in a uncomfortable position, and the Secretariat. These two resolutions may conflict with one another.

The second point which we would like to touch on is that the questions raised in this resolution only instruct one Study Group. But listening to delegates at this meeting, we usually are guided by what is prepared for the consideration of various Study Groups. We are also aware that quality is recognized and recognized in the leading role of Study Group 12 and other Study Groups too. It is not such a simple issue. And you know this very well.

So therefore, we cannot agree with this draft resolution being transmitted onwards for approval. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. So this is noted. Brazil, you have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just trying to address some of the concerns raised by the Distinguished Delegate from Russia, actually, the proposal is addressed to SG 12 since this resolution instructs Study Group to study QoS and QOE measurement frameworks. As we were discussing in the ad hoc about the mandates of the Study Groups, this mandate to deal with this measurement frameworks were placed on SG 12, and if we see the output of the ad hoc on resolution 2, also the leading Study Group on quality of service and quality of experience was placed in SG 12 also. So that is why we are addressing this in this proposal. Actually, the original proposal was from CITEEL and also from African Group. So that is why we are proposing to instruct SG 12 since we are talking about to elaborate recommendations that provide guidance in strategic monitoring of quality of service and quality of experience.

So we are not talking about testing methods, that

is in the scope of SG 11 as was agreed. That is why we are just stressing SG 12. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. I will want to do a summary here and propose a way forward.

The agreement on all these resolutions were such that they were not presented and they went into informal groups and when they came back, the agreement was that we proceed on to a drafting session. What I gather from Russia was that it couldn't participate in this drafting session. And for them the text as it stands now is one which conflicts with a compromise they have made before this. And this information from Russia came after the requests for anyone not in agreement to request for the floor, and the ruling had been made.

However, I want to address this by suggesting that with the instruct part, the number 12 removed, and it will read, instructs ITU-T Study Groups according to their mandate. Would this be acceptable by Russia? Russia, you have the floor.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. We are grateful to you for taking the step forward and showing flexibility, and we are really thankful to you. We hope that our future work will progress in the very same way. Thank you very much and of course we are in

agreement. Yes.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. I suppose this is good for everybody. I see Brazil asking for the floor. Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair. Just to support your brilliant proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Brazil. So, again, are there any concerns on this? I see no one asking for the floor. So do we have an agreement? Yes, we do.

(gavel).

Thank you very much. So as amended we have a new resolution on quality of service.

We will proceed on to agenda 8D, which is on a new resolution on IoT and Smart Cities available as DT56 rev1. We have the Chair from Singapore to take us through this. Singapore, you have the floor.

>> Singapore: Thank you, Chairman. We have been working on this since last month. We had two informal sessions before this, and then two drafting sessions. I'm happy to report that we do have an agreed text. My report is found in TD, DT111. And agreed text is found in DT112.

In my report, I just have one note that during the drafting sessions, there was a comment from Russia that

one of the particular resolves, resolves number 3 the comment was why was it unique to IoT or Study Group 20. If the resolution could be put up on the screen, it would be useful. It's DT112.

>> CHAIR: DT112.

>> Singapore: Right. We had two drafting sessions. During the first drafting session there was a comment from Russia on resolves number 3. If you go further down, resolves number 3. Further down. Sorry, above. Above. Sorry. ITU-T, number 3. Right. To collaborate with ITU related standardization organisations. On this point we had a question as to why is this necessary, only particularly for IoT or for SG 20 and shouldn't this be in resolution 1 in the rules of procedure and apply to all Study Groups.

Unfortunately, I did not see the Russian delegation today in the final session where the text was finalized and agreed. So I have captured Russia's comment here for noting at com 4 whether Russia still has the comment or they would be agreeable to take resolve 3 as it stands currently. There were no other comments. The meeting reached consensus this morning.

I'd like to thank all participants for their compromise and the contributions that they made to come

up with a final text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Harim of Singapore. I appreciate this report and the results that you have given us.

Except for resolve 3, which Russia will have to comment on, everything else is in agreement. I want to give Russia the floor to comment on resolves 3. Russia, you have the floor.

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

With regard to the ad hoc session in the morning, yesterday, at midnight, we thought that we had a decision on the fact that Russia would not put square brackets around this point, but as the Chairman noted in his report, we do still have some concerns. In connection with this, we would like to ask those at the meeting and the TSB as well a question. The way I understand this invitation to SG20 we are providing additional instructions on the method of work in addition to the rules of procedure, which is not in resolution 1 and recommendation A1.

During the discussion, on many issues pertaining to Study Group 20, I heard the opinion from a number of colleagues that SG 20 is a special case, but it seems to me that you could say the pilot phase of Study Group

20 has finished now. And following Assembly, it will be fully-fledged Study Group, which will work in accordance with the rules of procedure and working methods, which have been established in the relevant documents.

In our opinion, making further methods of work stipulated in a resolution is excessive. If we don't have enough mechanisms set forth in resolution 1 and recommendation A1, then is there a need to continue to work on those documents? I'd like to take this opportunity, when we are talking about the specificities of Study Group 20, I would like to draw your attention to something, namely that following our Assembly, this will be a fully-fledged Study Group, including from the point of view of the use of the official languages of the union.

I would like it if the Chair could reflect in his report our concerns on this subject as well. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia, but to attempt to respond to this, if you go into the recognizing A, which says that industry forums, developing technical specifications for IoT, and then really relating the resolve that because of ongoing work elsewhere, they



could collaborate, I see the mapping in this. However, we will note your concern that we may have to look at this as to whether to keep it and it will be of no harm, or to take it off and it will be of no harm. But I see that the resolves 3 was addressing the recognizing 1.

Let us note that, yes, why do we mention a special case, it could be a special case because of the conditions of maybe many ongoing work with other SDOs, and so it was specially mentioned. But we take note of your concern on this. So if this is fine with everyone, we could have an agreement on this resolution, and if Russia again will want to comment on this at plenary, we will want to take it there. If everyone else is in agreement, we can take this as a new resolution. I see Canada asking for the floor. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A question for clarification, under the instruct Director of TSB, point number 2 there, talking about the carry out the pilot projects in cities related to the SC and C, KPI assessment activities. Some clarification, what is the purpose of this particular activities, and what is the financial implication of that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. The report I had from the Chair of this group was that everybody else

was at the meeting and the issues were addressed. It was only for Russia who had concerns with resolves 3. So I'll beg of Canada that everything else was in agreement, and then it was so for Russia to comment on resolves 3. With the financial implications part we can transmit all the operative parts to Committee 2 for the assessment on this, if this is fine with everyone. So with this, I thank you all. We have a new resolution on enhancing the standardization of Internet of Things and Smart Cities and Communities for a global development.

(applause).

(gavel).

Thank you very much.

UAE is smiling, clapping and asking for the floor at the same time. (chuckles).

UAE, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We are taking the floor for two things. First, we would like to thank the Chairman of this ad hoc group for his great work and thank all the participants who participated in drafting this resolution. We are happy that finally this resolution was approved in committee 4.

Another topic, Mr. Chairman, with regards to the

new resolution proposed by the Arab group, I have done some consultations, and we have text to present it to you, consensus text to present it to you. You have already passed that part on the agenda, because I was not in the room, I was in com 3. Many meetings are going in parallel. So thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. So if you allow me to go back to that point, and present the document. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. We will come back to you soon, if you are able to deal with the remainder of the resolutions under com 4. So we will proceed on to agenda item 8E, which is a new draft resolution on financial services.

This was, the drafting session was chaired by Mr. Said of Egypt. If you are ready, you have the floor, and it's available as DT77 rev 1. Mr. Ahmed Said.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yesterday we had a drafting ad hoc group chaired by myself, we started the meeting at 5:30 and we lasted for two and a half hours of discussions. The meeting was attended by Sector Members and Member States representing different regions. It was agreed DT77 will be used as base text for the draft resolution, and to be reviewed by the group, drafting group.

Mr. Chair, the positive spirit of cooperation in the room helped us a lot to review this document, where interventions from different members who attended the group were very useful to the draft resolution.

They were very useful additions added by members. These additions have definitely cemented the text of this draft. I will keep it short, Mr. Chairman. We had reached consensus on the text of this draft resolution, and we agreed on the agreed on text was uploaded under DT77, rev 1. Again, Mr. Chair, we would like to thank all members who attended this ad hoc meeting for their valuable comments and spirit of cooperation and compromise, and also I would like to thank the TSB, Mr. Vijay for his support during will ad hoc meeting. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Egypt, for your report. As you said, the spirit in the room in the discussions were good, and then you had this result. I see United Kingdom asking for the floor. UK, you have the floor.

>> UK: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to add the thanks on behalf of CEPT to our Chair for his work in facilitating these meetings, and that we too welcome the spirit and the result of those consultations. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So with this said, are we in agreement to transmit this to com 5 for translation into all the languages, and to the plenary for approval? I see no one asking for the floor.

(gavel).

Thank you very much. It's no surprise that we have a new resolution on making money. It was not sharing money. So there was no contention. Thank you very much for this new -- now we ask if there are any financial implications with this new resolution. Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. From my opinion, I think the financial implications will be concerning studies that could be undertaken by TSB as mentioned in the resolution. Also maybe organizing workshops and seminars, producing reports, and guidelines by Study Groups. And also maybe establishing the platform for peer learning although there is already an established one, but by the focus group on digital financial service, but maybe an update might be needed. So that are, from my point of view the financial implications that may arise from this resolution.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Egypt. This is noted, we will send the communication to Committee 2 for

assessment. We proceed to agenda item 8F which is on combating mobile Telecom device theft. Mr. Isaac Wharton of Ghana his report is available as DT108.

Ghana, you have the floor.

>> GHANA: Thank you, Chairman, for the opportunity. As was instructed yesterday, we met actually this morning from 8 to 9 with all concerned parties in the room. We managed to get consensus as far as this contributions from two regions are concerned, one from the RCC and the other one from the CITEEL region. However, Mr. Chairman, there are some few areas of departures that we have not been able to get consensus on, particularly on the subject related to DOA and also the title of the resolution itself. And some few references to IM, but I would say in a nutshell we have been able to get consensus as far as the new resolution is concerned. In the morning I tried, in the afternoon I tried to have some informal discussions with some few proposers and some compromise has been proposed by Russia with regards to the text in square brackets which I have managed to do that this afternoon but unfortunately I have not gotten time to meet with all the concerned parties. We may ask for some time to be able to meet with the concerned party and come back with a fully-fledged resolution that we

will try to take out to all the square bracket and be able to present to you maybe in a jiffy, thank you, that is the status at this point on this, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Ghana. I see a number of issues to be resolved, even apart from the decision which will come out of the DOA consultations that is going on.

While the DOA consultations are going on now, I will also urge you to continue with this to come back with a clean text. I hope that your resolve will also give us a cleaner text so that we can consider this later on. So ladies and gentlemen, if you agree with me, we can then move on to agenda item 8G.

Thank you very much. Ghana, you can withdraw your question for the floor. 8G is on combating counterfeiting, DT102. And again Mr. Isaac of Ghana, you have the floor.

>> Thank you, Chairman, for the opportunity with this one as well. This one too, Mr. Chairman, we have managed to get some consensus on that but again I will indicate that it is also a bit related to the DOA and also the X .1255 recommendations, and also some few references that have to do with IME that will need clarification, also some results from the outcome. Aside from that Mr. Chairman, this resolution will be

to go forward with a new resolution.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your report. This is also dependent on the outcome of the DOA discussions. 8H is on resolution 78, and it also is dependent on the DOA discussions. So ladies and gentlemen, if you can hold on to resolution 78 as well. Thank you. Please note all these, we will come back to them when we get the results from the DOA discussions.

