Raw file.
November 1, 2016.
9:30 a.m.
ITU.
World Telecommunication Standardization Assembly.
Hammamet, Tunisia.

   (standing by).

   >> CHAIR: Good morning. Good morning, everyone.

   (sound of gavel).

   Good morning.

   We shall start our meeting. It's 9:30. It's time

for us to start our last session of Committee 4B.

   Document 31, ADM 31 is our agenda for today. In

our agenda today, we have to approve the report DT18,

revision 3. We have the presentations first of

resolution 75, on WSIS. We will then pass to resolution

54, and the last item in our agenda is the proposed new

resolution AF CP 8 on facilitating the implementation of this smart Africa manifesto which you can see as document from Africa 42A addendum 33.

Let's move the approval of the agenda. Agenda is approved. Any requests? No. The agenda is approved.

We have to approve also the report of the previous Working Group 4B. You see this in the revision 3 of document DT18. Regarding this you should note the output sent to Committee 4. The report we just state very briefly the results of our last meeting on resolution 44. The document was then submitted for Committee 4 for approval and transmission to the Editorial Committee. Resolution 54 we had very good discussions on the core issues, and many other issues that served for the Chair as subsidies to provide you with a working document.

Regarding resolution 75, we couldn't have time to discuss. We will do this today. But I requested that informal consultations be led by the Russian Federation on the points of possible divergence and that this can be presented today.

That is exactly what we should do now, if we can approve this report. So I see no requests for the floor. So the report is approved. Thank you. Now we are on resolution 75. For this resolution, we have to present

the proposals from Arab States 43 addendum 16, European proposal 45 addendum 11, IAP 46 addendum 23, and RCC 47 addendum 9. Shall we start with the Arabic countries, Arab proposal, addendum 16. But before we have a request for the floor from Japan. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, everyone. I have one question for clarification on agenda item 6. We haven't seen this document. This document is submitted fairly late timing. I'd like to ask the status of this document, without asking the floor for decision, or just information. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, delegate from Japan. This document was presented as Africa common proposal, and it was allocated for this Committee to discuss today, actually. It was very, it was decision that was in conform the Steering Committee as well.

Does that clarify, delegate from Japan?

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think this document is submitted after the deadline. So I'm not sure that it is appropriate to, well, discuss this document right now, or so maybe so we, it will be acceptable if it is information document. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I was advised by

our legal consultants that actually proposals can come even during the Assembly. So there is no formal deadline for proposal of resolutions, of proposed new resolutions for this conference. Thank you.

With this clarification I would like to pass to our colleague from the Arab States to present document 43, addendum 16. Please, the Arab States. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> Saudi Arabia: Thank you very much, Chair. On behalf -- good morning, all delegates. So briefly, the proposed modifications to resolution 75, this allows consideration development since we held the last WTSA. This is the high level conference to consider the outcomes of WSIS, and also the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals and 2030 agenda. We would like to take into consideration the developments that we are experiencing today, we would like to thank Professor Minkin who has allowed us to carry out these negotiations and consultations well to arrive at a consensus. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Saudi Arabia, for your presentation. I would like now to request the Arabic, the European states to present document 45, addendum 11.

Representative from Europe? United Kingdom, you have the floor.

>> Thank you very much. Good morning, colleagues. We would like to thank for the introduction of these proposals and again, I believe some consensus has been reached on the text. If I can just read out our introduction, we have reviewed the resolution 75, we do believe it needs to be updated to reflect the outcome of the WSIS+10 review, the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda, the role of the commission of science and technology for development and the U.N. group on information society and the roles of the Council Working Group WSIS and the Council Working Group Internet. That is the introduction from Europe. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, UK. The floor is now with the representative of IAP, from CITEL to present IAP addendum 23. Present document addendum 23, please, CITEL representative.

I think you need more time to present? I don't see the request for the floor from IAP 46 addendum 23. Well, I'll pass then the floor to RCC to present 47 addendum 9. Let me just explain, we are making the presentations. Then I will pass the floor to Professor Minkin to, and we will put on the screen the WD007, which is the results

of the informal consultations.

Uzbekistan, you have the floor to present document from RCC.

>> Thank you very much, Chair. Allow me to thank Mr. Minkin for his participation and discussion of resolution 75, and also the contributions of other countries. The main aspect of our contribution is in addition to resolution 75, in terms of adding the following to instructs, and advise Sector Members to take into account the different levels of socioeconomic development in countries and national circumstances. Here Mr. Minkin had a positive, well along with other participants, a previous proposal so thank you very much for this. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I would request again representation from IAP 46, 23, to present the document on WSIS. I don't see the request for the floor. We may come to this later. United States, sorry, I see this.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of CITEL, it's my pleasure to present document 46, addendum 23. CITEL is pleased that the international community concluded the ten year review of the WSIS and adopted by consensus a positive and constructive outcome document that is based on the inputs

of all stakeholders and reaffirms the WSIS vision of a people centered inclusive and development oriented information society. CITEL supports the international community's call for close alignment between the WSIS framework and the 2030 agenda. CITEL proposes revisions to resolution 75 to align the WSIS provisions with resolution 140 as revised by the Plenipotentiary conference in Busan in 2014. The U.N. General Assembly resolution 70/25 and Council resolution 1332 and to update the provisions related to the Council Working Group Internet to reflect resolution 102 from the Plenipotentiary Conference, and Council resolution 1344. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States for presenting CITEL document. After the formalities of presentation of documents, I would request Professor Minkin to present us very briefly document, working document 007, on the screen, please. It seems this document is a draft modification to resolution 75, after informal consultations that you had with the interested parties. Professor Minkin, you have the floor.

>> Thank you very much, Chair. The drafting group carried out a series of meetings, and first of all I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all

participants. We carefully considered the proposals from all regional organisations. And I will happily inform you that we managed to reach an agreed text, which is now on the screen. In this text, we have taken into account the changes that were, that came from the last, since the last Assembly and the main events such as the general review of fulfilling the summit resolutions that were held in December last year, at the General Assembly, and also the summit on sustainable development in September last year.

These two events and their outcomes had a significant impact, and for our work up to 2030. And we tried to bring together all of these changes, in, these draft changes to these documents. I present this document for your consideration. Thank you very much, Chair and thank you to all the participants in our discussions.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Professor Minkin from Russian Federation for these efforts on bringing all the positions in this important document for the Assembly. It's an important issue, which I would like now for you to consider section by section, please. I propose that we consider this section by section very fastly. Can we start there, from the beginning, yes,

okay.

So we are on considering. Any requests for the floor on considerings? Yes, go ahead.

No requests. Considering further. Recognizing. Recognizing further. Okay. Now we are on the taking into account section of the text. On noting, no requests on noting. Noting further. Finally on resolves, resolves 1, 2, 3, minor modifications on resolves 4. Instructs TSB. No comment. Thank you.

Next, invites Member States, Sector Members, associates and academia. Invites Member States. And at last, not least, invites all stakeholders.

Any comments? I see no requests for the floor. Any comments in general? No? So thank you very much. The document is approved.

(sound of gavel).

Thank you again, Professor Minkin for this great effort on this text. This resolution will be submitted to Committee 4.

Our next item on the agenda is resolution 54, on the creation of assistance to regional groups, the results of our previous meeting was all included in the working document 006. I would like you to assess this, access this document and see all the proposals from this

Chair. As we decided in our meeting, I have included

some new text, after our discussions. I have carefully

listened to all your comments and concerns regarding

the new proposals, the formal text, regional text and

proposals coming from many regions. So the work of this

Chair and the Secretariat was to combine all of them

in proposals for you to decide here on the modifications

of this resolution, very important resolution 54, on

the participation of, on the organisation of regional

Study Groups.

     So I would like now to pass the document to analyze

the document with you, paragraph by paragraph, so all

can see very carefully all the proposals by the Chair.

Okay, so again this is working document 6. You can find

this in our working documents 4B. Okay, thank you, the

document is on the screen. I'd like you now to consider

proposal modifications on the considering part,

considering part of the document.

     We will go first for the introductory part of the

document. Considering A, any request? Considering B?

On considering C, please, if you have any requests.

Considering D, resolution 191. On E, regarding the

strategic plan. Yes. Considering F, the last

considering is the F, any requests. United States, you

have the floor.

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

First, thank you very much, Chair, for all of your work on consolidating the proposals that have been received. You have done a very, very good job. If we look at considering F, we just have one suggestion for consideration.

The insertion of, telecommunication policy on the second line, now that we have had the successful ad hoc to develop the mandate of Study Group 3 and its title, we would suggest that instead of telecommunications policy, we insert, international telecommunication/ICT economic and policy issues. Alternatively, we could just delete telecommunications policy. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States, for your suggestion. We are including this, these words for you to consider. International telecommunications/ICT economic and policy issues. Yes.

On the screen, the suggestion from the United States. Do we have requests for the floor? Can we support this, those words? No comments? So it's agreed? Okay. Thank you.

