

Raw file.
November 2, 2016.
1400.
ITU.
World Telecommunication Standardization
Assembly.
Hammamet, Tunisia.

Services Provided By:

Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
800-825-5234
www.captionfirst.com

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

***.

(standing by).

(standing by).

(standing by).

(standing by).

(standing by).

(standing by).

(standing by).

(standing by).

(standing by).

(standing by).

>> CHAIR: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen,

and welcome to this fourth session of the plenary of the WTSA16. We are sorry for this delay, for two reasons. One is that we had this meeting that we announced this morning with the representative of regions, and with the Vice-Chairs, that took us a bit more time than expected. You can understand why. The other reason is that we have been doing a few changes on the agenda, and the revised version will be posted soon, so that the agenda we have -- what is this? We have a good news, because the agenda is short and we have only four lines. That means that we can take them in quarter now, no? Okay, two pages. Sorry.

Now the version is posted. I suggest to you if you see it, can we have it on the screen, so that we can approve it, or not. So you see it, the revised version on the screen, starting with a new series of text submitted by com 4, com 5, sorry, to the plenary, that is resolution 1 and recommendation A12. Then we will consider issues of subject from Committee 4, outstanding subject from Committee 4, that is mainly what already have been said this morning, related to over the top, OTTs, related to new resolutions regarding OTT, new resolution regarding counterfeit and combating spam, privacy, open source, and alternative calling procedures.

Then we will move on other draft new resolution. Now draft resolution revised one, resolution 50 on Cybersecurity, resolution 60, 78, and draft new resolutions on counterfeit and on device theft globally. As you know, those all five items have something related to DOA, which is one of the major issues outstanding today.

Then we will go through the 11 series of text proposed resolution 2, take up question 111, pending text of ITU-T Study Group 20, and this will be, will end the let us say operational part, and then we will go to the appointment of Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen of Study Groups of TSAG and SCV as we would have approved in the meanwhile resolution 2.

If you agree on this agenda, I suggest we move on, starting by the first item which is 9th series of text submitted by Ed com to the plenary to be approved. I give the floor to the Chair of com 5, Mrs. Rim, please. I see a request from United States, for the floor, United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It's putting us a bit off balance to have a, such a radically different agenda than what we expected. I wonder if you might slow down a bit so that we can

make sure that we have the right documents available when they come up. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I want to draw your attention to the proposed draft new resolution, enable open source as a work methodology in ITU-T. This morning, we agreed the Chairman's report of output of Committee 4, and it was decided that we wouldn't proceed with that resolution. So I'm surprised to see it come forward to plenary.

I assume given that we have approved the report this morning, that this is an error. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you again. Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. Actually, UK just raised my question. So I don't know if that is a typo. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm surprised because the discussion on the open source we did support this resolution, it was presented to the plenary of Committee 4 two times, one when the Arabic group presented the new resolution, and this had some support. Then it was moved for to an ad hoc to discuss it. When we went back to the plenary of com 4 there was a major discussion,

and we requested to take it to the plenary. I don't know if this was, and I think Chairman of com 4 can confirm this. There was some written text to reflect that there was an agreement not to have this resolution. I can assure you that there was no agreement. I don't know if this was written in this way in the report. But you can ask the floor. This is an Arabic proposal, it was presented, discussed and Arab and many countries has shown support. Because there was no agreement on the way forward, in the com 4, we requested to take it to the plenary. So I think what is in the agenda is accurate, and is reflect the right situation. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. Hello, everybody. Good afternoon.

We would like to join our voice to Jordan. In fact, I'm very surprised to agree on about things in com 4, I'm very pleased for that. We cannot reach a different conclusion once we have agreed on something. We cannot change something that we have agreed upon in the Committee, com 4 I mean. Mr. Chairman, the Arab proposal is still under discussion. And we on like to discuss it here, in this plenary, and I'd like to take a decision about it here. This topic, Mr. Chairman, is of interest to

all the developing countries. And we have to support this resolution in order to serve the interest of developing countries.

Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. I will give the floor to Australia, Ghana, unless it is com 4, Canada, and UAE, on this subject I would like however to make a comment. We are not talking about the substance of open source. I have heard a comment or a request from UK and Sweden, considering that open source is a closed issue in com 4. That is there would have been agreement not to have resolution on that, this is my understanding of the comment and intervention of UK and Sweden. My understanding from what Jordan said, from what Saudi Arabia said, is that the decision on the open source draft resolution haven't been taken. The only decision that have been taken is to move it to the plenary for the consideration. This is what I have understood from both sides.