I want us to go back to 8A, if Bahrain is in the room, we are looking at the results from the ad hoc group on the ITRs, and your report is available as DT81. Bahrain, you have the floor.

>> Bahrain: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We, as you know, were task on finding a resolution with regard to the proposal regarding ITRs, we met twice to review the three contributions that were submitted for formal consultation. We are pleased to present the consensus solution we have reached through these discussions and meetings presented in DT81 as you have mentioned.

We note that this has come to you with no brackets and with the consensus agreement of all participants. I would like to take this opportunity to thank them for their time, their sense, their spirit of compromise and consensus that has allowed us to reach this result.



Through you, Mr. Chairman, I thank them and I thank you. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Mohammed Abdoulaye of Bahrain for your report.

I see Egypt asking for the floor. Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you so much, Mr. Chair. I would like to thank the informal consultation Chair for the great effort and hard work he made to achieve the concrete results and to come up with this final text which resulted in a reconciled agreement and also I would like to thank all the participants participated in this resolution. Thank you so much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Do we have an agreement that we have this draft new resolution on ITR? I see no one asking for the floor. If you can scroll it a bit down, okay, so here we have a draft new resolution on ITR.

(gavel).

And just to make fun of it the ITR if it's projected again you see it's in square brackets but you have agreed with it. Thank you very much for the outcome on this.

We will ask if there are any financial implications to this, Mr. Mossadd, are there financial implications?

Bahrain, you have the floor.

>> Bahrain: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. On review of the text, I do not believe there are any direct financial implications. The only financial implications that could arise as this are translation of documents and the like, which would happen as the normal course of work conducted in the relevant expert group on ITRs.

However, I do not believe that this would generate, this resolution would generate any new financial implications. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Bahrain. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Yes, thank you, Chairman. I'd like to thank Mosad for a wonderful job done Chairing the ad hoc group. In regard to the financial implications of course, Mr. Chairman, there will be financial implications for the union, as a whole. There are relevant documents from Councils meeting in 2016 to the effect that with the number of meetings of the expert group on the ITRs, which may be four between now and Council 2018, the estimated cost including translation and interpretation is around 612,000 Swiss francs. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Canada. We will note this and we will send a note to Committee 2 for assessment on financial implications on this new resolution.

Thank you very much. If this is fine with everybody, we can proceed on and come back to agenda item 8B, which is on strengthening and diversifying the resources of the Telecom standardization sector of the ITU. UAE, if your report is ready, as DT97. UAE, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'm happy to report to you the consultations that took place with number of colleagues who have raised some concerns during your Committee 4 meeting.

So the results of this consultation, Mr. Chairman, is that inviting or instructing the TSB Director, we have done some amendment to that specific part, instructing the TSB Director, to participate in the study noting B, and the study noting B it's the recommendation of 2016 session of the ITU Council that study be presented to the 2017 session of the Council identifying all possible resources of revenue for the union without this direction to INRs.

So results instruct coming back to the results part, results instruct the director of the communications

standardization Bureau to participate in the study in noting B, for possible new measures to generate additional revenue for ITU-T, including revenues that may be obtained from IN Rs and conformance testing.

The remaining part on the resolves was suppressed and also was deleted, and also the invites the Council part was deleted. So with this, I'd like to thank all the parties who were involved in this consultation. I put forward this document to you, Mr. Chairman, for the agreement by com 4, and take it to com 5, the Editorial Committee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Chair of this ad hoc. Drafting team on strengthening, diversifying resources of telecommunications standardization sector of ITU. As we have it, is there any concern with this text, as was agreed?

I see no one asking for the floor. Do we then agree to transmit this to Committee 5 for translation in all the languages for approval at the plenary? I see no one asking for the floor.

So, thank you very much.

(sound of gavel).

We have this new resolution.

Does it have any financial implications, ask the

Chair. UAE, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Well, I believe these studies that the TSB director is asked to do are in line with the Council resolution, that there might be some additional costs if consultants are to be appointed to do some studies on other parts.

However, in general, I think this is in line with the Council decision, as I mentioned in noting B. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So again, we will send a note to Committee 2 for assessment on this resolution.

Thank you very much for your work and for everyone who participated to bring us this result.

With this, I want us to go through agenda item 8 again, and for us to know what the status. We have dealt with 8A, B, C, D, E, so A to E, we have agreed to all these new resolutions, and for them to go to com 5 for translation, and to com 2 for financial assessment.

Then we have F, G and H, which are dependent on the outcomes of the DOA discussions. So we put them on hold for now.

With this said, we started this meeting, this

afternoon's session with agenda item 6, which also involve Study Group 20, we know Study Group 20 ad hoc group was meeting. We will take their reports. So we will hold on 6 as well. But again, under 7, we had to skip 7.1 because the presenter was not ready.

So at this time, we want to complete agenda item 7 with 7.1 presented and for us to go into any discussions as it is. If Africa is ready, your proposal as 42 A3 2/2, you have the floor, Uganda.

>> UGANDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your patience. This proposal looks at the proposal made by the TSB, the Director of TSB on the reorganizing of the groups and Study Groups to make them more efficient.

And whereas the African Group welcomes this and is in support of efforts to make the ITU as a whole and ITU-T specifically more efficient, we are proposing that the TSAG sets up a Working Group to review this with the following approach, assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the current structure and organisation of the ITU Study Groups, evaluating the recommendations of the ITU-T and their implementation by membership and the sector, and determining the optimized restructuring and make any proposals. We also propose this group then brings their findings and recommendations to the

attention of the Study Groups 1 year prior to the next WTSA, that is WTSA 20, as well as the membership for their comment.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I submit.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Uganda, for presenting this proposal. Are there any questions for this proposal? I see no one asking for the floor. Just for clarification, the TSAG has a Rapporteur group on work programme and Study Group structure. Will it be acceptable by the African region that this proposal will be tabled to TSAG during their next meeting for consideration? Africa, or Uganda. Uganda, you have the floor.

>> UGANDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The proposal is welcome.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your understanding. So this proposal may be submitted to the next TSAG meeting as the other Rapporteur group on work programme and Study Group structure. Thank you for your understanding.

With this, agenda item 7 is dealt with.

We will go to agenda item 4, now we come back to agenda item 4. We want to take outputs of Working Group 4B, which is now available as DT107. Mr. Jeferson Nacif is the Chair of Working Group 4B. Brazil, you have the

floor.

>> JEFERSONNACIF: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like now to present document DT107, which is the output of the fourth Working Group 4B meeting to Committee 4.

The fourth meeting, we had the fourth meeting today, November 1, and in this meeting we agreed to invite com 4 to forward the revised text of resolution 54 which is presented in DT113 to Committee 5 for its review. We also invite Committee 4 to forward the revised text of resolution 75 as presented in document DT114. We invite Committee 4 to forward the new resolution on facilitating the implementation of this African manifesto as presented in DT115. The last is to inform com 4 in line with document 63 that the following text in the new resolution on smart Africa manifesto have potential, may have potential financial impacts. We invite com 4 to forward this to com 2. The instructs Director of TSB also to strengthen trainings and guides, Africa Member States, partners and industries and organisation in adoption of ITU-T standards. In this instructs the Director of TSB, Mr. Chairman, there is the provision that we think may have some financial impacts, so it must be forwarded to com 2.



With this, Mr. Chairman, I conclude my report, my output report for you. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Jeferson Nacif for your report. So ladies and gentlemen, we will go through this report to agree on the submissions of Working Group 4B.

The first is to look at the revised text of resolution 54, presented as DT113, and if it can be projected on the screen, DT113.

As reported this was agreed at Working Group 4B, revised text, revised resolution 54, creation of assistance to regional groups. Do we agree to transmit this to com 5 for translation to all languages? I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you very much.

(gavel).

We have resolution 54 revised. We have to look at the second which is revised text of resolution 75 presented as DT114. DT114 will be projected on the screen. Is there any concern with revised text for resolution 75?

I see no one asking for the floor. Even though it is not being projected now, do we have the agreement. Yes, it's projected now. Resolution 75 as revised. I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you very much.

We have revised text for resolution 75.

(sound of gavel).

New resolution on facilitating implementation of the smart Africa manifesto is presented as DT115.

DT115, to be projected on the screen. Are there any concerns with this draft new resolution as being projected now?

I see no one asking for the floor. So again, thank you for this draft new resolution on facilitating the implementation of the Smart Africa Manifesto.

The fourth point was for us to communicate to Committee 2 that under the instructs of the TSB Director A may have financial implications. This is noted and do we agree to transmit to Committee 4? I see no one asking for the floor. Thank you very much. This will be done. Mr. Jeferson Nacif we thank you for these outputs. I suppose you may want us to consider your report as DT11 rev 4. So project DT18 rev 4 as the report of Working Group 4B.

DT18 rev 4.

Ladies and gentlemen, we want to take the report of Working Group 4B as we have already considered the outcomes of this group, and we want to formalize the report of Working Group 4B. So again I give the floor

to Mr. Jeferson Nacif to take us through his report.  
Brazil, you have the floor.

>> JEFERSON NACIF: Thank you very much,  
Mr. Chairman.

I will present a very brief summary of this document DT18, as the report of all the four meetings that we had here in this plenary. We had the first meeting on October 26, on October 27, October 28 and November 1. We had discussed the IAP 7, resolution, on the first day. We have also discussed the resolution 44 and the proposed suppression of resolution 59 which was not agreed. So resolution 59 will not be suppressed. We came to conclusion on resolution 44, bridging the standardization gap between developing and developed countries. We also discussed resolution 59, on enhancing participation of telecommunication operators from developing countries which will continue as I said. We had also discussions regarding on Friday, October 27, on resolution 54, on the creation of and assistance to regional groups, which occurred to conclude today. Today we also finalized our discussions on resolution 75.

Today we had to present the proposal from African states on facilitating the implementation of the Smart

Africa Manifesto, as we could see we had, we reached very good consensus on the meeting and that is again, Mr. Chairman, the report, very detailed report in DT18 which I submit to this plenary to approval. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Jeferson Nacif for your report and for your work, to state that this Assembly appreciates all your work, and you see that in presenting your report, the agreement is so loud, and I can see everybody is so comfortable. So if you can give Mr. Jeferson Nacif a hand for his work.

(applause).

That closes issues on Working Group 4B. We now come back to Working Group 4A, and here in the morning, we took outputs which were available in DT100 rev 1. It was a very peaceful DT. Now, we have another DT which also is an output from Working Group 4A, DT106. We want to go through DT106. So I will invite the Chair of Working Group 4A to take us through DT106. Mr. Fabio Bigi, you have the floor.

>> FABIOTBIGI: Thank you, Chairman. As you see these are the pending items, some are linked with the issue, the matter which one you know, you will decide how to proceed.

Item 1 is text on new resolution Arab 6, as presented in TD 85, and as you remember, it was decided that the ad hoc group of chaired by Malaysia will deal with this matter. I don't know when will be the point to discuss that, and is linked with the other solution. I wait for your guidance on this point.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Chair. So this issue is still going on with SG 20 matters. So you may proceed on to the next one. Thank you.