Next, recognizing, mention to article 43 of the constitution, recognizing A, next is recognizing B. Recognizing C, including all the regional groups that now exist. D. On D we still have some, we still have one square bracket, as you can see there after the words, 12 are, we have the word often to decide whether it should stay or not.

I would suggest just to remove the square brackets and keep the word, often.

I ask you if this proposal from this Chair can be accepted. Any objection? I see none.

We also included 13 and 17 in the paragraph C, because those are the regional groups actually. Any requests for the floor regarding, often, no? Okay. So it's approved.

On E, instead of saying all Study Groups, we just say the activities of the parent Study Groups. It's more general, and here seems more appropriate to generalize than to mention all the Study Groups, to mention all the regional Study Groups. Okay.

Any objection? I see none. On G, inclusion of policy, tariff and accounting, then here we are mentioning Study Group 3. No objections to include this word. I see none.

Can we move to H? If I'm moving too fast, you can ask me to go slower. And then we can also come back to the whole document, if we wish, after we complete this first reading.

Yes, Cuba, you have the floor.

>> CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, everybody.

I'm sorry, but I would like to have some clarification with regard to subparagraph D of recognizing, where the brackets have been removed, around often, because here it expresses the fact that the meetings of these regional groups of Study Groups 2, 3, 5 and 12 are supported by regional organisations or by the ITU standardization group. I'd like to clarify that in this case for Cuba, the fact that this is being added into a resolution, when these are in fact held with regional organisations, and the fact that not all countries belong to regional organisations as in the case of Cuba, which does not belong to CITEL, so saying held with the support of regional organisations or held by regional organisations, in the case of countries that are not part of this, these organisations, it means that in fact for these countries, in fact, participating in these meetings is not possible.

I'd like to highlight that this expression didn't exist beforehand, in the resolution. We need to take into account the specificities of each region. We in our region have always requested that the meetings be held by the ITU. So for our region we have participated in Study Group 3, for example. We believe that this affirmation, this statement is something which might leave my country unable to participate in regional, in meetings, because it's not part of a regional organisation. However, in other regions we understand this does not happen.

In our case I'd like to repeat, that when we say the support of regional organisations, this is something which Cuba cannot participate in or does not participate in. It does not participate in the regional meetings of Study Groups, in the standardization sector. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Cuba, for your comments, and for your interpretation of this paragraph. Having regarding the differences of this regional Study Groups, and trying to accommodate those differences, it's why we put "often" because generally, the regional Study Groups can be supported by regional organisations or regional standardization bodies, but it's not all

the times that this support happens. So the support may
happen sometimes for some regions and not for the others.
That is why we asked to include the word often, also
and/or that can accommodate that it can be or not be
with the support of regional standardization bodies as
well.

I think that would encompass exactly the differences
in the specificities of different regional Study Groups.
I see a request for the floor from Argentina. Argentina.

>> ARGENTINA: Yes, thank you, Chairman. We would
like to express our gratitude for the comments made by
the delegate of Cuba. We understand their concern. But
bearing in mind what was just indicated for us there
has been no case in which a meeting of a regional group
of the ITU has not been held by the ITU. This doesn't
mean that in some cases there isn't support for, from
a regional organisation from another standardization
area. But we understand that the ITU has to be the one
holding the meeting and they have the responsibility
with regard to the results, the outcomes of this meeting.
This cannot be something handed over to another
organisation. Therefore, we would suggest that in this
recognizing so that other administrations are also happy
with this, we could say that the, we could say that

sometimes these meetings receive support of regional organisations, including in the part where, including when they are held by the ITU. I think therefore we could remove the possible interpretation, so we could remove this possible incorrect interpretation here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, delegate from Argentina. I would request Cuba to take the floor, and if you could understand that the words often and/or in the text could accommodate your views, after the clarifications.

>> CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. I believe that delegate of Argentina is proposing a solution. We believe this is appropriate, and here we could say that the meetings of the regional groups are held by the ITU and can be supported, can be supported by regional organisations, and then it will continue as it currently stands.

I think that it would be in line with the aim that we expressed before, and it would just clarify these meetings are being held by the ITU. I don't know if this satisfies everybody, but we are satisfied with this wording. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much for your words. After this proposal I would request if there is any, I would ask if there is any objection to the inclusion

of these words. I see no objection. So it's approved.

The next -- okay, thank you -- so we are on H now.
Yes. Here we highlighted this paragraph because it was
a proposal from RCC and from the conversations that we
had in our previous meeting, the idea was to suppress
this, after the discussions we had, so the sentiment
of the room was in agree to delete this paragraph, starting
with importance, to the end, of recommendations. Any
objections on deleting this paragraph highlighted on
the screen? I see none. We can move to notings.

Noting A. We think the mandate, that is the
inclusion. Noting B.

Noting C. Noting D. E. Here, we, that is the
proposal from the Chair.

Noting, so noting E, I should ask you if, and this
is a proposal from the Chair, if we can accommodate this
proposal, which is deleting international, after the
word standardization of telecommunication information.
Okay. If there is no objection for the deletion, we can
delete these words, this word, international.

Thank you. Now with regards to suggestion to delete
this paragraph G on noting, specifying some areas of
work, so my request to delete this if there is no objection,
we can delete. No objection. We can delete it.

Good. So I think now we are making this part more concise and more precise. Bear in mind, okay, bear in mind section, if it's okay for everyone, okay, we can move. Thank you.

Taking into consideration, letter A, regional groups, so we don't need to specify none, because it is in general terms. B, okay, no modifications in B. Recognizing further, the same thing related to the word international, and avoid duplication was also for you to make informal consultations, and from the report I received, there was a consensus on deleting this word, that would be the results of this informal consultation that it took, so we can delete avoid duplication and, delete as well the international. Okay. No requests for the floor.

Understanding the informal consultations were very effective. Recognizing further B, okay, thank you. Recognizing B. C. Good. So we come to the operative part of the text, resolves, that we request your attention to the resolves.

Resolves 2 -- 1, no modifications. 2. To encourage cooperation, collaboration of these groups with ITU-D and ITU-R. Resolves 3, any request? I see no request for the floor on resolves 3. Good. Thank

you.

And, oh, that's quite difficult for people to read. Can you change -- sorry, Bahrain.

>> Bahrain: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Sorry to take you back one step. Under resolves 2, to encourage cooperation, collaboration of these groups with ITU-D and ITU-R, we find the proposal a little bit unusual, since in our view, such cooperation and collaboration would be happening at the parent Study Group level, and this need for cooperation and collaboration is already reflected in the preamble of this document with reference to the appropriate resolutions.

Therefore, on behalf of the Arab group, we would suggest removing resolves 2. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Bahrain. The suggestion is to delete resolves 2, since it's covered by preamble of the resolution. So any objection? Objections to delete number 2? I also think there is appear as duplication. Any objection? I see none. So we delete number 2. Thank you.

Any more comments on 2 or 3? No? Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My comment is related to number 3. So I'm just wondering because the meaning in the deleted part means supporting the creation of the regional groups, but I don't know why we are going to remove it. If possible, I need an explanation for this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, again, as you can see, thank you, delegate from Egypt, it seems for us that the words are still there on resolves 1 which is to support the coordinated creation of regional groups. That is why we asked for your consideration on deleting on 3 and just keeping on 1. Does that satisfy? Okay, thank you. If we have no more comments on 3, can we move -- Cuba.

>> CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. Cuba would like to request a clarification with regard to the interpretation of recognizing further, I don't know whether you had finished discussing it and whether or not it might be possible to ask for a clarification on this section, so that it's in line with what we noted earlier.

I'm talking here about subparagraph B, where we also incorporate the words, regional organisation, where it talks about, where it talks about meetings concatenated with regional workshops, meetings of regional organisations.

I'd like to say that countries who are not part of a regional organisation may not be able to participate in these meetings. So I wonder whether there is a need for this to be explicitly indicated in this resolution. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: I thank the delegate of Cuba. What I understand from this provision is that once we have a meeting of regional organisations, it can be held conjointly, jointly. It is not exclusively for the meeting of the regional organisation for us in our region with CITEL. The point is to hold these meetings in parallel, to ensure that the resources are available. Often we don't have many resources and it's important to be able to have one meeting, one before the other. So here we are not saying that regions are going to have a mixed meeting of their Study Groups and regional organisations, but they are going to have some support, interaction on the same topics.

This will ensure that more people can participate in regional groups of the ITU. So it's merely here in order to take advantage of the opportunity provided here by regional organisations meeting and taking advantage of this meeting in order to also jointly hold a meeting of the Study Groups of the ITU. But they will be

independent. They will have separate and distinct structures.

They are not going to be mixed together. They are two different things, simply to avail ourselves of the synergies possible. That is my interpretation of this paragraph.

I wonder whether with this clarification I've cleared the matter up for you.

The delegate of Cuba, please go ahead.

>> CUBA: Yes, thank you, Chairman. The explanation that you have provided us with does satisfy it. We understand that there will be meetings of CITEL in our region, and then meetings for the region have been held under the auspices of the ITU. About the interpretation then we have no objection.