May I, and I ask Australia, Canada, UAE, Russia, and Sweden, may I ask you if I can, before your intervention, if I can ask the Chairman of com 4 who could clarify for all of us this subject. And then I will give you the floor if it is still appropriate, if you don't have

satisfaction. Are you okay with that? Australia?
Canada? UAE and Sweden. Please if you are okay with
that, not move, I will see that you are okay. So thank
you. And I give the floor to com 4 Chairman, please give
us the status on this open source. Thank you. Ghana,
you can take the floor.

>> Thank you, Chair.

To clarify, on the draft new resolution on open
source, yesterday during our discussions, the Chair of
the ad hoc from Russia asked for time to do further
consultation. So because we had lack of time to consider
his feedback from his consultation, the agreement was
all pending issues was to be forwarded to plenary. That
was the conclusion, on all issues that we could not get
closure to. This is one of them.

So, this TD which used to be DT85 is now available
as document number 114, as submitted to plenary for your
consideration. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Kwame. I see Canada, UAE
and Sweden requesting the floor. That means that we have
something else to add on that. Otherwise, if now we are
all on the same understanding, thank you, UAE, thank
you, Canada, for withdrawing your request for the floor.
I have only Sweden who is insisting. Sweden, please.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. So I would just wonder is it possible to see this meeting report? We can't find that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sweden.

>> May I ask again the Chair to clarify when we will have the report.

>> CHAIR: Kwame, as Chair of com 4, do you know when we will have the report?

>> KWAME BAAH-ACHEAMFUOR: Thank you, Chair.

Considering the volume of work that we had and the closure we had yesterday, the report is currently in, full text is under review, but yet with all the pending issues, if delegates will want to have a, we can do a extract of that as a document so that it could give further insight into what the pending, the status of the pending issues are.

>> CHAIR: What you are proposing is that you give extracts from the report? I don't see --

>> KWAME BAAH-ACHEAMFUOR: Yes, we couldn't, if delegates will allow we could make extracts on just the status of the pending issues that we could not have closure to and then we could post that as a TD, so that it is clear to everyone where we are with the pending issues and not the full report. The full report may take time

to get the total compilation as it stands. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. Are you fine with that? We can move on this way.

>> Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. We would like to thank the Chairman of com 4 for explaining what we have agreed upon. We are looking forward to discussing this topic during this meeting. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: We move on with this proposal. I will consider the request from the United States to go slowly, because the agenda was given to you a bit late. So I will move now to the 9th series of text submitted by Ed com. And I give the floor to com 5 Chair to present those text. I don't see, I don't see com 5 Chair here. But I see request from the floor, United States. United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I notice that in many of these documents there are still remaining many square brackets that were sent to your plenary. So I would like to ask if you are planning to handle these in the usual fashion. Normally when we have squared bracketed text and we can't come to an agreement, we just delete the text. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, U.S.

So can we have the text, can we have the document on the screen. Let's move on with the resolution 1. Please, this is resolution 1. Let's go through.

I see request from the floor, I will take them after we have reviewed the whole text.

It's a bit long resolution.

Okay. Now I give the floor to United States.

>> Thank you, not United States but Committee 3 Chairman. To remind as I said in my verbal report this morning, there is one square bracketed sentence in this text, that is the new proposed clause 2.10. My understanding is that there have been consultations and that there was agreement reached to remove this text, but perhaps Russia can clarify the status of that agreement.

I think I take Julie's comment that normally, if we can't agree, we remove it anyway, but I think in this case, my understanding was the agreement was all parties were okay with removing this text. It is 2-point, I guess it's the old, yeah, there is two clause 2s. There is a new clause 2, so there are some renumbering that will have to be done, so if you scroll up a little higher, the first clause 2, not the second clause 2 which you

are now looking at, yes, so it's shown here with the text in square brackets.

>> CHAIR: So apart from the two articles.

>> Yes.

>> CHAIR: And the 2.

>> It's 1 bis then.