>> FABIO BIGI: But I want to have confirmation from you. The second one is, and the third one, really I will ask you to take together. One is the text is presented in TD 79, and the third one is revised resolution 29 as presented in TD 68. These are linked with the definition of OTT, let's me use what was be changed, and informal authorize ad hoc group to continue informal discussion, and report to me, and maybe can be solved both or not solved both.

I draw your attention, there is the TD but there is also the report of the informal discussion in TD 116.

And if you authorize me, I give the convener from Brazil to state you the result of this informal discussion. After, we can go back to resolution.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Bigi. So Brazil, you have

the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chairman.

Yesterday after the Working Group 4A meeting, there was an informal discussion related to OTT resolution, and we almost have an agreement, and there is just one pending related to the definition of, in the terminology, about the services in the resolution. The text I've sent it. It's already posted on the DT -- let me see -- 116. And that it's posted. And all the controversies is indicated in the yellow part. Maybe if you can make it some consultations to the floor, I think maybe you could try to solve it here. There is just almost all versions are agreed, it is the definition about the on-line services that is the resolution. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. Thank you, Mr. Bigi.

So here, what I understand is that there are a number of square brackets. And they are highlighted in yellow, as we see on the screen. It's all got to do with the definition.

Let me ask from the convener, is there something that you suppose could be resolved with informal consultations, or this is something you feel we should move forward to the plenary?

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chairman. This is the result,

I think, probably is the final result in terms of text. It is almost agreed, I think, probably we should take some minutes at this plenary here try to get some consensus. But if not, you can submit to the plenary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So I will attempt for us to remove the square brackets which is in yellow, and it runs through the text. It repeats itself. I know there are aspects in numeric which I am naming. Study Group 2, are you here? You could help us with definitions.

I see Argentina asking for the floor. Argentina, you have the floor.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you very much, Chair. This is just to give a little bit of explanation for those who didn't participate in these discussions on this resolution, as it was indicated by the Brazilian delegate. Following a lot of work, we managed to, we weren't able to agree on the title. Therefore, this proposal here has not yet been agreed by all the regions. But I think if we can try to debate and discuss in this session of the Committee here, we would be able to save a bit of time from the plenary, and we will try to reflect in the best way possible the views of those who participated. And we would propose therefore a compromised text to review in this title.

And perhaps, if we could really make efforts to discuss this further in this meeting, I think we might be able to reach an agreed text, which we can send to the plenary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Argentina. Considering that there was no alternative text to this title and it repeats itself in this resolution, can we agree to remove the square brackets for this to be the title for this new resolution? Considering that the other parts on those two then are agreed, is this something which is acceptable by everyone?

I see Egypt and Russia asking for the floor. I'm asking or I'm proposing that considering that there was no other text as a title for this draft near resolution, can we consider to remove the square brackets and for the text to remain as a title for this new resolution? Because every other part of the text is agreed. If this is agreeable by you, you don't need to say yes. You may withdraw your request.

I see Egypt and Russia asking for the floor. Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We really appreciate the efforts done by the convener of this group, and the all Member States in order to reach consensus



on the term for OTT. My question is, if we are talking about the public numbering resources, so what about the applications that are not using public numbering resources, like Facebook?

On the other hand, also, I think we would like to change, replace services by applications, since these are applications, and not services. That is one of the things that we were thinking of in this. Okay, Mr. Chair --

>> CHAIR: Egypt, you have the floor.

>> Egypt and also, public, I'm questioning the term public resources. Public telecommunication numbering resources. We prefer not to have public, okay, but and also we question that applications that are not, which are not using public resources like Facebook how are they going to treat it in. It is not included like this in this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Egypt.

I want to let this be easy on all of us, and also considering that we need time for other issues. This is a text and there was no alternative and it is in square bracket, and my proposal was that we accept this text and remove the square bracket.

There are no answers to this than to propose that

we will want it, the title read in the particular way. So what I was proposing, if you don't agree, and you want to propose a new title, please go ahead with the no, and the new title. We are now trying to name a baby so we take all the names of the baby and we see which one is nice. Okay? I consider that with the work that you have all agreed to, we can remove the square bracket. But if you have a nicer name than this one, we could as well look at it to consider.

So again, Russia, you have the floor.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. We are not against this name, of course we have our own option for it but we would like to share certain concerns we have. Perhaps somebody in the room could respond to this or perhaps the Secretariat will be required.

If we adopt a resolution with such a name, we are taking it as guidance for action. We should understand that in our sector, work is ongoing, on under the name OTT. In the D sector, development sector, there was research being done on OTT precisely, and the subject at the beginning of this contribution, subject was OTT. There is a draft recommendation which includes the word, OTT as well.

How should this work be carried out, if we are going

to have a resolution which has this title. We will have to change all the names of other resolutions, recommendations which are OTT to this name. And how will we reflect the work on OTT as one of the forms of work under this resolution. If this term covers the term OTT, then we should be aware as to whether or not the term OTT will be used in our work, but or whether it will be replaced by this terminology. If we agree that OTT falls under the umbrella of this title and this title is more general, then we have a proposal which might assist you.

We looked at the document of the union, the documents of the union and we have a stable proposal, modern telecommunication/ICT services and applications. This if we choose the option of having a resolution covering a broader form of range of services, if we can concentrate on OTT alone in our work, then we should call this baby OTT. That is our proposal, Chairman, colleagues. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. I see United Kingdom asking for the floor. UK, you have the floor.

>> UK: Thank you, Chair. I couldn't help but notice and I'm speaking as the editor of ITU-T recommendation E164, that when you actually begin to

name a baby, and the family gets together and starts discussing what the name of the baby should be, that perhaps the antecedents of the name is to be considered. The last part of that title when we were talking in the ad hoc last night, there was a lot of debate around the name and trying to get public telecommunications numbering. And just to point out that that title containing international public telecommunication numbering, is actually part of the title of the ITU-T public, international public telecommunication numbering plan from which all telephone numbers globally derive.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the clarity, that remains because it's consistent what we have at the ITU when it comes to all numbering resources. I see United States asking for the floor. I see Senegal. I want to close the list, and the godfathers will want to name this baby.

So United States, Senegal, Sweden, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, well, too many godfathers. Okay. You all take a minute each, please. You just say no to me and then you tell me the name that the baby should be called. I want to close the list, United States, Sweden, Bahrain, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Russia, UAE, Jordan, and Australia. Egypt. The list is closed.

(sound of gavel).

Very nice.

Why don't we call this baby by all these names, United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chairman. I want to thank the Chair of the drafting group. We spent a lot of time this weekend discussing this resolution, and the United States has come a long ways from when we started discussing. This is a very carefully crafted compromise, any changes the U.S. could not support this resolution. We have come a very, a long way, so as it stands now, the text on the screen, we could support taking the square brackets off.

However, any changes to the text we cannot support it. Thank you.

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

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. Are we discussing just the title now, or will we go through the whole document? That is my first question, because the instructs part, were partly bracketed, and I'm not sure if that will be discussed also. With regard to changing the definition at this moment, after having spent five days discussing that, and the convener and associates to him

have asked us about the text you had on the screen at the outset, well, we can't accept the suggestion that was just made, that's a step back to Wednesday last week. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sweden. Bahrain, you have the floor.

>> Bahrain: Thank you, Mr. Chair. First of all, we would like to thank all who participated in the extensive work and discussions that we have had during the ad hoc that worked on this particular matter. Keep my intervention short so the title I'm proposing is, emerging call and messaging application and services, emerging on-line call and messaging, emerging on-line applications for call and messaging. That's it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Let me get this right. Emerging on-line call and messaging applications.

>> Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Bahrain. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. We support the proposal from the Russian delegation. As regards the latter proposal, that is also a proposal which we could go along with. We could also add in the term, video.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Now we take Senegal. Senegal, you have the floor.

>> SENEGAL: Thank you, Chairman. We support the second proposal, with the mention of on-line, with communication application instead of call, communication application, please. All of this is in order to come up with a compromise situation, because as was said, it has taken us a great deal of time to come to this agreement.

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

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes, thank you very much, Chairman. We will support any decision that our meeting makes, but there is just one thing that I wanted to touch on.

The resolution contains in specific indications in instructions to continue with work which is ongoing, to continue this work. We need to clearly reflect what work this is then, because there is no work under such a title which is being carried out now. Either we can do this easily by indicating what work we understand to be undertaken under this long and complicated title of on-line services and so on and so forth, and requesting access to public, which is requesting access to public

numbering resources. That is the point I'd like to touch on. Can we work further on this resolution, can we implement it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I will want to intervene here before I give the opportunity to UAE, Jordan, Australia and Egypt as the list closed on them. I want to clarify that in this Assembly we came in with certain words like 5G and all that and yesterday, we resolved that we could replace 5G with a word like IMT 2020.

So there may be certain words that we may be used to, that we, in this Assembly, could find new names for it. I think the understanding from this drafting session was that you know what this resolution is about. You really know what applications or services that you want to address this resolution with.

It is just a matter of removing the square brackets, and then we have a resolution. Can I appeal to you, that considering that at this stage, and considering that as the resolutions always consider, so further considering that for all the hours that you spent in discussing this, we could remove the square brackets, and keep the name as it is on the screen, so that we can have this resolution. Because all the various proposals that seem to be coming is like bringing back



all the arguments again. Can we step forward by removing the brackets, and staying within name as we understand what we want it to address.

Will this be fine with everyone, if this will be good for everyone, then I will plead with UAE, Jordan, Australia, and Egypt as they requested for the floor to withdraw their request, if you are in agreement with me.

Okay. So I see Australia is in agreement with me. I see UAE, Jordan and Egypt insisting to have the floor. UAE, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Exactly Mr. Chairman, as you just explained, the subject is very clear to all parties. Mr. Chairman, when we come to the OTT discussion, we speak about digital services, so this is the first direct proposal we have to say on-line digital services, and then we speak about certain type of services. What are those services, they are voice, video and messaging. So the second proposal is to add for voice, comma, video and messaging. Mr. Chairman, here we speak about generally the services related to the let us say OTT, if we can entitle it in this way. So then there is no actually need to have that requires access to international public telecommunication

numbering resources, because regardless of now what is the number resource that is going to be adopted, I think this is an important aspect that needs to be studied from economic, operational and other aspects as exactly mentioned in the resolves part.

Whatever relevant aspects related to numbering or any other aspect for economic and operational need to be addressed by the studies. So I think having the numbering resources in the title has nothing to do with the resolution at all. Or even in the text itself. I think it's one of the aspects that needs to be considered but not the only aspect that needs to be considered.

Again, Mr. Chairman, the first proposal was to add-on line digital services for voice, comma, video and messaging that require access, so delete that require access to international public telecommunication numbering resources.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE, from the submissions made by member countries, some have indicated with support that any change in the text in yellow as is coming from the drafting session they will not accept it.

So that is a default, and that is why I want us to move on without any renaming or changing of this text. Considering that we don't agree to change this text,

and considering that we don't agree to keep this text, would we agree to forward this as a text to the plenary for a decision? If you agree on this proposal, kindly withdraw your request. That we forward this to the plenary, if you agree, now the step is that we are no longer doing a renaming, because we don't agree to change the text, we don't agree to remove the square brackets. We have ideas for new names, so we have no consensus on what the title should be. And my new proposal is that do we agree to take this draft resolution as it is, with the square brackets, to the plenary. If you agree, then we have to withdraw our requests for the floor. If you agree, then we have to withdraw our request for the floor. I see Sweden, Bahrain, Cote d'Ivoire asking for the floor. Sweden, you have the floor.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. Could you just show us the instruct parts? The last part of the document.