I'm asking this question because I've interpreted it as being that in the framework of regional organisation meetings this kind of Study Group meeting will be held. But if there is no problem there, and if what we are talking about here is to have a meeting of the Study Group and then a meeting of the regional organisation, that doesn't cause any conflict for us and it would be fine. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, delegate from Cuba

for your comprehension. We share the same concerns and understandings in this regard on regional participation.

Well, so we can move to resolves 5. Can we have the screen? Yes, thank you. Delegate from Zambia, you have the floor.

>> ZAMBIA: Thank you very much, Chair. Looking at resolve 5 we are worried that this approval for regional, for other members from the region to participate in regional group meetings has been given on only one person, the Chair. We would be comfortable if maybe the management team of the regional group could give such approval, and also they should further approve the level of participation of such an outside member of the region. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, Bahrain, you have the floor.

>> Bahrain: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The text in resolves 5 raises some issues for us, because, one, firstly we feel that it's duplicating the fact that already the regional Study Groups have processes to invite relevant experts to attend. So there is the potential clash there. Secondly, in similar to what my colleague from Zambia has said, there are certain procedural questions that may need to be answered here as well as make sure that it doesn't conflict with other

resolutions or other working methods elsewhere.

Since we believe this is likely to take us down a long drafting process to clarify all concerns, our preferred approach would be to strike and delete resolves 5. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, delegate from Bahrain. Now it's Egypt who has the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, as mentioned before during the, our last meeting, when we were discussing this resolution, we have mentioned that this resolution is flexible enough for giving the Chairman or in general the regional group to invite the experts from other regions, so I would second my colleague from Bahrain that we don't need to increase or add more processes or add more, no process in creating more process for this issue. And I think not having this clause in the resolves will be better, since there is room for allowing experts from other regions to attend, so there is no need to have a clause about this matter in the resolves part, so we also support deleting this resolves part from the resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt for your words. I pass the floor to Saudi Arabia, and then Ivory Coast, Cote d'Ivoire. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, everybody. This text is in front of us now, in fact it's a reminder of the procedures adopted by the various groups. In addition to the fact that the agreement on the participants, I mean the other members who attend other meetings of the regional groups needs the approval of many parties.

These agreements differ from one group to the other. There is a specific procedure for every group. Therefore, I prefer that we delete this paragraph, and I support what has been said by Bahrain, Egypt and Zambia. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Saudi Arabia. Cote d'Ivoire, you have the floor.

>> Cote d'Ivoire: Thank you, Chairman. I would also like to make an additional comment in addition to that made by the delegate of Zambia, so beyond the issue of procedures for the acceptance of participation of these members, there is also an issue here, the question of the status which these members enjoy when participating in the meetings. It is important for this to be clearly defined. 2, are they participating in decision makings? Are they participating as observers? There are a certain number of clarifications which are

still lacking in this proposal, particularly with regard to subparagraph 5. Therefore, since we are lacking these clarifications we would be in favor of the deletion of subparagraph 5.

>> CHAIR: So the next request for the floor is from the United States. Then if I may, I will suggest a final proposal. I'm trying to capture the ideas that I've been listening to. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. We support the compromise text that you have suggested in this draft as reflected on the screen. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Well, thank you very much. But since there are many objections to this text, I'd like to offer a maybe final proposal as we don't have too much time to discuss this. Let's try. If it works, I'll try once again, which is resolves 5, to participate, that members may participate as observers, then by these as observers we would encompass the question regarding the status of those who is going to participate in the group, in a meeting of a regional Study Group outside their region, comma, through invitation of the regional group of the regional group, regional group management team and of, instead of, Study Group, management team, so that the burden would not go only to the Chair, but then would

be the regional group management team to decide whether to accept or not the participation of others outside the region. And as observers, we would address also the concerns regarding the status of those who can participate outside the region, of course.

Comments from the floor? I can accept comments from the floor. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. I support your original text for the following reasons. The new text points to the concept of invitation, but as we have heard from previous contributions, invitations will be only considered in the case of experts, and in that case, then the experts will be expected to not just observe but contribute.

A couple other comments. I think it's important to keep the spirit of what this organisation is about. We are a union. We are not just a group of regions arguing with each other. To me there is a fundamental concept here, that if we are to have a collaboration, if we have to have, if we are going to have developed countries understanding the requirements and the needs of developing countries, we must be able to attend each other's regional meetings, and to me that is a fundamental part of making this organisation work. For all that,

sir, I support your original text in yellow on the screen. Thank you.

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

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

If we understood the interventions earlier with regard to existing procedures for regional groups to invite participation, it would appear that the proposal that has been suggested would restrict their ability to invite participation. Therefore, we would associate with the comments from Canada, and support the original text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Portugal. Thank you very much, United States for your comments. And would request Portugal to take the floor.

>> PORTUGAL: Thank you very much for your efforts to compromise on this. We would like to associate to those who prefer the first option as a way forward, as we think it goes more in line in the direction of openness and the spirit of cooperations between regions. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Portugal. The list of contributors are increasing. So I would now have to

close this, okay, so I'm closing the list. The list is closed. Thank you. And the next is Bahrain.

>> Bahrain: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your efforts in trying to bring us to consensus.

With regards to your second proposal, and noting once again that our preference is to not have any text here, we could accept your second proposal.

However, we note that both the first and the second proposal as has been noted by some colleagues, do raise procedural questions and have the risk of conflicting with existing resolutions. I hope that clarifies why we originally had the stance of not having this text here.

Furthermore, with regards to the objective of interregional cooperation, and noting the comments of regions potentially arguing with each other, it is my view, Mr. Chairman, that regional groups actually assist in coming to consensus solutions, because as an example of that, in these world conferences, as you can see on the schedule, we have regional coordination meetings. That means that there are needs that can be discussed within a region. If there was no need for such discussion to try and reach a regional agreement, we would not have

such regional coordination meetings.

The Study Groups follow the same principle and the same spirit. So if anything, these regional Study Groups actually help filter the regional issues that come up to the parent Study Group and therefore come to the work of the global community, because whatever can be handled at a regional level is handled at a regional level.

We believe that this is in line with the principles of efficiency and of trying to find effective working methods that we have seen in a number of resolutions of the union. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we believe that these regional groups as they are currently operating actually are very much in line with the mandates and principles of the union, and they are very much in line of assisting regional dialogue.

In order to try and reach a compromise, Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest the following. I believe that part of the issue that we have is that this is in the resolves section. Perhaps we could consider text under noting, where we say, noting and forgive me, I'm making this up on the fly to try and find a spirit that we could all agree to, noting that representatives from other regions may seek to be invited to participate in the meetings of these regional Study Groups. Perhaps this

could be accepted, as a compromise text. Thank you very

much, Mr. Chairman.

     >> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Bahrain, for your

proposal. So from my understanding, would be, that would

be a deletion of the current resolves, and then trying

to capture the idea of the participation of outside of

the group as a noting part.

     Yes, since we are running out of time, and it seems

appropriate to deal with this suggestion from Bahrain,

so I would like you to request the floor and to think

about this proposal. Otherwise, I will have to come to

a conclusion on this very soon. Argentina, you have the

floor.

     >> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, Argentina

would prefer the text not to be included, to delete

subparagraph 5, but if it's included we prefer the

proposal of the delegate of Bahrain. On the other hand,

it's a question of an administrative nature that we have.

If a regional group has to invite a representative from

another regional group, whether the management team of

this regional group will have the authority to do this

invitation or whether it's got to be the TSB or the

management team of the group that they belong to that

has to undertake these procedures, it's just a

administrative question, sir. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: My understanding from this would be only to the management team, not to TSB. I think regional Study Groups they do have some autonomy to decide that.

Brazil, you have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the Distinguished Delegate from Bahrain to this proposal. But in fact, Mr. Chairman, I think if I heard well, this invitation approach maybe has some concerns from the previous speakers. So if may I suggest something, in your first suggestion, in that text that is in yellow, in order to try to have a compromise, that keep inside the text all the concerns that were raised by especially from Bahrain, and also for other countries from Arab group, if we include in this yellow, in our original proposal that Member States may request participation as observers, as observers, in the meeting of regional Study Group outside the region, however, such participation is subject to the approval of the management team of the region, of the regional group. If may I, actually, that's a good compromise in our views. So I put for consideration for all the parts. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Well, I'm taking a final comments from

Cote d'Ivoire, and Saudi Arabia and then I'll come to conclusion. Cote d'Ivoire.

>> Cote d'Ivoire: Thank you, Chair.

Our intervention is in the direction of what was just made by Brazil. We would support the proposal of the text that has just been reflected by Brazil. I think this is a good compromise to indeed deal with this issue which has arisen as regards the participation of nonmembers of the region. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Russian Federation, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. As we are looking, as we looked at this earlier, we have already highlighted that today we have all the mechanisms to enable participation of members if necessary. We don't need further formalization of this. Additionally, we would like to know and we will ask the question is there really a problem with participation? We will address our question to the U.S., to Canada, and unfortunately we haven't heard which problems we need to deal with and how we need to assist these regional groups.