>> CHAIR: 1 bis then is the --

>> Yes and while I have the floor and to save a bit of time there are no square brackets in the next text we will look at which is 8.12. But I did want to point out that one of the changes was to update the title of the D series of recommendation consistent with the title proposed for Study Group 3 in resolution 2. As we haven't yet come to that, we have taken on board the results of com 4 in selecting that title, but should there be modification in the title of Study Group 3 I believe we can take as a editorial matter to update the text of the D series in A .12 accordingly but first if I can have confirmation that my understanding was correct that agreement has been reached that we can remove this text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Steve. Russia, please, can you explain what is the agreement reached on this square bracket?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. I would nevertheless like to say that we and a series of countries who support us would like to discuss this point to start with. The issue is, that at the meeting of Committee 3, there was quite a lot of representatives of different countries and said that, because this is a different complex issue and in Committee 4 as well, there was a large, there was a lot of discussion on this, and so while I have the microphone, I'd like to clarify the reasons that this came up.

We believe that the resolution of ITU, resolution 1 should, WTSA resolution 1 should contain a full description of the process for preparing and approving documents for standardization. The resolution should be clear for specialists who often or always participate in many meetings and also representatives of Member States of the ITU, and members of sectors, ITU sectors particularly from developing countries who participate in meetings on a periodic basis. Therefore, opponents expressed the doubt that this could reduce the number of Sector Members. Responding to these doubts, I would like to, there were many countries and there was a plan, like in a hotel there is a evacuation plan and nevertheless, the presence of this plan doesn't mean that there is

a danger. It doesn't mean the number of guests is reduced.

The new point 1 bis 10 is a paragraph that is for use in exceptional circumstances, and therefore then every participant will be able to know what activities can be undertaken if a consensus is not achieved. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. I have Australia requesting the floor. Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Australia would also like to seek the Chair's guidance and clarification on the query that was raised earlier by our colleagues from the U.S., and that is with regard to the text for which there is currently no consensus, will the usual approach be taken, which is to remove the text that is currently in square brackets. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. Sorry, this is just to echo the question from Australia. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair. I too have the same question as the U.S., Sweden and Australia.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I have plenty of requests for the floor, is it for the same thing? China, please.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Chairman. I would like to speak

in Chinese. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Regarding this points, at the meeting of Com 3 we have already explained our views fully, with regard to resolution 1, it has given all the procedures of ITU-T. Regarding to the situation where Member States or Sector Members cannot agree on something, we are of the view that a clear procedure is very important. Therefore, with regard to 1 bis 10, we would like to see it clearly into the resolution 1. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since we are discussing the rules of procedure of the ITU telecommunication standardization sector, I think it is very important to be remind the general rules of the conferences, Assemblies and meetings of the union. Number 91 of the general, of those rules, says that each proposal or amendment duly supported by the submitted or shall be -- sorry, each proposal or amendment duly supported shall be submitted for discussion and thereafter for decision if necessary by vote. This is rule number 91.

So I think it is very important to keep this in mind. I mean each proposal or amendment shall be discussed. I mean there is no reference in the general

rules and the procedure that says that the square brackets, all the square brackets should be deleted. This is number 1.

Number 2, regarding the proposed text between square bracket, Saudi Arabia of the view and we have expressed our views during the Committee 3 meeting, we are of the view that the rules of procedure should be clarified and should be documented. If the consensus is not achieved then there has to be some actions to be taken in order to help the meeting to move forward. We are of the view that the square brackets to be removed, and this is to be adopted. Thank you.

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

>> GERMANY: Mr. Chairman, well, we are of the opposite view then from our colleague from Saudi Arabia. We think that any vote conducted according to the relevant sections of the constitution, convention and the general rules would exclude Sector Members from being part of the decision-making process. It is to be recognized that resolution 14 of the Plenipotentiary Conference however resolves to invite Sector Members to take part in any decision finding procedure in facilitating the achievement of a consensus in the Study Group.

In particular, and here we are in the field of

standardization, and farther invites the World Telecommunication Standardization Assembly to adopt the respective provisions in the working results and procedures.

Further bearing in mind that supplementary text are by definition technical documents not having regulatory or policy implications, it does not seem to be pertinent to completely omit industry membership in these decision-making processes. In particular, as the practice to agree on supplementary text by achieving consensus among the Study Group appears to be well-established and has worked so far without any proven deficiencies or shortcomings.