>> CHAIR: Sorry, not to cut you, but Sweden, I asked and I proposed something. Can you respond directly to my proposal, is it that you don't agree we forward this to the plenary for further discussion? We can stop the discussion here and move on for it to go to the plenary. That was my proposal. Can you directly address my proposal, please? Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: I need to come back, sorry. I withdraw my request.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sweden. Bahrain, you have the floor.

>> Bahrain: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Considering the discussions that we have had, I believe we could try to achieve a consensus in this room rather than forwarding it to plenary. Unfortunately, Chair, I would not agree with your approach if we can try to finalize it here, we have tried to put forward the reasoning for why we believe the title should change and should not include access to public numbering. We would like to understand why can't that be taken forward and accepted? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Bahrain, for your submission. No consensus. And as some member countries stated that any change in this text they will not agree to it. So, I see Cote d'Ivoire and UAE insisting to have the floor. And Jordan as well. My proposal was clear. For us to forward this to the plenary, and Bahrain is saying no, we have to deal with it in this plenary. Is there support for Bahrain? I want us to move on. Is there support for Bahrain for us to deal with this at com 4? If there is support, you ask for the floor. If you don't have

support for the Bahrain proposal, you can withdraw your request.

I get the sense that there is Cote d'Ivoire, UAE, United States, Saudi Arabia, Russia, Zimbabwe, Egypt, everyone saying they can discuss this further. This when you are requesting for this floor this is what it means.

This is my proposal. Bahrain, will you accept to take on informal consultations with these countries, Coted'Ivoire, UnitedArabEmirates, UnitedStates, Saudi Arabia, Russia, Zimbabwe, Egypt, Senegal, Jordan and Cameroon, to resolve this issue, so that we can go back to com 4 Working Group 4A for their other outputs, please. Bahrain, you have the floor.

>> Bahrain: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll be more than happy to do that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So with this, we proceed, the understanding is that Bahrain will hold on further consultation with all the countries who are interested to get this clean before it goes to plenary.

So thank you very much for withdrawing your request. So any other issues with this particular new resolution, Bahrain will give us some result before this meeting closes today. Bahrain, thank you very much.

Mr. Bigi, here we are. Can we proceed? Thank you.

Italy, you have the floor.

>> FABIO BIGI: You have all my moral support.

(chuckles).

The only thing I can say.

The one resolution on numbering, resolution 29, was point 3 in my report, is linked also with the OTT. So maybe we have to skip and come back once that has been solved, provided there is no proposal from the convener, Phil Reston on this particular point. May I ask Phil if he has on resolution 29 any further update, in that case we will remain TD 68 revision 1.

>> CHAIR: United Kingdom, you have the floor.

>> UK: Thank you, Chair good afternoon. Indeed, in conducting informal discussions with respect to resolution 29, the position remains that it is to await the outcome of the discussion on the OTT resolution at this time. We look forward to that, so as we can take resolution 29 forward for completion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So I see Egypt asking for the floor. So, Bahrain, please note that this other resolution is also pending your results from consultation. Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. First I would like to thank the UK for his effort and the Chairman, but

I think I want to raise here that there is a big difference between the resolution 29 and the scope of the resolution 29 and the scope of the OTT resolution.

Resolution 29 is concerned with alternative Related calling procedures and mentioning OTT as a type, one type of alternative calling procedure which is, which is clearly in the scope of Study Group 2 in the paragraph of this resolution.

So I don't think there is any need to stop considering resolution 29 until finalizing the OTT resolution. There is big difference in both. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt, just to say that the first President of Ghana, Marie Fati from Egypt so they are very good relations so let me show the link between these two if it is not clear to anyone, that as you admitted that OTTs are part of alternative calling procedures, so then there is the link. The other bit of it is as we have done in this Assembly there are certain Study Groups whom we have heard their mandates and lead roles resolved, but because they are tied with issues of Study Group 20, we have to hold on. It is something that we have progressed in this Assembly and if you accept that because there is a linkage between this resolution and that of the OTTs, we will allow that they will be solved

and be put together so we can proceed as such. If Egypt will allow we can go in this direction as we have been doing for com 4 meetings. I see Egypt asking for the floor and Jordan as well. Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the resolution, for the resolution of the OTT, we are concerned with the OTT and the main scope of the OTT declaration and many terms. But in the other resolution of 29, what we are talking about is alternative calling procedure and misuse and fraud. This is mentioned in item number 4 and under item number 5. So we are not, OTT is not a main part of this contribution. What we are talking about is misuse or fraud, in this resolution. And as the delegate of Russian in his before conversation said OTT is declared in many other areas of ITU.

So, I think we can consider resolution 25 as it is alternative calling procedure and it is related to the misuse and fraud mentioning only OTT as part of the fraud.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Here you finally landed on the point that you can link OTT to the fraud which happens with alternative calling procedures. So there is a link. If you accept this and for us to proceed on that. Jordan, you have the floor.



>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The fact that we are using the word OTT in this resolution is the link with the new resolution, because some arguments saying that we don't know what is OTT. It is in yesterday meeting that we approve the questions of Study Group 3, and one of the questions that we have approved to continue the study on is the economic and regulatory impact of the Internet convergence and the new services such as OTT. How come we approve on a question that already related to a continuation of a study that already Study Group 3 are doing relating to the impact, economic impact of OTT on the international telecommunication service and we are not able to accept that we will put the word OTT as an example in the resolution. Even though the question that we have approved is exactly the title of the resolution that we were debating now. The resolution about the OTT is about the impact of the OTT on the international telecommunication services. We instruct Study Group 3 and Study Group 2 to continue the relevant studies, what are the relevant, related studies, the studies on the economic impact and other studies related to operational aspect of the misuse and fraud using the OTT. So I am surprised, we are linking things together while they are so clear to us. The issue on this

resolution is why we want to use the word OTT, because we don't know. And in yesterday we approve a question that we all recognize what does mean OTT.

We are debating a resolution that should have a title on OTT, even though that we know the study is about the impact on the OTT on the international telecommunication services. So I'm just, I want to note that this for the meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jordan, for your articulation and so, Bahrain has accepted to take all this discussions and give us a report, and just as you said, there is a link between resolution 29 and also that of the new draft resolution. So thank you for emphasizing that.

I will now want us to go to Working Group 4A Chair to take us through the remainder of his outputs. Mr. Bigi, you have the floor.

>> FABIO BIGI: Thank you, Chairman.

I am afraid I have two other resolutions who are pending waiting for resolution from I11, these are resolution 50 in TD 83 revision 1 and resolution 60 in TD 69, because these are quoting some terminology that has been discussed at the head of delegation meeting, and we have to expect the result and I think we come

to your Committee later on if at all possible.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Bigi. So we have to hold on to revised text for resolutions 50 and 60, pending the outcome of the discussions on the terminologies as may so agree. So you are left with one more, which is on the revised text of resolution 52, if you will take us through that.

>> FABIO BIGI: Hoping that we will be more lucky let's say, let's hope, always my wish is, that you have in TD 84 and there is still a square brackets on further instructs, where there was reference to Study Group 3.

And there they were question were stopped because there were still not sure what will be the mandate of Study Group 3. It was not necessary to quote here or not necessary, so I, as Chairman, I am not bias, whatever solution, delete 3, delete the brackets, for me, everything is fine, no problem. Provided we agree at least on that agreement.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, so if you can project DT84, yes, and we have, this is the part, the further instructs 4, which is in highlighted in yellow. So as we agreed on the mandate of Study Group 3, related to spam policy, regulatory and economic issues, and their impact. So here firstly, the issue of regulatory was

not agreed as part of the text and mandate of Study Group 3. So we could take that one out in the meantime. So with this deletion of regulatory, do we accept to remove the square brackets? I see Japan asking for the floor. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As far as the mandate of the Study Group 3 is concerned, I'm sure that there is no term as spam in the new Study Group 3 mandate. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. We support the intervention from our colleagues of Japan. The current Study Group 3 text does not include spam as part of its mandate. We also draw your attention to the fact that the proposal was to continue its work. When this was first introduced, the U.S. asked, is work currently under way and the answer we received was, not right now.

My recollection of the conversation was, pending the resolution of what is the current mandate of Study Group 3, that we could remove this text. Now that it's clear that there is no proposal to include spam in Study Group 3's mandate, we insist that we remove this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: My understanding from the United States is that you want the entire further instructs 4 to be removed. Is that the case? Right, thank you. I have Australia, I have United Kingdom, Jordan, Brazil, Saudi Arabia asking for the floor on this matter -- Jordan. I want to close the list. Coming quickly as much as possible for a minute to let us know the way forward. Australia, United Kingdom, Jordan, Brazil, Saudi Arabia, Russia, UAE and Canada. The list is closed. Thank you. Australia, you have the floor.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you Chair. In the interest of saving time I would like to say that we support your suggestions to remove the term regulatory, and we also support the comments of our colleagues from Japan and the U.S. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia. UK, you have the floor.

>> UK: Thank you, Chair. Speaking on behalf of CEPT, we support the suggestion that further instructs 4 should be removed. We think following the discussions on Study Group 3, it's no longer appropriate here and should be removed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We do not support

removing this. Basically we did explain that in yesterday when we agree on the mandate of Study Group 3, there were technical issues related to economic and regulatory and policy issues as well mandate regarding consumer protection issues. Basically we are looking on the issue of spam from the side of the consumer. We are not saying that Study Group 3 will have a specific mandate to related to spam. In this text we are talking about publication, we talk about technical papers, related to the spam, and from the consumer perspective, what can Study Group 3 do related to spam and anti-spam regulatory measures. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jordan. You have brought a very different perspective to this debate. I want to pause here. I'll give all those requesting the floor the opportunity, if we may progress at this point.

What I got from Japan and I suppose that is the Chair of Study Group 3 is that currently, Study Group 3 do not do any work related to spam. The sentence as it reads now is saying Study Group 3 is going to continue its work related to spam policy.

That is what SG 3 Chair indicated. What Jordan is saying is that considering the resolutions on consumer

protection, then and also looking at the mandate which has been assigned Study Group 3, then it will be interested that this spam policy will be coming under the mandate of Study Group 3. In this case, it is not a work to continue but it's a work to start. If you agree on this front, it means that this entire sentence, if we want it to reflect as per the perspective from SG 3 Chair, and also as from the perspective of Jordan, can I request that SG 3 Chair and Distinguished Delegate from Jordan will sit together and give us the appropriate text for further instructs 4.

If this is acceptable by the meeting, then we can proceed on that front. If this is acceptable, then you can withdraw your request. So that we can proceed. Because the sentence as it stands now is not a fact. If you accept to withdraw our request, it means that Jordan and Study Group 3 Chair could come up with an appropriate text for further instructs 4.

I see Brazil insisting to have the floor, Russia, Canada, United States, Japan, Egypt. UK. The list is growing. Right, Brazil, you have the floor.

>>BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair. I think this is a simple question. As was just mentioned, this is not a fact, yeah, actually, there was no work being done in SG 3

in the last study period on that, and this is not even in the mandate that were just approved in the com 4 meeting for SG 3. So we support the proposal to delete all the further instructs 2 -- 4. Thank you.

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

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. We are grateful for the opportunity to express our opinion. As far as we recall, the discussions focused more on the mandate of Study Group 3 itself, and the part on policy, regulatory and economic issues which were indicated. Since the whole resolution pertains to the issue of spam, then clearly this issue should not specifically be in the mandate of the Study Group, because it is a question which might be considered later or looking at the economic consequences of spam or the political ones too.