Also, the Portuguese delegate highlighted that they also have questions on this. And I work at Study Group 3, and we held a European regional group, and who could

not come to the meeting. So nevertheless I'd like to clarify where this need comes from. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, two final comments from Saudi Arabia and Egypt. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. We find that the text proposed by Bahrain is appropriate. If we manage, if we can't reach a consensus on these three options then we would prefer that this whole section, this whole part be deleted. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: The last speaker is Egypt. You have the floor.

>> Egypt: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We were going to support our colleague from Saudi Arabia on this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Well, thank you very much. So we are out of time and after having heard many comments and suggestions, although some of the suggestions seems to me very broad and could actually fit all the regions, but since we have no agreement, I would kindly ask you if a NOC is a good suggestion for us in these resolves, we would keep resolution 54 in this part, in this section, of the participation of outsiders of the region in the regional Study Groups, as is it now resolution 54. Therefore, we would also have to keep the same ideas

on resolution 1 as well, which has been dealt in Committee 3. I would ask you if a NOC on this part is a good solution for everyone. Can we have a NOC in this regard seems it would be more appropriate in this time not to accept any kind of modifications on the participation from outsiders. I made all the efforts to include, to be more inclusive as possible at this moment, but it seems that we could not find an agreement in this. We are going for NOC. No request from the floor. We have a NOC in this section. Thank you very much. We still have some parts of the document to analyze. It's invites, invites regions and their Member States, there is no resolves 5 anymore so it's 1, 2, 4. Any comments? Okay, no comments.

2. We are on 3. Invites the regional groups that's created, now my suggestion is to delete international for the same reasons, also to delete relevant, doesn't make sense here. We can say parent Study Groups, not parent relevant Study Groups. Invites regional groups to, any comments?

Since we have a NOC so this paragraph inviting all ITU members it is not necessary anymore. Instructs Study Groups, and the TSAG, instructs all the directors, no, instructs TSB in collaboration with BDT. The same thing

regarding the consultations that we had regarding the

allocated resources, so the consultations came to a

conclusion that we can delete the words within the

resources allocated. This is my understanding, and from

the group. So we are deleting this.

Instructs 2, instructs 3, the same reasons we can

delete that, which is now in brackets, it was in brackets,

we can delete allocated resources, okay. Calls upon the

Director of TSB, 1, 2 and 3. In 3, it is also the results

of the consultations. We can delete avoid duplication

of work in 3. No objections. Yes, delete this.

Thank you. Yes. Can we go ahead? Further invites

the regional groups for them to cooperate with everyone.

(chuckles).

That is possible.

No comments from the floor. So we can move on.

Thank you. So we concluded our document.

Yes, so thank you very much for your cooperation

in this regard. I think that we can conclude in this

way resolution 54. Final comments on resolution 54? If

I can see no -- Bahrain, you have the floor.

>> Bahrain: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I

simply wanted to extend appreciation to you and to all

colleagues in the room for the spirit of compromise and

consensus in getting us to an agreed document and to
also note with appreciation the spirit and the comments
that we have heard about strengthening interregional
cooperation, which we have noted with appreciation.

Thank you once again, Mr. Chairman and to all our
colleagues.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Bahrain, for reminding us of
this important spirit of cooperation, not only in
resolution 54 but also in 75 and all these, the works
of this Committee.

The floor from Swaziland, and I want to remind that
we still have some work to do, which is related to African
proposal that we have to present. So, please, be very
brief in this regard. Swaziland.

>> SWAZILAND: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
And thank you for the wonderful work that
you have done in consolidating this.

However, my proposal is not directly on this,
however, it is covering, this is also covered, it's a
request concerning the support that is cited in this
proposal in terms of the BDT assisting Member States
in participating in these meetings or Study Group
meetings. The current assistance is only availed to
least developed countries. My appeal would be if such

assistance would also be extended to the grouping just above that, so that there will be increased participation by these developing countries in these meetings. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Swaziland, for your comments. Your comments are noted. I will make all my efforts to transmit these comments to the TSB Director and also to the BDT Director which are actually responsible to provide assistance to countries in need.

Yes, the floor now to Japan. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I requested the floor not by the Japanese delegation but as the Chairman of Study Group 3, because Study Group 3 has many regional groups and I appreciate their work, because between the parent group, Study Group 3, and end users regional group can find more closely the views and needs of end users. So I really appreciate the activities of regional groups.

I look forward to having more closer flow of information between parent group and these regional groups. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Chairman of Study Group. So no more comments and then we have to go to number 6 of our agenda item, which is the proposed new

resolution from African countries on facilitating implementation of smart Africa manifesto. Document 42, addendum 33. I request, the presentation of this document from the African region. Rwanda, you have the floor.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chair. Chair and Distinguished Delegates on behalf of the African region I have the pleasure to present this draft new resolution on facilitating the implementation of smart Africa manifesto available as document 42, addendum 33. In January 2014 smart Africa was adopted by the African union as a framework to leverage ICT for Africa development, and it has an office since October 2015. This proposed resolution is in line with PP resolution 195 on smart Africa manifesto, and has been supported by the African region as a common position.

Chair, this resolution will pave way for ITU-T support for smart Africa within its own scope and mandate. In concluding, Chair and Distinguished Delegates, we are seeking support for this proposed resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, delegate from Rwanda. The floor is now open for comments. Gambia and United States. Gambia, you have the floor.

>> Mr. Chairman, I've gone through the document. Rwanda is a model for ICT services in the subregion, and definitely I support the proposal to have a smart city replicated in all the developing countries. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And first let me thank the African countries for bringing this proposal to the WTSA. Mr. Chairman, we have not had a lot of time to review this, but want to work with others in order to come to a successful conclusion on this resolution. So we would like to propose some edits in your meeting, as I feel that it's going to be very difficult at this point in time to set up ad hoc or drafting groups.

We would propose to delete, recalling B, on the reference to resolution 197 on the Internet of Things, as this does not seem to be connected to the general purpose of this resolution. We would propose on the section titled resolves to instruct ITU-T Study Groups to change the instructs to invite. For us it's unusual to instruct through a resolution all ITU-T Study Groups.

On the resolves themselves, we would propose to delete resolves 3, because we have concerns about leading

to a standardized open protocol framework, for just one region.

And finally, on instructs the Director of the Telecommunications Standardization Bureau, we would propose to strike, carry out pilot projects aimed at speeding up and replace it with the word support. Mr. Chairman, we believe this resolution should also be sent to Committee 2 to evaluate the financial impacts. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, delegate from the United States. Before continuing our session, I should like to ask the interpreters if we could have more ten minutes for this session 4B. Can we have ten minutes more, please?

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

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, interpreters. China, you have the floor.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Smarter services is a very important area of study for ITU-T. It is not only useful for developing country but also can be very useful for developed countries. The services can be delivered to common end users, can also be friendly to our environment, by reducing the energy consumption. Therefore, contributing efficiently to economic

development, it can also facilitate African countries to elaborate ICTs to promote their economic development.

Therefore, China supports this proposal about this new resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, China, for your comments. We have to limit our comments now, to one minute only. I would kindly ask you to limit your interventions to this brief one minute, and please let's try to think about modifications provided by the United States, if you can agree with these, we can continue with the resolution with the spirit of it, but putting more clarity on the things that can really be provided by ITU and ITU-T in particular.

Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. We thank our colleague from the African Group for drafting this resolution. It is a quite important one, in keeping up with the 2030 development goals and how to transform the nation into a smart nation, to gain the benefit of the social and economic aspect of their life. We strongly support the resolution. Thank you, Chair.

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

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Russia

would also like to support this initiative in this resolution. The only comment that we do have is that the activities which are proposed in this resolution ought to be undertaken in close cooperation with the development sector.

So, this is a task not merely for the standardization sector but also for the development sector, too. Therefore, we support this new resolution, with the understanding that this activity will be carried out in cooperation with the development sector. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, delegate from Russia. It seems that the cooperation is, under instructs TSB and BDT it's the final part of the text, but I would request you kindly, please, to make comments on the proposal from the United States, general supports we do have for the proposal from Arab, from Africa countries, sorry, I keep repeating Arab instead of Africa, from Africa, and then we can approve this or not, and send to it Committee 4 with proposals. But I need further clarifications and comments on the proposal coming from the United States, so that we can deal with it very fastly.

Please, Egypt, you have the floor. Then I'll have to close the list, I have to close the list, if somebody else, some country else can speak, it's time to request,

because I have to close the list.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Egypt supports
this initiative strongly. We think it is very important
for Africa. Smart Africa in principle focuses on
developing Africa through following the specific action
lines, and we think it's very important and it would
help also to bridge the gap between the developing
countries and the developed communities with this effect
to technology and standardization. With regards to the
comments raised by the United States, may I have a look
on the screen on each of the comments proposed, please,
so that we could all -- okay, we think that as part of
this resolution, I think there is a considering of the
particular article referring to taking into account new
emerging technologies, and we think the Internet of
Things has a definite and smarter cities and communities
also have a definite potential impact for such
development, actually there is also a new resolution
that is currently also presented to the WTSA which
definitely illustrates that particular relationship
between the Internet of Things and the growth and
development.