Taking all this into account, it is our firm belief that no direct reference to voting procedures should be made promoting voting procedures on supplementary text. In consequence, the proposed text in square brackets is by no means to be included in the resolution 1. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. South Africa.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you very much, honorable Chairperson. We have listened carefully to the interventions from our colleagues, and we would like to associate ourselves with the comments made by Russia,

China, Saudi Arabia, and other colleagues. Chairperson, we do not believe that striking out issues that other parties are still willing to deliberate on is a form of consensus. We do believe that colleagues have expressed their view that they would like the brackets to be removed and we also are of the same view, but are willing to continue deliberating. And from where we are, and observing, the fact that each time there is some sort of disagreement, we just want to revert to striking out the text, is not a solution per se. It doesn't even imply consensus for that matter.

I do believe, Chairperson, that in terms of what we have in terms of the rules, there are several ways we can actually resolve matters, but because we are anxious to have some kind of consensus most of us have been trying to advance the discussions rather than having a sort of standoff, because that is not the principle, that is not the standard of this union.

With those Chairperson, we would like to support the colleagues as mentioned and would urge that the square brackets be removed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I remind delegates that we are discussing square brackets that was supposed to be agreed upon before the meeting. So, I have some

additional requests for the floor. And I hope that we will not spend so much time on items that are supposed to be agreed upon, and I will give the floor to the remaining states who asked to, and then I will give the floor back to Russia to explain its proposal, and then I would propose a way forward.

So, Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: I thank you, Mr. Chair again. Jordan in support of removing the square bracket and maintaining the text. Actually, this text is important, because it is reflect exactly some issues that need to have a procedural issues on it, on resolution 1. In fact, we had a similar situation when we were in Study Group 3, and there was a common contribution regarding the need to develop a new recommendation on roaming. When we start discussing this issue, there was a lot of opposition on the floor to the need of this recommendation.

However, because there was no, you can say, agreement or acceptance from that, I raised the question that in this case what we shall do. Shouldn't we apply the same rules and procedure that we have in the General Assembly of the telecommunication sector? And I got an indication that yes, in this case, if it carried no -- we need to go for a vote for example in this case.

However, after some countries reconsider their position, we worked on the recommendation and this recommendation is now, have come to this Assembly to approve. So sometimes you need to be clear about what are the rules and the procedures needed to tackle certain issues. We already have faced similar situation. You can ask the TSB to give clarity that of course, even there is nothing written, but I think now we have more consistent and clear written text and we need to consider to maintain this text. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. UAE.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon to one and all. Concerning this question, it can be split into two. First part has to do with text that have been transmitted to plenary, and which are in square brackets, and secondly, the current subject that we are dealing with now. Concerning the first, when we submit a question that hasn't been resolved on a Committee level or ad hoc group level, we can't, at that point in time, say that in turning it over to plenary, that we should just delete it. Quite the contrary. We need to discuss it. We need to attempt to find a solution.

Concerning the second question, the one at hand, here, in A14 of commission 3 we have expressed the wish

to retain this text, and to take away the square brackets.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon for all colleagues.

We listened carefully for all views regarding this point, and also as my role as Working Group 3A, I involved in the discussion for the new text for 1.10 bis.

It's clear, Mr. Chairman, it's clear that some Member States and especially those from developing countries require rules and procedures on resolution 1 to be clear, completed for all type of text of the ITU-T. Also I would like to clarify that this text is specifically for when there is no approval procedures. So all type of text like recommendations, questions, where there is a specific approval procedures is applied, so we are talking here about if there is no specific approval or agreement procedures, such as implementation guide and the technical report, and we understand specifically the views objecting this text, since we find that such reports are very simple and may be approved in the Working Party level on some occasions.

Having saying that, Mr. Chairman, and however, this text is very important to my administration, and for

many developing countries. And since we have very limited time for our Assembly to discuss the issue regarding working methods and procedures in very extensive way, we may propose, Mr. Chairman, that we can not include 1.10 bis in the revised text of resolution 1, and through you, Mr. Chairman, asking the Assembly in your report to ask the TSAG to take it into account the text of 1 bis, 1.10 bis, and during the development of the draft new consolidated WTSA res 1 for consideration for WTSA coming Assembly WTSA 20, so we can have some time for a lengthy extensive discussion how we can reach consensus for such delicate issue. We heard also for documents from our colleague from Germany that there is some, maybe some contradiction with some recommendation in the A series. So we are dealing with a very delicate issue, linking many documents together.