The discussion only focused on whether or not it would be the economic consequences or regulatory consequences to be considered, because the regulatory ones were excluded from the mandate of SG 3, then we can say that we can change the text, indicating an invitation to Study Group 3 to consider these issues, study these issues in this current study period. We won't



run counter to any of previously taken decisions. We will simply draw on them. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. At this stage I'll plead again to propose another way forward. And if that will, let's everyone withdraw their list. We can look at further instructs 4 and say, ITU-T Study Group 3 to consider policy and economic, to consider studies on policy and economic issues related to spam. Will this be acceptable by everyone? Further instructs ITU-T Study Group 3 to consider studies on policy and economic issues related to spam. If you agree with my proposal, kindly withdraw your request. If you agree with my proposal, kindly withdraw your request.

Okay. So I see Canada, United States, Japan, UK and Australia. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair. I agree that time is precious here so I will be brief. We would support the suppression of further instructs 4, and along the lines and the views expressed from Brazil and the UK. We don't see the mandate. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. To clarify our position on this point, the problem is not, is not related to Study Group, it is not specifically

related to what work Study Group 3 focuses on. It is that we don't see a need for the ITU-T Study Group 3 to study policy aspects related to this topic. The technical, we agree that this is an important problem facing all stakeholders around the world, that this issue is best achieved through a combination of technical and policy measures, but the technical measures are under way already under study in Study Group 17. The policy measures are actually also well under study in ITU-D question 3/2.

That is where we think is the appropriate place to address those issues as there are already globally accepted best practices for issues that are related to these issues. We think it would be a duplication and an unnecessary focus for Study Group 3. Once again, now that we have explained our position, we continue to believe that suppression is the best option here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. So again that was to address that the statement as it came in square brackets was not a fact and Jordan raised the need for Study Group 3 to study this, to follow up on the resolution on consumer protection, and the U.S. is saying that such studies are currently going on at ITU-D. And therefore,

if we sustain further instructs 4, it will be duplication of work in the same ITU.

With this said, I propose that we delete the entire 4. Would that be acceptable by everyone? Will you withdraw your request if you accept my proposal for us to delete further instructs 4, to have this revised resolution. I see many withdrawing their requests. I have two asking for the floor. Meaning you don't agree with me, three asking for the floor. Okay. I get the indication that you don't agree with further instructs 4. I'll propose something else.

What I propose is that we will keep that in square brackets and we take it to the plenary to deal with it. If you agree with taking this to the plenary, kindly withdraw your request. We have done everything to resolve this. We can't change the text. We can't delete it. Can we send it to the plenary, please? I see Russia asking for the floor. Russia, you have the floor.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. We are very grateful to you for your attempt to seek a solution. We are also grateful to the United States for their very clear comments. We understand their position. We would like to support you in your first proposal, and ask the United States whether or not we

could proceed in this way, to meet with the delegates of Jordan and Bahrain so that perhaps we could unite our efforts and try to find maybe literally 20 minutes so as either to make our positions closer on this issue or to come up with some kind of a solution which would satisfy you. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. What I gather from Russia is that they propose otherwise to my proposal to taking this to the plenary, and they will want, they want to contact interested parties to be able to bring a result to this further instructs 4. If this is acceptable by everyone, Russia, I'll be coming to you. Can you kindly withdraw your request so that we can proceed. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair, we are happy to discuss this further but like we said, this is really a duplication of work. We know that there is a representative from the BDT here that works directly on these issues. We wonder that, if, we are okay sending this in brackets to the plenary, but if this is a complete duplication of work, then maybe we don't need to. Perhaps if the, maybe the BDT can shed some light and explain some of the efforts they have under way there.

We are happy to consult but we are not sure what

it would accomplish, because again, ITU-D Study Group 3 should not be doing work that is already under way in another part of the same ITU like you said. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. In all the discussions, if you agree Russia will contact interested parties and then the BDT rep will be in there to explain to everybody on what we do with the instructs 4. With this I ask everyone to kindly withdraw their requests so we can move on to the next agenda item. Thank you very much for withdrawing your requests. Anything on this further instructs 4 will be considered by the interested parties and Russia promises to bring us a result on this. Thank you very much.

We will now proceed on, and I come back to you, Chair, of Working Group 4A, we haven't forgotten you at all because you are the one who has brought us all these babies to name.

Kindly proceed on to your report. Thank you, Mr. Bigi.

>> FABIO BIGI: To solve the remaining problem, I see you have had more or less the same success that I had.

(chuckles) but let's hope the best for the plenary

at least, because at the end, my plea is international cooperation should prevail, everyone has to give up something. We have not to impose our view on each other.

Now I come to the latest point of my, this report, and the report is contained in revision 4, of TD 23. This is because there are no other contentious part we have approved this morning, and if you allow me, we have had four, six sessions in total, and we were creating firedupgroup, one on numbering solution, one on 9 related resolution one I still call OTT resolution, one on Internet related solution, one on security related solution. If you have seen this morning, at least we have produced something that was commonly agreed.

Now the one we will solve hopefully in plenary. We have examined the report of the various group and my report is stated all the item we have solved. It will be included in the various resolution, was included. The only thing I didn't, thanks during the close of the meeting because as usual I was in a hurry I didn't thank my Vice-Chairmen and my assistant and all TSB's stuff, the Chairman of the ad hoc group, and all the delegates for their spirit of international cooperation that I hope will pervade in continuing the debate. Thank you. With that, my report is over.

>> CHAIR: Thanks very much, Mr. Fabio Bigi. Is there any comment on this report as it is presented as DT23 which is on the working group A4, Working Group 4A. I see no one asking for the floor. Here I will want to thank the Chair of this Working Group for all the hard work and the outputs that came and even with the ones on square brackets, we appreciate them so much. There is a hope for it to be resolved before it goes to the plenary. I will want to sincerely thank you and if you can give Mr. Bigi a hand of applause.

(applause).

Thank you. I see Korea asking for the floor. Korea, you have the floor.

>> KOREA: Thank you, Chairman, actually I'm a little bit late because I actually, regarding resolution 50, there is one square bracket.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Not to cut you, Korea, sorry, not to cut you, you are really late. And we have moved on, if you can ask your colleagues about the updates on resolution 50. It is pending a certain decision. And if you allow us, we could use the time for us to come back later to it.

>> Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. We can now move on

to the, our agenda item, and just to say that we have completed with the outputs and the reports from the Working Groups under com 4.

So we are done with agenda item 4 for this com 4 meeting. We go to agenda item 5, and here we go to 5B, which is on the ad hoc group on Study Group 20 related matters.

We have Mr. Ramnan Na of Malaysia who will give us the results of all the discussions on SG 20 related matters. Malaysia, you have the floor.

>> MALAYSIA: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon, everyone. I must say this task was not only challenging but also very interesting, as we had all the delegates present, fully engaged and never did we have a silent moment.

(laughter).

This afternoon, though some of us skip lunch, others had a brief time out, I'd like to mention that all the delegates are committed to continue the progress further by addressing as many possible points of discussion.

I'd like to take the opportunity to thank all delegates who participated for their tolerance, passion and spirit of compromise that allow us to present the outcome today.



Further my special thanks to Cristina from the Secretariat, she is wonderful, she has done dedicated work and consistent in helping this part. As I start from November 1, 2016 because we had prior meetings to this, the request of the com 4 Chairman we convened a informal consultation and successfully reach a compromise to remove all square brackets in resolution 2 related SG 20.

However, again, due to time constraints, the informal consultation was not able to address comments and proposals contained in USA 48A15 and 43 A3 2 with regards to the current questions of SG 20 and the new proposed questions proposed by the Arab group.

To review the draft new resolution of Arab addendum 28 concerning the role of ITU-T in ensuring data privacy and trust in ICT infrastructures and services submitted for com 4 consideration. In addition the concept below has been agreed. However, there was no agreement on the placement of this text in resolution 2, which is the criticality of infrastructure may be considered differently from one Member State to another. This sentence suggested to become a para to be applied to all ITU-T Study Groups in resolution 2. I end my presentation. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Na of Malaysia for your work, and also for the results that you have given us.

I want us to take it one after the other, so that we can address all issues appropriately in steps.

So, the general statement that I heard was that anything related to Study Group 20 in square brackets in resolution 2 should be removed. What was not clear to me was the issues that are linked to Study Group 20 which is about other Study Groups like Study Group 2, Study Group 11, Study Group 13 and Study Group 17.

So if you can start off with Study Group 2, there was the issue of identification in square brackets on the lead Study Group role. What do we do with the square bracket? Malaysia, you have the floor.

>> MALAYSIA: Mr. Chair, in this aspect we have suggested how to refer to identification in terms aspects IoT, so my suggestion now is it would be good to open the floor to other Member States to give some suggestions, so we can close this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So my understanding was that this was not discussed and it was not concluded. Can we relate this, can we go further to Study Group 20 and see what we are supposed to remove in square brackets in relation

to identification and what we can do with Study Group 2 vis-a-vis the square brackets we are supposed to remove. So if you can go to Study Group 20, lead study role, yes, so Study Group 20, lead study role is saying the leadStudyGroup for IoT identification. So here it seems to me that the lead Study Group role of IoT identification is clearly a subset of identification as a bigger umbrella under Study Group 2. And that if we can identify the identification with IoT with Study Group 20, it is clear we do not have any conflicts with the other aspects of identification, that may be going on in Study Group 2.

If this is clear with everyone, can we then remove the square brackets for both Study Group 2 and Study Group 20, if you agree with me, you don't need to ask for the floor. I see no one asking for the floor.

So we accept that the identification that got to do with Study Group 20, is clearly what is associated with IoT. And every other identification will be at Study Group 2. Seeing no one asking for the floor, so thank you very much.

(gavel).

We are clear on how identification is supposed to be prescribed for Study Group 2, and Study Group 20. Thank you very much.

Study Group 2, I want us to look at something which was in square brackets on lead Study Group role, and that was related to dependent presentation from the RCC on classification of telecommunication services, and earlier on it was agreed by the RCC that this is something they will propose later to TSAG.

So, can we here agree to remove this part in yellow, and on classification of Telecom services for it to remain and read as lead Study Group for service definition. I see no one asking for the floor. So again, thank you very much.

(sound of gavel).

For accepting for us to remove this.

So, with this said, we can go on further again with Study Group 2, that there are no pending issues, when it comes to the lead Study Group role, their mandates and the points of guidance. Okay. We go to the agenda areas -- general areas. If you can project that. I mean consequently, anything with identification which is in square brackets under Study Group 2 can now be removed as per our agreement. Thank you very much.

So we can now have Study Group 2 -- we are still on Study Group 2. Yes, on the screen, so here under Study Group 2 we are seeing including support which has listing

of including Internet of Things.

Can we therefore remove Internet of Things because we have now assigned that to Study Group 20? I see no one asking for the floor. So clearly we can delete that in order not to conflict with the for Study Group 20. Thank you very much. With this, we are clear on the title, mandate, lead Study Group roles and points of guidance for Study Group 2 when it comes to identification.

Thank you very much. I see United States asking for the floor. U.S., you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. We really appreciate the hard work of all colleagues in reaching this good conclusion. We wanted to return to the point of the footnote related to infrastructure. Before, we agreed on text but we were, before, did not have a proposal for where it could go, that would apply to all Study Groups. Chair, if you allow me we would like to propose that the language from the footnote that we agreed could appear in annex A, and it would be as a footnote for the word infrastructure, the first time it appears. If that is acceptable to colleagues, then we are comfortable with that placement. It addresses our concerns with the respect to the word infrastructure. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. I see United Arab Emirates asking for the floor. Is it in response to the U.S.? United Arab Emirates. Please proceed.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank the Chairman of the ad hoc and other colleagues for their hard efforts in order to reach a compromise on some delicate issues.