I would support to keep that recalling B section.
If we go to the next --

>> CHAIR: Okay. Sorry. We have only one minute per delegate.

>> I'll give room for delegates to comment. Thank you.

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

>> SENEGAL: Thank you, Chairman. We support this resolution for the implementation of the smart Africa manifesto which is in line with the ITU's goal in the development of ICTs particularly strengthening connectivity. With regard to the Internet it's important to promote the Internet of Things and therefore we support this resolution.

>> CHAIR: I thank the delegate of Senegal. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I think that it's important activity in this initiative. We would like to support the modification of the U.S. and the comment from Russia. Thank you very much.

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

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chairman. Australia would also like to thank the African countries for this resolution, which we would support with the U.S. modifications which we think add clarity. We agree with comments on deletion of resolves 3 in particular because

we wonder about having a standardized open protocol framework that applies in one region only. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Delegate from Germany, you have the floor.

>> GERMANY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Good morning.

In the interest of time, we will concentrate on the operative part in particular resolves and instructs, and in this regard, we support fully the intervention and the proposals of the United States. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada and you are the last speaker.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We are also aligned with the comments from the U.S. on the proposed changes from the U.S. and the esteemed delegates from Australia and Germany. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Well, since we have three minutes more, I would like you to think about the proposals, the proposal of deleting resolve 3, all of resolve 3. And keep the modifications also from the United States, resolves to invite, and deleting the, sorry -- the recalling B as well.

Can I have your support or comments on this deleting

B, any suggestions, comments on deleting B? Rwanda, you have the floor.

>> Rwanda: Thank you, Chair. The recalling B is really necessary and important in this new proposed resolution, as it is talking about facilitating the Internet of Things, to prepare for a globally connected world. This new resolution is focusing more on smart Africa manifesto, and the Internet of Things are part of some initiatives of smart Africa manifesto. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Well, thank you very much for your comments. I tried to reach a conclusion, a consensus on this. But I think that we would have to have more time on that, and maybe a small group to deal with particular resolution. It is actually very difficult to discuss in detail a resolution with the short time that we had, unfortunately, for this important issue.

So, my decision is to report to com 4 on the conclusions that we had in this 4B session. We don't have more time to discuss this, unfortunately. And I will have to submit this report with those square brackets to the com 4.

Okay.

Delegate from Nigeria, Nigeria, do you need the

floor? I have to conclude. Rwanda.

>> Thank you, Chair. We are okay with the instruct 3 deletion proposed by the United States, regarding protocols. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, so anyway, we don't have more time, but thank you very much for deleting this. I think we can delete it, if everyone can agree with this, we are deleting. The more consensus we send to Committee 4, the better. Everyone can agree with deletion of 3? Nigeria, you have the floor.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is not about the deletion of instruct 3, but the recognizing B. Recognizing B is a harmless statement, and is an obvious one. We feel that it should be left there, which is not ITU-T is responsible for the standardization work relating to emerging technologies. It is just recognizing that and I think is it a very harmless statement and it could be left there. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, but I don't think that we, that nobody asked for deletion, recognizing B, at least from my notes here. It is kept anyway. It is not in square brackets, is it? No. It's recalling B. But not recognizing.

Please, the United States, you have the floor.
Please be brief so that we can conclude.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chairman.
In the spirit of compromise, let's keep recalling B,
and move forward with the revised text to com 4. Thank
you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your comprehension.
So, we are coming back but it's okay for me, if we can
reach an agreement here, I would be very happy to follow
this compromise solution to com 4. So we would have only
one modification, no, two modifications, three. This
is, the first is on, oh, yes, the first is on resolves,
instead of instructs, resolves to invite. Can we agree
with that? I think so. Thank you.

We are deleting 3, resolve 3. Thank you. And to
support pilot project under instruct 3, with the
amendments from the United States, we can all agree,
I think. No objections. Okay. Good, very good!

So, thank you very much.

So, document 42 addendum 33 with amendments is
agreed. Thank you.

   (sound of gavel).

So, closing this session 4B, we will send the report
to com 4, with the conclusions regarding document 44,

with their approval also for document 75 on WSIS, and fortunately we also came to conclusion for this new resolution from Africa, so those will be the results of the outcomes of our last session of 4B.

And we will also have to send to Committee 2 all the financial implications that this new proposal from Africa and all the other resolution 54 and 75 may have. It has to be acknowledged and recognized and sent to Committee 2 for financial implications.

Colleagues, I would like to thank you all for the trust, it was an honor for me to Chair this 4B. It was a great challenge for me. I would like also to thank the Secretariat, particularly to Lara, we spent many many hours studying all the documents, with no lunch, no breaks, no dinners. So thank you very much for a great effort. It was really great. And also to Amin, he is not here but he is following all the works and even before coming to Tunisia, they all made huge efforts for a good conclusion in this Committee 4, 4B. Well, thank you very much, everyone.

4B is closed. Thank you very much.

(applause).

Sorry, I have another note. Com 4. Yes. Can I have the microphone? You can see, you can listen. Okay.

So, just a final one regarding Committee 4 which
is reconvening in five minutes. So we all need to be
here in five minutes for Committee 4. Thank you.

>> Ladies and gentlemen, hello, hello, hello.
Hello. Com 4 will start soon. Hello, hello, hello.
Hello, please be seated. Com 4 will start in few minutes.
Com 4 will start in few minutes, please be seated. Thank
you very much.

Please take your seat. Please take your seats, com
4 will start in one minute. Thank you very much.

(sound of gavel).

>> CHAIR: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.
Welcome to the 6th meeting of com 4. Com 4 is on ITU-T
work programme and organisation. I want to introduce
to you our agenda for today available as ADM 30, revision
1. ADM 30 revision 1 is taking up our agenda for this
morning where we hopefully break at 1230 and we will
resume at 2:30 for the 7th meeting of com 4.

Our agenda as on the screen now, we will go through
the report of our session for yesterday. We will look
at interCommittee issues, and there is a note to com
2 for which I'll seek your agreement on. We will take
up the outputs available from the Working Groups this
morning, and to defer the reports later in the day.

Agenda item 5, we will take reports from com 4 ad hoc groups and drafting groups and take decisions concerning the structure and allocation of blocks of work. We will look at intra Study Group matters as agenda item 6, TSAG and other matters as agenda item 7, WTSA resolutions under com 4 will be considered, we will look at any other business, and close 4, Committee 4 of this WTSA 16. This is our agenda.

Is there any comment on this agenda? Do we agree to this agenda? I see no one asking for the floor. Thank you very much. We have our agenda for both the 6th and 7th meeting of Committee 4 on ITU-T work programme and organisation.

With this, we will move on to agenda item 2, which is report of previous session of com 4 session now available as DT95, DT95 to be projected on the screen, please.

Now projected on your screen is the report of our previous session. So page 1. Page 2. Page 3. Page 4. I see no one asking for the floor. Do we have an agreement to this report?

Thank you. This report is approved. Thank you very much. We will go to the agenda item 3 which is on interCommittee issues. This is available as DT109, note

to com 2 on financial implications of approved new and revised resolutions under com 4.

As projected on the screens now, if can be much more zoomed in for the reading of all. The new resolution which is found as DT54, the instructs parts, instructs 1 and 2, is transmitted to Committee 2, to assess its financial implications. Instructs Director of TSB for revised resolution 76, 3, 5 and 6 is also to be transmitted to com 2. The new resolution on consumer protection invites the Director of TSB 1 and 2 is also to be transmitted to com 2.

A revised resolution 72 under instructs TSB in close collaboration with director of Bureau within the available financial resources, those instructs 2 and 4 also to be transmitted to com 2. Revised resolution 77 instructs 1 and 2 to TSB Director. Instructs 6 under revised resolution 73 and new resolution instruct TSB Director 1 and 2 as well, are to be transmitted to Committee 2. This is based on your agreement. Is there any comment to this? I see no one asking for the floor.

Do we agree to transmit this to Committee 2? Thank you very much. We have the agreement.

(sound of gavel).

Now, we are on agenda item 4, and here it's reports

and outputs of Working Groups under com 4. This morning we want to take the outputs that are ready, so that they will be transmitted to com 5 for translation into all languages, so as to facilitate the work as well of com 5.

With this said, I will invite the Chair of Working Group 4A to take us through the outputs available as DT100 rev 1. Mr. Fabio Bigi, you have the floor.

>> FABIO BIGI: Thank you, Chairman. As you correctly point out we obtain agreement on the text of some resolution. I put these resolution for your approval. The revised text of resolution 20 showing TD 67, the revised text of resolution 49 in TD 62, the revised text resolution 64 in TD 46, the revised text of resolution 65 in TD 70 revision 1, the revised text of resolution 69 as presented in TD 59, the text on new resolution APT 1 as present in TD 63 revision 1, the text on new resolution IAP 4 as presented in TD 54. The text of resolution RCC 4 as presented in TD 71 revision 1, the text on resolution of RCC 5 as presented in TD 61.