I provide this proposal to your hands, Mr. Chairman. Maybe we can reach a consensus in this, in your plenary. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt, for your proposal. I have still three, sorry, two requests for the floor and we give back the floor to Russia and then the proposal from Egypt on the discussion.

>> ITALY: We strongly support the German position,

and we think that it is not detrimental for the work of the sector coming to the vote. Every time there is a vote it is division. We are for harmony, for good result, not something oppose one side to the other. But however I can follow the idea of Egypt as a compromise.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Italy. I have Senegal.

>> SENEGAL: Thank you very much, Chair. We support the position expressed by South Africa, the Emirates and others. We feel that if there isn't any specific approval procedure on a urgent basis it would be wise to take account of 1 bis 10 and take time to work on taking away the square brackets. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Senegal. I would like to propose, I have two other requests for the floor. I would like to close the list now, for clarification, and after taking these two requests I would like to give the floor to Russia to give us back his position, and I would like you then to react on the proposal of Egypt as potential way out.

I will give the floor to China, to Brazil, and this closes the list. Then I will give the floor back to Russia. It's okay, so China, please.

>> CHINA: That regarding Germany's proposal, we wish to express our ideas, China including Sector Members

have been active in promoting Sector Members' participation in ITU efforts. Therefore, we hope that members can listen to each other while exchanging ideas, in the spirit of active cooperation for a common solution. Of course we also notice that in some Study Groups, sometimes consensus cannot be reached. We hope that when a Sector Member opposes to something, they can be very cautious. It's our hope that when a consensus cannot be reached that there is a clear process and a procedure for facilitating the approval of recommendation. If the issue is delayed until WTSA 2020, and it seems the problem has already been discussed during this session, we do hope it can be resolved as soon as possible. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China. Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Brazil is of the view that the Study Group environment is an environment that we should be, should be very open, should be, the technical environment, so everyone who attends those kind of meetings should be allowed to express their need, their views, in technical documents so the technical work will actually get done. That is why it's so important to keep the spirit of compromise as well, of consensus in this work.

And specifically on the proposal was made I think

by Egypt, I think it's a very good way forward. It is a way we could allow ourselves more time to consider what would be a good procedure to deal with this kind of documents for the Study Groups. We have procedures in place for recommendations. We should have procedures in place for other documents that are approved at Study Group level as well. We don't have them right now. But I don't think that's, that we should just decide specific procedure now, at least I don't believe we have maturity enough or have discussed enough the issue to know what would be the best procedure to deal with this kind of documents.

That is why we would like to associate ourselves with the proposal that Egypt did, to postpone this discussion to TSAG and have TSAG to evaluate what will be the best way to conduct this matter. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. I suggest we listen back again to Russia, as the initial proposers. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. First of all, I would like to note that we prepared this text in line with the proposals from chairs of Working Party, Working Group 3A, at the end of the last meeting 3 of 3A, and in no case are we advocating for having a vote.

But at the same time, we would like to see the procedure to be clearly set out.

I would like to note also that as you have already seen at this meeting, the majority of speakers supported this text, and these speakers were from developing countries. Agreeing with proposal from the Chair of Working Group 3A, we would like to call on developed countries who have spoken against, in this case, and who are against some other documents, nevertheless to be more careful in listening to the opinions of developing countries. And at the end, we support the proposal expressed by the Chair of Working Group 3A. I thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Thank you for accepting the proposal of the Working Group 3A, which is actually Egypt.

I see Japan asking for the floor. Japan and other Distinguished Delegates, I would like you now to give any comment or position on the proposal made by the Chair of Working Group 3A, that is Egypt. So as we can decide and go forward on this item. Thank you very much. So Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I asked the floor not as the delegate from Japan but as the Study

Group 3 Chairman.

As Chairman, I have conducted business on the consensus basis for a long time, because this is the traditional way of doing business in ITU-T. And if we change this traditional environment by adopting voting, I think that we would change significantly the environment.