I think, Mr. Chairman, the discussion on the criticality of the infrastructure and whether we use the critical infrastructure or not, we try to agree on a concept. I think this was clearly mentioned by UAE in different sessions. The concept itself, the criticality of the infrastructure differ definitely from one country to another. The criticality that we have at that time that how this concept can be reflected or fact can be reflected in a text and where to be reflected. The difficulty that we have no text right now proposing any critical infrastructure in the current resolutions.

The question was do we need to open this, we don't need to open this from the scratch. However, I think we said that let us see first the proposal to see something in the context and then we can decide whether we need it or not or whether we can agree on it or not. As I said before it is a matter of fact that criticality of

infrastructure differ from one country to another. However, do we need to reflect this and where we need to reflect it and how to be reflected, this is something that was not agreed and we need to think about it based on the context that we show it to everybody, then we can say this is can be done or cannot be done. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. But just to let Distinguished Delegates, we have 28 minutes to close this session. So it will be very helpful, if we close the session it is not likely we have com 4 anymore. We will have to deal with all the agenda items.

So if you agree, let's stay on course and removing square brackets, and then any other issues that were not concluded, we could go on that. So if you withdraw your request, I want the Chairman of the ad hoc group to help me understand the square brackets. He asked us to remove, so that we could finish that and deal with other issues. If you could withdraw your request kindly, so that we can proceed on that.

United Arab Emirates, you just spoke. There is nothing you have said other than to proceed. So if you can kindly withdraw your request. I have UAE, United States. United Kingdom, Saudi Arabia asking for the

floor. I want to close the list. I wanted to proceed. Do you disagree with me that we proceed to removing the square brackets? If you disagree with me to proceed in understanding what we are to remove from the square brackets, you can sustain asking for the floor. But if you agree with me to understand from the Chair of Malaysia to remove the square brackets, you can withdraw your request. United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Definitely, Mr. Chairman, we will do our best to help you, Mr. Chairman, in the meeting to move forward. However, Mr. Chairman, as explained earlier and several times in the meeting, we have only agreed on a concept. This even was proposed by UAE as a concept but not as a title or as a text to be drafted or to be put somewhere that we don't know what is the context of the text is. Mr. Chairman, we have difficulty to remove the square brackets. We are not in agreement to remove the square brackets. We can have some text to see where the text can be fitting whether it is suitable to have it or not, so we cannot accept removing the square brackets, Mr. Chairman, and this is what we exactly explained in the meeting and the ad hoc that we are not in favor to remove the square brackets, unless we see



something in hand and then we can decide whether it's suitable or not to have it. But as a matter of concept criticality of infrastructure differ from one country to another. Is it a matter of concept but it is not as a text to be added in the resolution. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: UAE, are you saying that you disagree with the Chairman from Malaysia that we remove every square bracket that is around the text of Study Group 20? Is that what you are saying? Because that is what we are on now.

>> No, thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: We are doing as requested by the Chairman of the ad hoc group on Study Group 20 matters, and he said that the agreement was that all square brackets related to Study Group 20 should be removed, it's your request to say that we don't address that? Is that your request?

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: No, sorry, Mr. Chairman, maybe I was not clear in my briefest intervention. My intention and my proposal is we keep the square brackets only for the issue of the infrastructure. Everything else definitely we can go ahead with removing the square brackets. The only concern is about the infrastructure issue, to keep the square brackets for the infrastructure

so we are not in agreement right now to remove the infrastructure square brackets. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, UAE. If you accept and for us to take the report of the Chairman in steps, because we cannot look at section of the reports and bring it up for debate, we went through the square brackets as Study Group 20 related to Study Group 2, so we are taking it from the top and we will definitely get to the bottom of the report. Let's have the patience to wait for our turn, if we have an issue with the particular item.

I want us to go in steps and to be able to accomplish our tasks. Thank you very much, Distinguished Delegates. If you will accept for us to proceed in that way in that step, the next step I wanted us to resolve is the square bracket of Study Group 20 relating to Study Group 13.

If you withdraw your request. So that I can understand from the Chairman how this is addressed. I see United States and I see UK asking for the floor. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. For the United States, we need to understand how exactly we are going to be proceeding here. Committee 4 created many ad hoc groups that ran in parallel to one another.

If we cannot accept the results of this, of these groups when certain delegates cannot be attending the sessions, then we are going, then we have a problem. For us, there were, for us this point was discussed at length last night, and the text was proposed and there was agreement last night that we would be, that maybe the terms we would think about the placement. We had the conversation again this morning with many colleagues. The text was agreed. However, according to the Chair's report which is correct there was no agreement on the placement of this text in resolution 2. From our perspective the issue of the text is closed. The only issue to be resolved is the fact that there was no agreement on the placement of this text.

We know that any country has a right to place a reservation or to suggest that we modify the text in Committee. But then, but we have to understand that if the results of these groups are not going to be considered legitimate, if certain people are not there, then that is going to be a problem for all of our work across this Committee. Many delegates are prioritizing. We have the same experts that cover many different issues, because we are scheduling ad hoc groups on the same issues. So to us, it's, we are very concerned if we put this,

if we keep this text in square brackets that it calls into question many of the decisions that we are making in these groups. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States. If you understand me, we will get to this point. We are not there yet. We will get to this point and address it fully what we do with this part of the report from the Chair. My request was for the Chair to take us through at this stage the relation of the square brackets for Study Group 20 and Study Group 13. If we can withdraw our requests, then the Chairman will take us through the report as such.

I see United Arab Emirates asking for the floor again. I see UK asking for the floor again. Kindly withdraw your request so that the Chairman can, from Malaysia, can respond to my request on what to do with the square brackets of Study Group 20 relating to Study Group 13. United Kingdom, you are insisting to have the floor. You have the floor.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to associate myself strongly with the remarks of the United States. The text that we see before us was agreed after a long hard drafting session and it was indeed compromise text. We believe that the report that we see in front of us

is quite correct. It was agreed. The only remaining issue is the placement of the text within resolution 2. I believe my colleague from the United States has made a suggestion about that. Mr. Chair, we support the text which is on the screen in front of us by the criticality of infrastructure, we believe it is compromise text. We believe it should be in resolution 2. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UK. Malaysia, you have the floor. What do we do with the square brackets relating to Study Group 13 and Study Group 20 on big data? Okay, so that is removed. All right. Thank you very much. Now, we have to look at, between Study Group 17 and Study Group 11, the lead role on combating counterfeit. Mr. Chairman, what was the outcome of this clearly to us?

Okay. That's fine. So with 17 and 20, projected now, this text as revised is acceptable by everyone. If this is acceptable by everyone, we can agree on it by withdrawing our requests for the floor. Between Study Group 17 and 20. I see UAE. Okay, now they are off. With this, thank you very much.

(gavel).

So much desired for the critical infrastructure,

there are submissions already done.

We go back to page 7. Looking for a footnote.

>> Footnote 2 is in brackets.

>> CHAIR: Here as it reads security privacy and trust, the Arab group said they will come back on this. Do you have an update on this? Is there any update on this? UAE, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think Mr. Chairman, we have a comment on the previous intervention by some colleagues. However I will delay it until we address your question. Mr. Chairman, with regards to the privacy, as you are aware, Mr. Chairman, this subject have been discussed in different groups. One of them is the resolution 2, another one is the new resolution submitted proposed by Arab States. In order to address the subject, we have discussed the privacy as stand alone subject. From that perspective, we could come up with a text that will mention privacy here, we have a footnote saying that some relevant aspects of this term may be considered differently from one Member State to another. The use of this term as framed in terms of international telecommunications standardization, our understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the same that we have applied here should be applied exactly in the

resolution from Arab States on the privacy and trust issues. However, unfortunately, there was some objection after we agreed on this to open even the discussion on the new resolution from Arab States. So just, this is to clarify the issue on the privacy, Mr. Chairman. However, for the trust, we have seen that it has a bit different aspects, that we need to consider differently. And that is why the proposal just was just to keep this for the privacy, and that is why we kept another footnote without any text here, that we proposed to delete it. This is with regards to the privacy and trust, Mr. Chairman.

With regards to the issue of the infrastructure, as I mentioned earlier and explained before, to clarify issue for other colleagues, we say that we agree on the concept, however we cannot agree on a text to be included in the resolution unless we see a proposal in a specific context, and then we can decide whether this text is required or not. There are two different aspects here, concept issue and a text to be included in resolution, so we cannot agree on something that we don't know what context it will be considered in. That is why, Mr. Chairman, the text for the infrastructure should be kept between brackets unless we see first of all the

proposal which context will be and then we decide whether we accept it or not. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, UAE, and before I give the opportunity to Saudi Arabia, if I recall on the issue of criticality of infrastructure what the United States was saying as it has been done for privacy as a footnote, then it could be similar for it to read that maybe considered differently from one Member State to another, as it reads currently for privacy. Is this acceptable by everyone? Is this acceptable by everyone? If this is acceptable by everyone can you withdraw your request for the floor. The way we treated privacy with a footnote that some relevant aspects of the term privacy may be considered differently from one Member State to another, the use of this term is framed in terms of international telecommunications standardization. Would we accept that critical, criticality of infrastructure be treated similarly to that of privacy. I see no one asking for the floor. So, United States? You have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Sorry, Chair. I'm not sure that I understand your proposal. Can you please repeat it?

>> CHAIR: Again, as is showing, we can see footnote



1, which is on privacy and here the footnote is saying that relevant, some relevant aspects of this term and the term is privacy, may be considered differently from one Member State to another. The use of this term privacy is framed in terms of international telecommunication standardization. So to look at how we treat for infrastructure, can we treat it in a similar way as we have done for privacy, by stating that this may be considered differently from one Member State to another, but this is framed in the context of international telecommunication standardization. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. We really appreciate your efforts. We, so our group tried that last night. We spent many hours discussing it. The reason it does not work for the United States and does not address our concern, Mr. Chairman, is that we, our issue is not about, our issue is not with respect to the term infrastructure at large, infrastructure, infrastructure is a topic that of course we are going to be studying in the context of smart cities and communities.

Our issue is with the designation of what is critical. Critical infrastructure is a very particular type of

infrastructure, that has, that where every jurisdiction defines it in a different way. So again like I said in the opening, United States has 16 critical infrastructure sectors. We regulate and we have various types of measures that are applied to that, that is very specific to our context. So we do not want, we want to make a distinction between infrastructure and the designation of what is critical. So we can work on telecommunications technical standards that are related to how you make infrastructure more secure, but we cannot work on standards that are related to how countries designate critical infrastructure.

So we explained this to colleagues. It is how we came up with, how we arrived at the text. Our original text was that what referred to the designation of what is critical infrastructure. We were requested maybe to change designation to criticality. That was the discussion that we had this morning. There was agreement in the room that this text here was acceptable and a compromise solution.

Chair, I have to ask you again, we, the only, how are we going to proceed? Because the way that we understand it is, the only issue we had outstanding from our group this morning was that, it was the placement.

What we should be talking about right now is where we should place this, not to reopen the text.