Working Party 4A wish to inform com 4 in line with document 63 that the following part in the new resolution IAP has potential financial impact. It was understood that the approval of new resolution APT 1 will rephrase

furthermore existing resolution 38. In addition resolution 57 is also mentioned in this resolution. Com 4 is invited to invite Working Party 3B accordingly. Working Party 4A also wishes to inform that it was agreed that no change to resolution 47, 48 and 61.

Finally, I will like to remind you that we have already presented to you resolution 40, as in TD 44 for transmitting to the Editorial Committee. I think that is it for presentation. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Fabio Bigi for the output from the Working Group 4A.

Ladies and gentlemen, we will go through this DT. Here we have a number of revised texts to resolutions as well as texts for new resolutions, and the request is to transmit them to com 5 for editorial review.

Here I seek your agreement that for as projected on the screen now 1 to 9 as we have all agreed, our Working Group 4A, do we agree to transmit this in block to Committee 5? I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you very much for giving us the opportunity on this so we can save a lot of time. Again if you go further on to the report, Working Group 4A is asking that Committee 4 to forward new resolution that have financial implications. So with this, do we have agreement to transmit this to

committee 2?

I see no one asking for the floor. Thank you again.
This will be transmitted to Committee 2.

Here, Working Group 4A which is the last but one
sentence wishes to inform us that there were no changes
to resolutions 47, 48, and 61.

Do we have any comment on this? I see no one asking
for the floor. Do we agree to this no change? Yes, we
do. Thank you very much for your agreement. Yes, thank
you, Chair of Working Group 4A, we have noted that on
resolution 42 which was sent to Committee 5 and also
the information that you are supposed to notify Working
Group 3B. We will do that accordingly.

Thank you very much for your report. We will proceed
on that. Now we move on to agenda item number 5 which
is report from Committee 4 ad hoc groups and drafting
groups, and then we will attempt decisions concerning
the structure and allocation of blocks of work. We take
the very first one, which is 5A, ad hoc group on SG 3
matters. I invite the Chair from Zambia Mr. Bhuku to
take us through the report that is available as DT96.
Zambia, you have the floor.

>> ZAMBIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Good
morning to you all. After several hours of spirited

deliberations, and a great deal of compromise, I am pleased to report back to you, Mr. Chairman, that the ad hoc group on the mandates, scope, on the mandate and scope of work for SG 3 has successfully completed its work.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to all Distinguished Delegates for their active participation in the ad hoc meetings and for their tremendous spirit of compromise and cooperation. I would also like to thank Lara Srivastava for her support. We met on 29th of October 2016 and met again from 1400 until 1615 hours on 31 October 2016. The meetings were attended by 40 to 50 participants representing all regions. The ad hoc group was chaired by myself, Mr. Lwando Bhuku of Zambia with the assistance of Lara Srivastava of the TSB Secretariat. Tariff and accounting principles and international telecommunications/ICT economic and policy issues was confirmed.

The second meeting reached consensus on mandate points of guidance and lead roles, these are detailed in the conclusion of the report as well as in annex to the report which contains tracked changes for ease of reference. With respect to contribution BGD52, the

meeting noted that the specifics of the questions of the Study Groups would be subject to a separate discussion, with respect to implications of BGD52 on mandate and scope of work the meeting agreed this is dually reflected in the points of guidance namely to the reference to protection of consumers. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to submit my report. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Lwando Bhuku of Zambia for your report and your hard work to bring us this result. Ladies and gentlemen, are there any comments to this report? I see no one asking for the floor. As per the terms of reference, this ad hoc group was to as per the agreement of yesterday on the title supposed to deliver to us the mandate, lead Study Group roles and points of guidance for Study Group 3 for which we have projected on the screens now.

Do we agree to include these agreements on mandate, lead Study Group roles and points of guidance for Study Group 3 as part of resolution 2 now? I see no one asking for the floor. Thank you very much. We have the title, we have the mandate, we have the lead Study Group roles and we have the points of guidance for Study Group 3, as part of resolution 2. So here we take off Study Group 3 as those who were outstanding for the conclusion of

resolution 2. Thank you very much.

Now, we will go on to 5B ad hoc group on Study Group 20 related matters. And as of now their report is not available. So I will want --

>> Just posted.

>> CHAIR: Okay. I hear, just posted. So, I will invite Mr. Ramnan Na of Malaysia to take us through DT015 as the report is ready to take us through the results of this group. Malaysia, you have the floor.

>> MALAYSIA: Thank you very much, Chair. Good morning to everyone. Ad hoc group met yesterday 31 October into the wee hours of the morning, and today, we started as early as 9. The document contained in the result is the discussion that took place during the ad hoc meetings. I'd like to explain my persuasion and thanks to the various delegates who participated, their cooperation and support and tolerance is much appreciated. And special thanks to Miss Cristina for her continuous effort in helping us to put together document.

With regards to resolution 2, directly and indirectly related to 20, text highlight in purple and green have been agreed. New text introduced is in red. Due to lack of time the group was not able to address comments and proposals contained in U.S. 48A15, and 48

A3 2 with regards to the current questions in SG 20, and the new proposed questions also proposed by the Arab group.

With this, I'd like to say that the revision draft or rather the review draft of the new resolution, Arab 43 addendum 38, role of ITU-T and ensuring data privacy and trust in ICT infrastructure and services is submitted for com 4's consideration. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I seem not to have -- okay, so thank you, Malaysia, Mr. Na for your report. There are still square brackets. And this is our final time, as com 4. If we have square brackets and we want to go into discussions on square brackets, that we know com 4 time for other issues will be exhausted. So I'll plead with you, those asking for the floor, that I give this back to the Chair of the ad hoc group, to continue his consultations as much as possible to remove the square brackets, and then we could take up this issue in greater detail in the afternoon.

I want us to have a morning of agreements only. (chuckles).

So that we can discuss our disagreements over lunch. So if everyone will be kind to me, kindly withdraw your requests, so that we can defer this issue on Study Group

20 related matters for the afternoon in detail. After
we have projected all the disagreements as it stands
now, if you be kind to me. I see United States, Jordan,
Malaysia. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. Of
course we always want to be kind to you, and we are very
happy to continue working over lunch and talking about
this again in the afternoon.

There is not time for formal consultations but
informally perhaps our leader from Malaysia can help
us. Chair, we do request though that in this report,
we think that it's very important to reflect that there
is no agreement on the draft new resolution, so we think
it's very important that in addition to saying is
submitted for com 4 consideration, we would like the
sentence added, the ad hoc group, there was no agreement
in the ad hoc group that a new resolution is necessary,
or something like that. We think this is a very important
outcome of the group. Thank you very much.

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

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As well as the
Distinguished Delegate from U.S. we are willing to
continue working on this subject. But it is my

understanding that there is some related issues to Study Group 20 that was an agreement on it. Just for more transparency that we have shown square bracket, but part of it were deleted. The only issue stand is now the resolution, so I don't know, if you want to leave it all to discuss in the afternoon we don't mind. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. To clarify, I understand the agreements which have been highlighted in green, and new text which were agreed which were also in red. But this entire mandate has as deliverables some of them in square brackets. I was requesting that we could take lunchtime to remove these square brackets, so that we have a wholesome document without square brackets, and then we could take it further, or if we could have minimal square brackets, then the discussions becomes easier. This is about Study Group 20. We all know how much time we spent on talking about these related matters at com 4.

I still have Malaysia, Saudi Arabia asking for the floor and UAE asking for the floor. I want to close the list on this. I was suspecting us to deal with this in two minutes. I see Egypt asking for the floor as well. Malaysia, Saudi Arabia, UAE, Egypt. The list is closed.

(gavel).

Malaysia, you have the floor.

>> MALAYSIA: Thank you, Chair. What I wanted to say just now was the two sessions that we had were very challenging, and we will attempt to assist as much as we can in the session we plan for this over lunch. But most importantly the interested parties really need to come together and compromise on how we can move forward. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Malaysia. I trust you to do this. That is why it was given to you. So please do it. And let's have a good result. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning. Good morning, everybody. Welcome.

Mr. Chairman, in the ad hoc group we have discussed this resolution, in conformity to the instructions given to us by com 4. We do not support adding the sentence proposed to us on the screen. It was said that there is no consensus on this resolution. This is not the mandate of the ad hoc group, sir. The ad hoc group was invited to see if there is agreement or not. This is the first idea I wanted to express.

Secondly, the Arab group, Mr. Chairman, has

presented the resolution because we believe that the privacy and confidence in ICTs is a priority for everybody. This should be our priority during these coming study period. This is the substance of our resolution very briefly, Mr. Chairman.