So I think we should be a little bit more cautious, and agree to postpone to defer this discussion for the TSAG, and to have the more in depth consideration. Thank you very much the.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Chair of the Study Group 3, for your comment.

I see Jordan, and again, I appeal on you to give your opinion, your position on the proposal of the Chair of Working Group 3A. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> Jordan: The proposal from the delegate of Egypt, that is that we ask TSAG to solve this issue, could be a possible solution for this question. But the question that I wish to ask is the following. We have documents which, in which SGs are working and they have procedures relative to those documents. However, other documents don't have specific procedures, for example, technical reports that SG 3 deals with on OTT applications. This

was already discussed in the SG, and a lot of remarks are forthcoming. A lot of work was undertaken to finalize that report, and we are now meeting here to approve it. And if we don't approve it, then what are we going to do? Do we defer this until such time as we have found an appropriate mechanism? We have to have clear mechanisms in place here. And if we defer to TSAG, will we have to wait until 2020 to see a clear procedure in this regard? That is my question.

And between now and 2020, if we have other questions to resolve, how are we going to proceed? What do we do if we don't have a consensus? All of those documents will be put aside until 2020? This is the question that I wish to raise here. I think we all need to find an answer. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. Switzerland.

>> SWITZERLAND: Good afternoon, everybody, I'm not speaking for Switzerland, I'm speaking as Chair of Study Group 13, a very technical oriented Study Group group, and I just would like to, my colleague from Study Group 3, we are really doing work in consensus, I think it was of value for all participants, and introducing, and considering the fact that most work of us is done by Sector Members coming from the industry, to produce new

recommendations, it is important that we can continue with consensus, and it can be with such kind of votings, on the one hand I'm concerned that more than already we have, there were more leaving, Sector Members, more members will leave and not continue the work, technical work in Study Group 13. That is my first concern. Secondly, it could be also driven in the other direction. We had in the past in the summer an issue with certification designed with TSMA, and I think it was a very difficult issue, because the industry was against this, and but because we had to find consensus, we had to sit together, there was a proposal from African country, indeed with such a rule countries could vote and say okay but what would happen, okay, nothing will happen because it requires the support of the industry here to get things done.

So we really should reconsider here on the behalf of the technical work of Study Groups, not that we achieve the opposite, but we intend to achieve with good spirit.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Chairman of Study Group 13. I see, Chair of Study Group 20 or as Member State?

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I'm speaking as UAE, not as the Chairman of Study Group 20. Although I might not disagree, but sometimes we do have some issues raised

in the Study Groups where there are different views, and in some rare cases consensus cannot be reached. So there has to be a procedure for those issues which cannot be resolved by consensus.

But anyhow, Mr. Chairman, after hearing the proposal from my dear colleague from Egypt, perhaps deferring this discussion until WTSA 2020 it's too long. But we have another vehicle. Perhaps during, we can do it through TSAG, and amendments to A .1 recommendation could be a way forward. Maybe during TSAG, first meeting, we can reach to good compromise text which can be then inserted to A .1 recommendation. Which would solve the issue and will not have a very long time until the next Assembly to consider this issue. So this is perhaps another proposal, way forward, if this is acceptable by other colleagues who have mentioned that they would prefer to discuss it in the Assembly and keep the text of the resolution. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. Now we have Portugal for the floor and then I will ask the Chairman of TSAG the opinion of the Chairman of the TSAG on this proposals. Portugal, please.

>> PORTUGAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to strongly support the intervention made by the

distinguished colleagues of Germany, Italy, Brazil, Japan among others. Europe is supporting consensus driven environment in ITU and in ITU-T in particular.

We also consider as a very dangerous precedent for the sector if we go with the lines of the proposals that we have in front of us. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Portugal. That ends the debates part, unless there is a very very specific -- I would like to ask the Chairman of TSAG to give us his opinion on the proposed way forward by Egypt, and as amended by UAE, if the Chairman can give us his view, and then we would propose a way forward on this topic. Bruce.

>> Yes, thank you, Chairman, and good afternoon, everyone.

Chairman, certainly I'm in your hands to reflect the consensus point of view of a way forward. Certainly TSAG is one possibility of trying to address this issue. It's very difficult, and we would need certainly the assistance of the legal affairs unit to try to provide us with some material and information with regard to what kind of text might be appropriate.