We can, once again, we can talk about this all night once again, but to us, it doesn't make -- we have no confidence that these drafting groups are producing legitimate results if we have to renegotiate every time new people enter the room. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States, to understand me correctly we are talking about the placement of the text, as it reads, the criticality of infrastructure may be considered differently from one Member State to the other. This text, the proposal is that where do we place it? The same way we placed it as a footnote for privacy, we were suggesting that we place this, the criticality of infrastructure may be considered also as a footnote so the placement is as a footnote. It is not about discussing the text but placement as a footnote also to be similar as it reads for privacy. If this is acceptable by everyone, kindly withdraw your request, because I see the United States nodding. If this is acceptable that we place it as a footnote, kindly withdraw your request. Kindly withdraw your request, if this is accepted as a footnote, the same way it is for privacy. Kindly withdraw your request

if you are in agreement. I see Egypt and I see United Arab Emirates asking for the floor. Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm a little bit confused. I think we were discussing the footnote related to trust. I can recall clearly that you have asked the floor whether we would like to add the same footnote, the same footnote which is, which reads some relevant aspects of this may be considered differently from one Member State to another, to have it on the trust also. And we were moving forward. Actually, my intervention, I raised my hand perhaps to note that there is a two, if I can see it clearly, I think it's 2 inside the brackets, so just for consistency, we wanted that to be, to refer to footnote number 1, to reflect the same content.

I'm a little bit confused.

The second point with regards to the previous interventions from my colleagues from the United States and from my colleagues from UAE, yes, we have discussed this extensively over the past few days, and until midnight actually, all these issues including the infrastructure. However, it was our understanding that the placement of that particular comment, I mean we didn't

discuss the exact location of that particular comment. And accordingly as we all know that placement of that particular comment might imply different meanings, based on where it, how and where it is going to be located in resolution 2.

So that was our only concern, and accordingly, it was requested from UAE to keep it between two brackets. Still we possibly consult because we didn't have time what, we were just finalizing and wrapping up the discussions before engaging into other ad hocs as our dear colleague from United States have mentioned.

We haven't had time to see exactly how this is going to be reflected, because the ad hoc was just before this plenary, Mr. Chairman. So we had to actually wrap it very quickly.

So this is the second point. The third point, I don't understand which footnote are you referring to, you mentioned that, is it acceptable as a final reconciliation to add a footnote on infrastructure, where? In which text are you proposing this in Study Group 20 mandates or where? Because the whole purpose of taking that comment at all the Study Group levels, because it was thought, it was advocated by the United States that infrastructure can actually touch upon many aspects in

different Study Groups. That was the general comment.

That is why we thought to put it between two brackets to give a chance to all the delegates attending the Assembly to comment on that, because we cannot actually, we were like 30 or 40 experts in the room, but we are not speaking on behalf of all the Study Groups and for all the delegates in the WTSA. So that was the intention for bringing it to resolution 2 because it touches upon many Study Groups. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Much, taking -- so much of the time, we have 13, we even have three minutes to close this meeting.

So interpreters, thank you so much for all your extension of time to com 4, for our days, throughout this Assembly. I appreciate you so much for your interpretation to this Committee. With that respect to you I wouldn't ask for any more minutes for interpretation.

Thank you so much, and if you can give the interpreters their round of applause for their work to us.

(applause).

We have the pending issues on resolutions that are related to DOA. We have resolution 52 as well, and also

related to OTT. We have the new resolution on open source to consider, the proposed resolution on privacy, and to bring closure on resolution 2.

So here we will attempt to continue this meeting, if you agree in English. To respond to Egypt, and to bring clarity, there is this text on criticality of infrastructure and as to where we place this text in resolution 2. For now, we have the word privacy, and we have placed a footnote to indicate that privacy as it so appears may be treated differently from one Member State to another. There is the footnote which is on trust as 2, and UAE indicated that for now, they do not have the text for it to provide. That footnote which is 2 relating to trust there is no text for it as of now. It is pending on UAE to provide that. That is what the understanding that I had.

Now the third point is criticality of infrastructure. My proposal was that where there is a mention of criticality of infrastructure, we treat it similarly as we have done for privacy 1 for it to be a footnote as well which will read as agreed by the ad hoc group. With this, if it is clear to Egypt, this is where we are. My request was that do we accept to place the placement of this text in green as a footnote as we have

done for privacy. And everyone else withdrew their request. So there was a certain amount of agreement on that. Let us agree that we treat this text in green as a footnote, where we see infrastructure. In resolution 2, in the first instance, that we see infrastructure, we will put the footnote there, if everybody accepts. Then we can withdraw our request for the floor. So that wherever we see infrastructure, we put a footnote there and then the footnote will, the wording will be as in green now. If this is fine with everyone, can you kindly withdraw your request. I see United States asking for the floor. And UAE asking for the floor. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. We can go along with your proposal on this infrastructure text. Our proposal earlier before we got into the discussion of the text was to include it as a footnote the first time infrastructure appears in annex A. We are flexible about those two options, if it's okay with our colleagues. Also Chair, I want to clarify the agreement we came to on trust. It was our understanding that the Working Group and I believe it was echoed by the intervention of my colleague from Egypt is that we actually agreed that the same text that appears for



privacy also appears for the word trust. I think our options are, either we list the footnote twice as 1 and 2 or we include the same number one footnote on both words as my colleague from Egypt suggested. I'm not an expert on citations. I defer to the Secretariat for that. We agree with all three footnotes and we have two options for where we can put the footnote on infrastructure. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. We seem to have a certain agreement. For three words, trust, privacy, infrastructure, there will be a footnote. Then the footnote will read that this term may differ from country to country. As it's on the screen if it's projected. Some relevant aspects of the term may be considered differently from one Member State to another. That should be repeated for trust as well. That is my understanding. I see everybody nodding. This should be fine. If we agree that the same footnote for privacy should be repeated for trust, by Secretariat work they will refine that if we agree to that as a concept.

If you can withdraw your request in agreement, UAE, then we can go to criticality of infrastructure, where we put it. For criticality of infrastructure, wherever we have infrastructure up here, in annex A of the text,

then we could put a footnote on it and then it will read as it is in green. I see no one asking for the floor. Thank you very much. UAE, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think with the spirit of compromise we accepted to have the same footnote on the privacy also for the trust. However, Mr. Chairman, the same discussion on the privacy has been included in the other resolution and we heard from some colleagues that we can not accept this resolution on the same topic with the same difficulty we had before which already now solved with the group. Keep noting this for the trust and accepting this for the spirit of compromise it's hard to accept this for the infrastructure. Why, Mr. Chairman. I think first of all, having a new proposal at last minute without studying the impact and the context of the sentences, in every and each mentioning of the infrastructure is a bit dangerous. Mr. Chairman, there is no any mentioning of the criticality of infrastructure in this document. If it is not requested to be mentioned, why should we mention it. It is not clear to us.

This is exactly the same what we have said yesterday, we said we acknowledge that as a matter of concept, as a matter of fact, criticality might differ from one

country to another. However, do I need to mention this? Do I need to mention every fact in the world? Not necessarily. As we are aware, Mr. Chairman, resolutions have a regulatory sometimes and legal aspects which is definitely related to the context of the text, without reading the context of every text to add such a footnote we cannot decide on it, Mr. Chairman. It is completely impossible.

We cannot come as last minute to propose something which has not been studied at all, and proposing just to keep it everywhere, as a footnote on the infrastructure. I think this is not the way that we are using and that is why we normally have a deadline for some contribution to study it. I have real difficulty with having this addition everywhere in the document or even in the annex because Assembly cannot understand right now what is the context and how to understand the context of mentioning this in particular and in specific location. If we accepted the trust, as a compromise, it is honestly hard to accept something which is not even requested to be mentioned because simply there is nothing proposed to be mentioned in the critical infrastructure. Why to open a door which is not already open. Is it closed, why should we open such kind of doors and without any

study on any technical or regulatory or legal aspects on the context of mentioning such kind of things.

Mr. Chairman, again we are sorry to say we cannot accept removing the brackets or even adding the text at this stage.

>> CHAIR: What I get from everyone when it comes to trust and privacy we accept the footnotes should be similar, where that of privacy has been placed. The difficulty is with the one on criticality of infrastructure. And if we will go through the text of resolution 2, there are the use of the word infrastructure, but nowhere will you find the words criticality of infrastructure. The proposition from the UAE is that because the use of criticality of infrastructure is nowhere in resolution 2, then we cannot create a footnote for it. So here, just to make it clear, infrastructure is used in resolution 2, but the words criticality of infrastructure is not used in resolution 2. And UAE is placing, because there is not the use of criticality of infrastructure in resolution 2, there is no need to put a footnote describing what criticality of infrastructure is in resolution 2. This is the request from UAE. I see Canada, United States, and UK asking for the floor. I see Australia as well. Canada, you

have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair, we came in on this when it was on this aspect when it first came up, as we mentioned we have a national critical infrastructure strategy. While we only have ten sectors and not 16 it is still very important term for us, to that end the first mention of infrastructure should clearly state what this is referring to and we believe that the U.S. compromise text would be acceptable. This was again done through a lot of work, and at this stage, I think we have run out of time. We believe we need this either in a footnote or at the top of annex A, but without it, it is going to be difficult.

>> CHAIR: United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Chair, we talked about this concept at length. This was not even a proposal that we made to the ad hoc group. It was a contribution that the United States made to the conference. The contribution number is C48A15 where we talked about the concern was not about the use of the term critical infrastructure in resolution 2, it was that there was a need for clarity around the term infrastructure. When we are using terms, just like when we use the term privacy and like we use the term trust, when we are talking about

standardization, it is necessary to define what it is that we mean to make sure that we have a common understanding. For us, the important aspect of the common understanding around the work we will do related to infrastructure includes that the designation of what is critical infrastructure which has different meanings in different countries, will be, is not what we mean here. So, Chair, I think we have talked about this a lot in our group. There was agreement on text. We submitted, this was not new text that we brought to the group. It was text that we brought to the conference, so therefore, Chair, I suggest that we include the footnote as it has been agreed, and that we move on from this conversation. We are really, we don't have time to keep on talking about concepts that we agreed to in groups and that were part of contributions that came into the conference. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States. I want to close the list on where we place criticality of infrastructure as a footnote. The argument from United Arab Emirates is that criticality of infrastructure cannot be read together anywhere in the text. So should not be placed. And that of United States is that because infrastructure has been mentioned and

supported by Canada, then the criticality as it is now should appear so that it will read as such. With this, I will want to close the lists on further submissions and make a ruling. I see UK, Australia, Egypt, you United Arab Emirates Saudi Arabia and Jordan on the placement of criticality of infrastructure as in green. I'm closing the list. The list is closed. UK, you have the floor.

>> UK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This was indeed the result of a U.S. contribution which we then debated about for many many hours. We did come up with compromise text as is noted in the meeting report. It is not actually a piece of wording I particularly like but it was compromise report and it was acceptable to all at the meeting and therefore I accepted it. Underlying this there are strong national policies on the sovereignty of discussions about our critical national infrastructure. It is a very important issue to us but nevertheless we are more than happy to work with others to come up with compromise text which is precisely what we did after many hours of discussion. I support the position of the United States on this. This text is quite important to us. And we believe it was agreed and the only discussion that remained was exactly where we would

go in resolution 2 which we seem to have a way forward for. Mr. Chairman, we have discussed this for so long, may I suggest that we just accept that there was a compromise during the ad hoc meeting and we move on to another subject. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom. Australia, you have the floor.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Australia would like to note that this isn't new text or new proposal. It was submitted to the conference. We believe it provides clarity in framing the work going forward and we support the U.S. compromise text appearing. Thank you.