I don't think anybody in this room, I don't think anybody doesn't support the topic related to privacy and confidence. On this basis, the Arab countries have proposed the adoption of this decision, this resolution. We would like everybody to continue discussing and we hope with the help of god that we will reach an agreement concerning this resolution that we offer you. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. For Saudi Arabia, is the additional text and I will want to ask you what was the case, that there was no agreement on the new draft resolution. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> Saudi Arabia: Thank you, Chairman. The draft resolution has been discussed in this ad hoc group, and it was transferred to another team to prepare a new draft on the resolution. Who will decide that there is or there is no consensus, it's this meeting. Not the ad hoc group, sir. We should say here, we are available to work on this resolution. Maybe we will reach a consensus very

soon, sir. But who decides? It's this Committee, it's
not the ad hoc group. The ad hoc is in charge only of
the drafting, nothing else. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So for I go to Malaysia,
Malaysia, give us the status on this draft new resolution.
What is the update? Was it that it was moved to a new
formal meeting? Was there no agreement on having this
resolution? Or it was not discussed at all? Kindly give
us the update. Malaysia, you have the floor.

>> Mr. Chair, thank you very much for allowing me
to speak. There were two parts of this. One was a
decision whether we should proceed with the resolution
or not, and that was not achieved, because half parties
were saying we should not have this resolution, the other
half was saying we should proceed with the resolution.
The second part is if we should proceed with resolution
then the contents need to be reviewed and I think that
is going to take more time because there is quite a bit
of resistance in terms of some of the text.

>> CHAIR: So there was no decision on this. Is that
correct? I see Saudi Arabia nodding. Let's take that
of UAE and Egypt on this and then we can move on to the
next agenda item. UAE, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning, all colleagues. Mr. Chairman, first of all we would like to support your kind proposal for having the official ad hoc group continue its work on this important aspect. I believe there, Chairman we have done a great progress yesterday on very common subject, for example privacy. We have come to agreement on how we can reflect this which is the same topic being addressed also and as resolution proposed by Arab States. Accordingly we associate ourselves with Saudi Arabia, this needs to be continued. The sentence as of now there is no need for it. I believe we need to take it out, because the discussion is still ongoing. We don't need to have the sentence in the Chairman report as of now, because we did not have enough time to discuss it.

One more thing. There are other aspects as well that did not, were not discussed yet. We need to continue discussion on them like the question, like the infrastructure subject, and I hope that we can avoid overlapping session as much as we can, to be able to discuss this in the proper manner. Thank you.

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

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We support the ad hoc to continue its work on that important topic. We think that that particular resolution is very

important and crucial for the ITU to focus also its activities, its future activities, in that important aspect, in these important aspects. We noted that during the discussions, some Distinguished Delegates presented views on the unnecessity for having this particular resolution. However, we do not understand or share or agree with the rationale proposed by them regarding that particular position.

We think that it is very important, when you propose something to be deleted or something in principle, you impose on the principle itself to have such resolution to exist in the ITU, ITU-T resolutions mandates, we think that the delegate ought to understand the reasons and rationale behind it. Accordingly we cannot support that position. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I've listened to everyone who asked for the floor. So this is my proposal to the meeting, so that we can proceed. I will ask that we now have a new square bracket in the report as not new text that is supposed to be added. You have one more square bracket to take over lunch. And because com 4 will resume at 2:30, in the meetings on this, for this ad hoc group should be between 12:30 and 2:30 to be able to resolve all these square brackets.

Again, I will plead that you all withdraw your requests for us to proceed. When you go into the ad hoc group you can also decide on whether to bring this in terms back or not so this is additional.

So if everyone will be kind to me to withdraw their requests so we can move on to agenda item 5C, please. We want to move on to agenda item 5C. I see United Kingdom, Australia and United States asking for the floor. United Kingdom, you have the floor.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning, everybody. Mr. Chair, the sessions that we have been engaged in in these discussions have been very long and difficult. I believe that the U.S. actually reflected what happened at the meeting very well in the sentence that they proposed. There was no agreement on the need for this new resolution. The UK certainly believes that privacy was covered very successfully in some other text that is we discussed, and that a new resolution is not the way forward. We are requested to reduce the number of resolutions that we have.

We also feel that a good way forward is to have informal discussions. We are not sure that a formal drafting session will take us very much further forward at this point. Thank you very much for your time,

Mr. Chairman.

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

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chairman. We would also support the inclusion of the sentence about no agreement in the report. We think it's just simply a statement of fact. We would also agree with the comments by the UK that it would be extremely difficult to conduct a formal ad hoc covering all of the issues that are still in contention at this stage, and would support informal consultations. Thank you, Chair.

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

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. We associate with the previous two interventions, the text in the report is absolutely essential to ensure that we have captured what happened in the ad hoc groups. As far additional consultations, we think that a formal ad hoc group at this point whose mandate is to discuss the text of this resolution will not go anywhere. The United States has made it quite clear that our position is that a new resolution will not be possible to reach.

The only, we proposed earlier today, that we are willing to discuss how we can reflect some of the ideas that are proposed by the resolution somewhere else in

the text. We had some conversation about possible instructs. We would be willing to discuss the language that we currently have in the instructs section. But unfortunately, Chair, we are not willing to discuss the other aspects of the resolution, because, Chair, the rest of the resolution is saying that we need either a new mandate or a more expansive mandate for the ITU-T on privacy and trust. And we do not share that view. So we believe that if we talk about the resolution, we are supporting the premise of the need for a new resolution and we do not.

Our proposal would be to have a focused conversation about specific lines, but we cannot talk about the text of a resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Let me make another attempt. Now we have formal and informal discussions in square brackets. Let me attempt to remove those square brackets.

The mandate under the ad hoc group on Study Group 20 and related matters has outstanding issues to be discussed, despite issues on the draft new resolution. That is the indication. So even without any discussions on the draft new resolutions, there is still work to be done for the ad hoc group on Study Group 20 matters.

It is for this reason why I'm asking that you take the opportunity between 12:30 and 2:30 to be able to remove as much as possible the square brackets as was presented in the report, so that when we go into the afternoon discussions it will be easier for us to open the few that we may have left.

That was why I was suggesting we have this ad hoc formal session between 12:30 and 2:30. It could be an hour. So with this, would everyone kindly withdraw their requests, in approval of my request.

I see Germany, Saudi Arabia and Canada asking for the floor. Germany, you have the floor.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Chairman. I'm very sorry. I, following the interventions, I do not understand the reluctance with regard to the amendment of the report, because the convener of the group Malaysia has clearly expressed that in fact, there was no agreement to have this resolution in his group, but in order to be cooperative, for the case that an agreement might be reached in the future, they start the discussion on the text. I think this sentence clearly reflects what has happened last night in this group. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. Saudi Arabia and

Canada.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, we are not very clear on what is happening in this discussion, sir. In accordance with the rules or regulations on conferences, which stipulate that any proposal submitted to the conference must be discussed, as with resolution 91 of the rules, so we submitted this proposal in good time. So it's important for us to be able to discuss it and also to be able to take a decision in this regard. We cannot take a decision to say that this proposal cannot be discussed.

The proposal was submitted in due time, and therefore, according to the rules, it shall be discussed.

Secondly, the Arab States group made various suggestions which they proposed on deleting part of this resolution. So, Chairman, we propose that we continue with the discussion in the ad hoc group in order to take a final decision at Committee 4. Thank you.

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

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll be brief. We support the inclusion of a factual sentence that notes that there was no agreement on the need for a new resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. With this said, no one disagreed with my proposal to have an ad hoc group between 12:30 and 2:30, and so Mr. Ramnan Na you will be kind enough to take this up with all the disagreements on the texts of your report as well as going into the substance of your mandate. If you could remove as many square brackets as much as possible, I'll be grateful to you all. So thank you very much for your agreement with me.

(gavel).

We will now move on to, yes, so as a priority, again as guidance and as a priority you should look at considerations of removing square brackets on matters which are supposed to feed into resolution 2, as a priority.

Now we move on to 5C, which is on the drafting group on draft new resolution on enable open source as a work methodology in ITU-T, and I invite the Chair from Russia, Mr. Dmitry Cherkesov to give his report. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Our group had quite a productive second meeting. You can see the report of this in temporary document 104. We changed the document quite a lot by reducing the size of it. And now, it fits on two pages more or less.

We have had the following results. Canada and the United States were not in agreement with this draft resolution as a whole, saying that this resolution will be duplication of work being currently carried out by TSAG. CEPT reserved its position, because they could not participate in the whole of the meeting, due to participation in other meetings.

We agreed, taking into account these proposals, on 19 paragraphs. 12 paragraphs, however, have not been agreed on yet. I see that there is an opportunity to continue to work on the text. So, we have a text which has been truncated a great deal, and changed a lot, which needs to be worked on further.

I could make my proposals on further editing wording, but when I've finished introducing my report of course, I'll give over the final decision to you, sir. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Cherkesov of Russia for your report. As you said, you need time. So if the delegates will agree with me, I will want you to take the lunchtime to as much as possible get the agreements from the interested parties.

I see United States and UK asking for the floor. I see Canada asking for the floor. United States, you

have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon. Our view from the start was that this resolution was not needed as a study on open source has already been initiated in the July TSAG meeting and that TSAG has asked for contribution to study the open source issue.