I do agree that it does not appear that we can reach consensus here, so that other solutions need to be

identified. So Chairman, I can only indicate that we will try our best to address this issue, but I do believe that we need to defer a decision at this point and try to find a solution, whatever the most appropriate solution might be.

I'm not going to comment on whether the amendment to resolution 1 or A .1 is the most appropriate vehicle. But I do believe that we need to discuss this further at the next TSAG meeting next year. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now, I would suggest that we consider as a way forward for this specific point which is, looks very important for the appropriate work of Study Groups, but I have heard also the importance of the role and the word of Sector Member who have, who are giving much expertise in our Study Groups. This is why I propose to you as a decision on this topic is to remove this paragraph, and to insert in the draft, in the summary report of the Assembly of the Chairman, to ask the Chairman to work on this issue, so as to prepare proposed text, either through A .1, or for the WTSA 2020.

I'm not the most skilled in drafting such a sentence. But I would propose to my team to propose a draft on that, and this is what I propose as a way forward. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair.

In my information, the Chair of Working Group 3A has a prepared text, which I think could be transmitted to the Secretariat to be included in the report. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Great, thank you. I will have nothing to do. So the text is already prepared. Thank you. United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, not United States but Committee 3 Chair. I'd point out in our not yet presented report of the results of Committee 3, we do have a similar statement, and we did recognize not just this issue but additional work is required. So I can read out what is there, but you will find this in document 99, which is, let's see if that is the right document, but the sentence is plenary is requested to instruct TSAG to conduct a wholistic review of document procedures across recommendation 1, A .1 and A .13 and prepare a proposal to the next Assembly. This is already in my report, Chairman. You are certainly welcome to take it in yours. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I suggest we move forward as proposed by the Chairman of study, of com 3. I see no objection. Are there any comment on the resolution

itself apart we have taken the point where we have some editorial minor issues, paragraph 2, which was used twice.

No issue, no question relating to resolution 1. So I consider it as approved.

(sound of gavel).

Thank you. Next text proposed for approval to this Assembly is recommendation A12, related to identification and layout of ITU-T recommendations, which I hope is a simple one. Are there any comments? I don't see any. Approved.

Next one is the issues coming from Committee 4. Okay. So I hope we are not having a debate again on the open source, because it's one of the issues remaining within com 4, so I will name them. You have them on the agenda. We have the draft new resolution AFCP3 on over the top, AFCP-3. We have then the revised resolution 29 on alternative calling procedures. We have resolution 52 on counterfeit and combating spam, draft resolution based on Arab proposal number 5 on open source. And we have draft resolutions on Cybersecurity revised resolutions, sorry, on Cybersecurity identification. Two of them. And new resolution on combating mobile theft.

Those are the main outcome or the main pending issues from com 4 report. And we can now start with the proposal on over the top. Can we have it? On the over the top issue the major remaining point is the title.

So, the document is 110. And we have an informal report, sorry, report from an informal discussion on the consolidation, on the resolution on ITT which was Chaired by Bahrain. I would like to ask the Chair of this informal consultation to give us the status of this consultation. Bahrain, please.

>> Bahrain: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Of course we have been discussing the title of this document since yesterday. We have had a lot of consultations with different interested members of this informal discussion. Very unfortunately, Chair, I would like to inform you that we could not reach a consensus or an agreement on a title. There were several options by different members to try to reach a consensus, but we could not agree on the title or the way forward for this title of this document. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Bahrain. So can we have the document with the present title, that wasn't agreed upon. So, I would like to have your views on this title, whether it is acceptable or not. Is it the initial title that

have been discussed in informal, Bahrain, can you confirm this is the initial title discussed and not agreed?

>> Bahrain: Yes, Chair, I confirm. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So I see Jordan. Jordan, please.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chair. As regards the title of this resolution, I believe that the title should be in line with the content of the resolution. This resolution asks for us to study the impacts of OTTs through work of SG 2 and SG 3. So these are two Study Groups who are concerned by the economic impact and also Study Group 2 deals with operational aspects.

The problem in the title is that it limits these services to the aspects and services which have access to international public telecommunication numbering resources. All these services don't require, all services don't require access to such resources. That is why we haven't been able to reach a consensus. I think we should not limit the title to those applications that have access to international resources, because this will make study within the SGs quite limited. So therefore, we would need the title to be more broad, and have a broader span. The problem in our view is that the title limits the applications to only those who

require access to international public telecommunications numbering resources. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. Senegal.