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

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, this particular issue has been debated long and long and long, and I have a consultant, I haven't consulted with my colleagues so I don't know their position on this, we are trying to reach some sort of compromise so this is a proposal, perhaps if we could add the arguments proposed by my colleague from the UAE in my views are very rationale arguments and I do understand the concerns of the United States and the other colleagues. Basically I could on



propose as a potential way forward to instead of putting that footnote or that particular line of sentence in resolution 2, I could propose to move it to resolution 50 and we can then consider the context within which that can be applied.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: As mentioned by our distinguished colleague from Egypt even consideration of such kind of text which is not required, not even mentioned and not even at all highlighted in any way in the text need to be a little bit -- we cannot cook something very quickly and without studying it and studying the context and -- we are in ITU. Every word worth, and this means such type of criticality has definitely correspondence consequently legal and regulatory aspects and this exactly the case, when you talk about critical infrastructure in one country there are so many aspects. If every other country does not have this critical infrastructure or this specific infrastructure isn't critical, this means country X can impose whatever other aspects because they require it as critical. We are not sure how this specific sentence, we said this is a fact, different country define different critical infrastructure in different manner, but how

to put this in the context in a resolution which is a legal document by ITU, how this can be reflected and what in back of this. Nobody knows. Just want to put it somewhere, I didn't know until this moment where we can post this.

>> CHAIR: UAE, you are out of time. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As a question now, this footnote reads as that the critical infrastructure differ from one, maybe consider differently from Member States to another. Is there any, this is a fact but is there any, in any document in ITU-T resolution that is says that the critical infrastructure is the same in order to, I mean, I mean in order to put the counter-argument in that. If this sentence is the, I mean the fact, why should we reflect it in here? It is a fact. Otherwise if we have a sentence that says the critical infrastructure is the same, just this is, I mean in order to understand the angle that is our colleague is coming from, in order to I mean try to move this discussion forward. There is no point, I think that says that critical infrastructure is the same or right. Thank you.

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

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It is my

understanding that some Member States have a concern on using the word infrastructure in resolution 2. This is why they have submitted a contribution that, to my understanding, the meaning of this contribution that in the work of the ITU-T, where the term infrastructure are used, in terms of the standardization and developing recommendation, there should be a common understanding among all Member States that there is a terminology called critical infrastructure which should be a national issue, that this recommendation will not be or standardization work should not be related to. So I think this is not only the right of those Member States. Each country have a critical infrastructure in terms when you talk about the telecommunication networks and services, and they have the right to preserve their position that any work related to the telecommunication standardization sector will not be in that regard. So I think we understand the concern, is the issue that we need to work out how we can bring this to more clarity in the legal text in the resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jordan. We have ten minutes to close this meeting, and to rule on the placement of this text. I'm listening to everyone carefully. The desire to have this as a footnote to resolution 2 is

considered. However, there is no consensus on that this text should be a footnote to resolution 2.

As there is no consensus on this additional text, my ruling is that there is no change and this text cannot be included in resolution 2. Thank you very much.

(gavel).

We will move on consequently we have to look at the changes that we have agreed from the report from the ad hoc group on how it affects the use of privacy in Study Group 20 questions and modified questions E20 and F20, as well as new question 220 and new question 320 as well. Now we have to look at other square brackets in resolution 2, and if you can use the next 8 minutes to remove those square brackets, if it is projected on the screen so we can have resolution 2 at least from com 4 because that is one of our core deliverables to deliver to this Assembly.

Can we project resolution 2 as it is. And see where, whether there are any other square brackets to remove them.

Now we look at resolution the parts which have square brackets, we have been able to deal with Study Group 2 which was pending. Study Group 11 is on, Study Group 11 versus Study Group 17 is on for a different ad hoc

to choose who is the lead Study Group on combating counterfeit. That is one which is pending. Do we have a result from the discussion on the lead Study Group role on combating counterfeit? Stolen, sorry, stolen devices. Do we have an output on this? If you don't have any outputs from the discussion on this, can we delete it for both Study Groups? So there is no leadership on stolen devices. I see Brazil asking for the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe that at this point we have two regional groups CITELE and RCC that have submitted contributions to resolution 2 supporting the addition of this resolution to Study Group 11. Even though there is still ongoing work in Study Group 17 relating to this matter, to be specific a resolution most focus on smart phones, and even though and I believe that this would not apply to the problems that we are facing on developing country where this is not, there is still raising of this theft of mobile devices, in the sense we believe that the solutions that are being discussed with Study Group 17 are not enough.

In this sense, there is a necessity to establish global standards that should apply to the current devices that are already on the market, and such devices and make sure they are kept out of the market. Right now

there is a lot of strong synergy between the ongoing work in Study Group 11 on counterfeiting that can be applied to this stolen devices scenario, and is in fact there are some countries that are already adopting this kind of solutions. We of course recognize the importance of collaboration between the Study Groups, for example Study Group 17 on security of the device itself, Study Group 2 regarding identification, but, and we believe that this work should continue on the respective Study Groups within their mandates. But in any case we believe there is, it is necessary to have Study Group 11 as coordinator of this activity and as it was proposed by CITELE and RCC and to keep the leading role of the combat of stolen device on Study Group 11. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I want to make a proposal, then if you are in favor you can withdraw your request. We don't have much time to close this meeting. My proposal, Brazil is saying they will want the lead Study Group to be with Study Group 11. Are we in agreement to keep the role of stolen phones with Study Group 11, if you are in agreement, kindly withdraw your request.

Kindly withdraw your request if you are in agreement that Study Group 11 should keep the lead Study Group role on stolen devices. I've made a certain attempt.

I want to revise it. If you are in agreement that the lead Study Group role on stolen devices should be with Study Group 17, kindly withdraw your request.

If you agree that Study Group 17 should have the lead role on stolen devices, kindly withdraw your request.

Thank you very much for the indication. I have a number of countries, Brazil, Argentina, Russia, when I ask that for Study Group 11 to remain, I had United Kingdom as the only one requesting for the floor.

Considering that this proposals came from two regions, and for it to belong to Study Group 11 and it has the objection of only one Member State I want to rule that the lead Study Group role on stolen devices should go to Study Group 11.

(gavel).

Thank you very much.

(applause).

With this we have two minutes to close this meeting. We have a number of issues to deal with. One more square brackets to deal with. Okay. I have United Kingdom asking for the floor. United Kingdom, you have the floor so that we can bring closure to Study Group resolution 2. United Kingdom.

>> Thank you. I'm very disappointed with the way that this matter has been handled. You have treated it as a vote. You haven't allowed any discussion. Can I just make clear that mobile device theft is a question in Study Group 17, currently. It is only being discussed in Study Group 17. And there was a proposal which is still being debated in an ad hoc group about where it should go. In other words, there were one or there were proposals to move it. And the way you posed the question was that it should be moved from 11 to 17. In fact, the reverse is the case. I'm very disappointed in the way that this matter was discussed and the way the question was framed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United Kingdom. This is very much well noted. Consequently, as per the agreement of this meeting, we will have the, and the conformance testing to improve the quality of recommendations up which is, this is in square brackets, can we take off the entire text as conformity testing we have agreed is with Study Group 11.

I see Canada, I see Korea asking for the floor. We are now on this text highlighted in yellow. If your request is on this text, kindly let us, kindly keep your request for the floor. To note that it's 6:00 p.m. and



Committee 1 is starting for which I have to join in to report. If you will be kind to me I'm closing the list, Canada, Korea and Brazil you have the floor. Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. With regard to that text it was Canada that asked for clarification, I got the clarification and I am suggesting to modify the text as follows. After comma, you can add text specification languages in support of conformance testing to improve the quality of recommendations. Study Group 17 has a question that deal with languages which could be used for conformance testing.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Will we accept the text from Canada as improve to this text and we remove the square brackets and we conclude Committee 4. If you accept this can you withdraw your request as the new text is showing on the screen, please. This is test specification languages. Korea, you have the floor.

>> Actually I support the Canada suggestion. But in addition there is a -- for example in the area that ended, it is in point of guidance. Point of guidance, in the Study Group 17 is responsible for studies on specification and description -- please go down.

Yes. After URN, add because we have TTCN, relate to these issues, so after the URN and TTCN hyphen 3.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Sorry, is this addition by Korea acceptable by everyone? I see no one requesting for the floor. I suppose that is an agreement. Brazil, you were requesting for the floor earlier on. Do you want to comment on this new additions? Thank you very much, Brazil has withdrawn its request. And accepted both.

Brazil, you have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In fact regarding Korea text we have no problem with that. But regarding the text submitted by Canada I still would like to get clarification why this has been, for me this is a very specific topic, these are very well covered in Study Group 17. Test specification and performance testing they have been leading this work in ITU-T for a long time. I don't understand why we are adding this to Study Group 17. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. Here the difference is not just test specification but test specification languages. This they are currently ongoing work at Study Group 17. It's consistent with what they are doing there, if this gives clarity and for you to see the difference between that and what happens at Study Group 11. Thank you very much for accepting this. Korea, you are asking

for the floor again? Korea, you have the floor.

>> Thank you, Chairman. Actually this is a addition of the new text from the Canada is reflect to the Study Group 17 and instead of 11 agreement after the WTS 12. Just to support the agreement, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Korea. With this said, we have all the agreements to the changes to resolution 2, so as a closure we agree to have resolution 2 as a text. I see no one asking for the floor. Thank you very much.

(gavel).

Com 4 has resolution 2.

(applause).

Now we build the house, we have painted it, we have some furniture in there and some furnishings, yet we have some very pending issues that would have made the house beautiful. Resolutions 50, 60, 78 pending, new resolution on counterfeit pending, new resolution of mobile pending, resolution 52 pending, resolution on OTT pending, resolution on open source pending and proposed new resolution on privacy also pending. With all these my proposal with your agreement is that if no time is agreed upon one level for us to have additional com 4 meeting then it will be reported to the plenary

as it stands now.

With this, I will thank you dear delegates, for all your hard work through the days and the nights and over the weekends and for all the sacrifices that you have made for us to achieve this high results from Committee 4. I thank you so much. I thank the Secretariat, my advisor, Simao, Christiania, Stefano, Rena, all in the background, and to the Chief of Study Groups, Dr. Bilel Jamoussi for all the guidance and help to accomplish all these tasks. Thank you very much. See you again. Com 4 is closed.

(applause).

I saw Saudi asking for the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: You thanked us and it's our duty to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for all efforts that you made to make this successful meeting. We wish all the best for the outcomes of this conference. And we also extend our thanks to the Secretariat, that spare no effort to support us in this meeting. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We wish to continue such a discussion in Committee and plenary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. I see Bahrain asking for the floor.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chair, in relation to the informal

discussion that you requested with regards to resolution, the new resolution on OTT, I want a confirmation from you, Mr. Chair as we have come to the end of this committee meeting if we can have some more time to further discuss it and be able to present it during plenary tomorrow, if that is possible.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. That will be the case. I'll refer you to update the plenary on the status of that. Thank you, Bahrain. You have that clarification. With this, nobody asking for the floor, thank you very much. Enjoy your evening. For the first time you sleep early. Thank you for having come to this far. Thank you again. Bye-bye.

(gavel).

(session adjourned at 1810)

Services Provided By:

Caption First, Inc.

P.O. Box 3066

Monument, CO 80132

800-825-5234

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

\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*