However, in the spirit of cooperation, we actively participated in the drafting group and spent a lot of time on editing this new resolution. Although some of our concerns were resolved, there still remain a substantial amount of work to be done on this document.

As you can see, Mr. Chairman, the whole document is in square brackets and considering the amount of work that is still needed, a number of ad hoc and drafting groups that will be meeting before midnight tonight and that documents need to be submitted by midnight tonight for translation, the U.S. does not see that many out, that the many outstanding issues could be resolved in the remaining time we have. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

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

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm speaking as CEPT coordinator rather than as the UK on

this.

Firstly with respect to the report of the conversation, it would be helpful to reflect that CEPT believes that this resolution is duplicative of existing work. We were participating in the meeting until 9:30, the scheduled ending time of the meeting, at which point we had to go, it is true, to other work.

We certainly appreciate the hard work of the Chair, we appreciate the initiative of the proposals for the resolution and all of our colleagues who have worked on this important issue. But given the late state of the conference, the volume of outstanding issues on this text, and other issues at this conference, and the continuing gap between administrations on whether or not a resolution is desirable, with great regret we don't recommend that this resolution is ripe for conclusion at this WTSA.

We hope that all parties and Working Groups and focus groups of ITU-T will contribute to the existing processes related to open source and especially the consultative process that TSAG agreed at its July meeting. We continue to believe that there is real value add for open source and for those communities to this work of the standardization sector and we continue to support

that work already under way. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, CEPT. I want to propose something on this, so that we can again progress.

I wouldn't want to refer this work any further beyond 2:30 today.

That's my proposal to you.

Between 2:30, I want us to give us the opportunity to see what text we can bring for our final meeting on com 4.

Then we can take a decision.

I propose to you for us to use between 12:30 and 2:30 any part of it and give the Chair the opportunity to consult with all interested parties and give us his very final report on this matter for us to take a decision on this.

If everyone agrees with me on this, kindly withdraw your request so that we can proceed. Again, I repeat that, I plead with you, that we take the lunch break between 12:30 and 2:30, any part of it, to have informal consultations with the Chair of this ad hoc group, and for him to finalize this report to the afternoon session.

If you agree with this way forward, kindly withdraw your request. I want to close the list now. Canada, Australia, Sweden, Russia. The list is closed.

(gavel).

Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Canada notes that TSAG has recognized the importance of open source and has included in its study and invited ITU-T members to contribute. We appreciate the efforts of all participants in the drafting session. We still believe that the number of important issues remain unresolved and cannot be resolved in the next couple hours. We believe that this work is important, but that we want to continue contributing through the TSAG process, and we encourage others to join us in this process as well.

I would also note that I think we have reached a point in this conference where to ensure success, we need to pick our battles. This one has been a focus point for a ton of work, but there are too many open issues left to recommend going forward. Thank you.

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

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Australia would just like to reiterate the sentiments already conveyed by the colleagues from the U.S., CEPT and Canada. At this point in time, we view this new resolution as being quite duplicative of work that is currently under way

and being carried out by TSAG.

We also have concerns about being able to resolve the differing views over lunchtime. And given the late stage that we are at in the WTSA process, we do not feel that we will be able to resolve those issues over the lunch break. This is an important issue for Australia, but however, due to the other priority issues that are also being discussed over lunch it will be difficult for our delegation which is quite small in number to actually participate in the ad hoc session at lunch. Thank you.

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

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. Just a request from you that could we please schedule ten minutes slots for every outstanding issue that you plan to resolve during the lunch? Because it will be impossible to resolve every issue, you have just asked us to address the proposed resolution on Study Group 20, now you add this discussion with many outstanding issues. I guess there will be more after this agenda item.

So, I'm not sure how this will be progressed, because we will have to reserve our right to speak during the com 4 meeting because we won't be able to attend all

these informals. Thank you.

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

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Now I'm speaking not as the convener of the group or Chair of the group but as the representative of the RCC.

We are fully in agreement with the fact that TSAG has already begun work on this, but we believe that the work at the moment is restricted to four issues, which are covered in the TSAG report. We support this resolution. We propose that it covers a much broader range of issues, especially since it is not in contradiction with the work currently being carried out in TSAG. Therefore, it seems to us that we could continue work on improving this resolution, and gradually addressing the most difficult issues which are of concern to our colleagues. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much and everyone, and I'll propose a way forward. Considering that there is no consensus to the proposal to even meet during lunchtime, and considering the amount of issues to be resolved in this draft new resolution, I propose that we include in the summary record of WTSA 16 encouraging Study Groups to consider open source based on TSAG agreement. So with

this text as a record for the WTSA 16, there will be
no new resolution. Is this acceptable to everyone? If
this is acceptable to everyone, then we can move on.

I see Saudi Arabia asking for the floor. Saudi
Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. At the outset
I would like to thank the delegate of Russia for the
efforts they have made to seek a consensus on this
resolution. Given the importance of open source
software for developing countries, in the framework of
the ITU, we believe that this resolution is very important.
It is a resolution which should be adopted during this
WTSA.

The work being done within TSAG does not run counter
to this resolution. That is why, Chairman, we would
request that you grant us more time to discuss this
resolution in order to come up with a consensus text.
Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Again, I will
want to propose a way forward, that there is no consensus
on the need for this new resolution. There is no consensus
with a text that was provided by the ad hoc group. There
is no consensus on meeting any further on this draft
new resolution.

So there is no consensus on even moving forward on this. Again, I will appeal, and this time, to report to the plenary that there is no consensus on this new resolution, no consensus to meet further on it, as it stands. So that we can, plenary can decide on this, if this is fine with everyone.

I see Germany, China, Saudi Arabia asking for the floor. I want us to finalize on this. I see UK asking for the floor as well. I want to close the list. Germany, China, Saudi Arabia, UK, Jordan. Germany, you have the floor.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Chairman. Very brief, we support your conclusion.

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

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think many delegates has participated in the discussion of open source, there is no consensus, we should give due consideration to this issue. Open source is a very important topic, and TSAG is studying on the method of how we do open, I think open source is still important. We hope that through this resolution we can encourage as the study organisations can at least have some tries and we can actually instruct TSAG to do something about

open source, and there are many open source organisations in the world, and study development organisations are also working with, including SDNs and 5G, and these standards organisations are working with open source organisations. This also is proof that open source can help the development of standards and can help us to verify the feasibility of these standards. I know that there is no consensus, probably we need to wait TSAG to develop the guidelines and encourage focus groups and other groups to study open source. And probably we should also try to explore a way to work with open source organisations. I think we should first utilize some software to develop the prototype. Also we can also actually input our standards to the open source organisations. Probably this is also a good way forward. I think we should give due consideration to the conclusion that you have proposed just now.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China.

(off microphone).

>> Thank you, Chairman. We support your proposal to transmit this draft resolution to the plenary session, following informal discussions on this subject. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. UK, you have

the floor.

>> UK: Thank you, Chairman. Again speaking on behalf of CEPT, we thank you, Chair, for your proposal and endorse it. We also would say that we agree very much with China's comments about the significance of open source, its value, and that we actually complement the introduces of this resolution for bringing open source to the front of mind during this meeting which we think is a useful thing to have done.

We too hope that all parts of TSAG will participate in the TSAG process that we are currently undertaking. Thank you, sir.

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

>> Jordan: Thank you, Chairman. We support the intervention by the delegate of Saudi Arabia, so we believe that if we discuss this issue now, and it's decided as to whether or not there is consensus or not, it is not important, there are those who support this proposal and there is a need for us to discuss it in the plenary session. We have explained our position with regard to the importance of this issue, and we have indicated that this proposal is not contrary to the work of the TSAG. We do not understand why there is opposition to what we have explained to everybody. I hope therefore that

the plenary session will discuss this issue, and the decision on whether there is an agreement or not, well, this is a decision which will be taken by WTSA.

We may be able to adopt new wording to explain the importance of this issue, during the WTSA. And this on open source software. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Sweden, you have the floor.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. This is just to express support for your we think constructive proposal to report to the plenary that TSAG should continue its work. As with us discussed yesterday during the ad hoc we don't think any direction from the Assembly is necessary. TSAG has a very detailed instruction, the process is very specified in the TSAG documents. And also, we think we have very important issue to address during the plenary, so if we are going to address all the outstanding issues discussed yesterday, I think we would need quite a lot of time during the plenary.

So, we would suggest that let TSAG do its work. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you to everyone for your submissions. We have three minutes to close this meeting. So I will want to summarize as follows.

As per your agreement, we will have something in

the summary record to the plenary, and with this, we will project the text, so that we can all agree to what goes to the plenary on this issue. Thank you very much to you for your agreement.

(gavel).

So, with this, we have two minutes to go. We would have loved to look at intra Study Group matters. But with no time, and not to ask for any more time for interpreters and also to give the opportunity to the meetings on Study Group 20, I want us to adjourn this meeting and come back at 2:30. Thank you very much for your cooperation this morning. See you at 2:30.

(applause).

(meeting adjourned at 12:29)