>> SENEGAL: Thank you, Chair. Within the African Group we have worked on a new title, so that we can make progress and find a solution that would be appropriate. Thus the title of our proposal is, which I will say in English, on-line voice, comma, video calling and instant messaging application impacting recognized Telecom operator in developing countries.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Senegal. So this is, we have two options, the one between bracket, and the proposal from Senegal. Sweden, please.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. There has been many discussions on this proposal, late, very late last night, there was a discussion on what was needed as an instrument due to the fact that the whole document was put in brackets and not only the title.

We agree that we should try to find agreement on the content of this document, and then discuss what kind of instrument we need to bring the tools that are asked for. I'm confused if we discussed or if we are discussing this now within the context of the proposed resolution, or whether that will be discussed later, what kind of

instrument this document should be. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sweden. Mexico.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon to one and all.

I think that there is an additional proposal that is missing here, which was a text introduced by the United States supported by CITELE. Through this the report would include, in the Chairman's report, that there wasn't necessarily a resolution ready on this particular point. We just had this discussion a few minutes ago. We would also like to have this taken on board as one of the options that we can use in trying to advance on this topic. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mexico. So we have, today first text that haven't been agreed within brackets. We have a proposal from Senegal, which is in red on the screen on line, voice, video calling and instant messaging applications impacting recognized Telecom operator in developing countries. And we have the proposals of Mexico, of CITELE, proposing to add the text in the summary report of the Assembly.

I would like to ask you if the proposal from Senegal is acceptable for you, please countries who are against -- who agree on this resolution, on this proposal,

you don't need to take the floor. May I ask if there are one Member State who accepts this text? The proposal of Senegal. I would like only the Member States who are not accepting this proposal. So first, who supports, which Member States support the proposal of Senegal of using this title you have on the screen? United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is not clear to me which procedure you are beginning to use in this circumstance, but while I do appreciate the proposal from Senegal with respect to the title, that particular proposal is not acceptable to us, because it broadens the scope of the resolution to include messaging, video calling and on-line voice applications, whether or not they require access to international public telecommunication numbering resources, and indeed that phrase would have to be placed throughout the resolution. We would support the compromise offered by the Distinguished Delegate from CITELE, and urge you to move forward on the basis of consensus. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: South Africa.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you very much, honorable Chairperson. I think we heard you very clearly, even though English is not my first language, you indicated that you would like countries who actually support the

proposal from Senegal, and actually this was a proposal discussed in the African Group, so it's a proposal coming from the African Group. It is not coming from Senegal. I just want to emphasize that, Chairperson. We would like, because we think that actually the proposal was made, is very much definite. It is not -- it is within scope. We could have broadened it, and we discussed options which could have broadened it to cover our concerns. But I think in the spirit of compromise, we limited the scope. Thank you, Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, South Africa. I am sorry if I misheard the gentleman from Senegal, but I have heard that it was Senegal proposal. Or maybe he didn't mention that it is African proposal, common African proposal. Thank you for that. Sorry for that. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. We would like to support the new title, as proposed. The only thing is that we will propose to delete the word recognized, because it's not quite clear what it means in this context. Overall, this new title is something we believe to reflect the substance and essence of the resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Zimbabwe.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chair. We want to support the proposition of Senegal, and want to reiterate that OTTs

do not necessarily need to use numbering resources, it is in fact they do not. Some OTTs utilize numbering as a way of authenticating but they do not use numbering resources. The idea of putting in public telecommunication is a way of trying to make sure this resolution amounts to nothing. We do not agree with that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Sorry, Zimbabwe, you do not agree with what?

>> The position proposed by the United States that they want to have numbering, use, requiring access to public telecommunication numbering resources, that is not what OTTs are. We know that OTTs we are addressing in all resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Zimbabwe. Tanzania.

>> TANZANIA: Thank you, Chair. The proposal by African Group through Senegal is supported. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Senegal.

>> SENEGAL: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to clarify, I said at the beginning that we worked within the African Group so that was just to clarify that is it a proposal from the African Group. Another point, we need to be clear that we tried to do a, make huge amount of progress compared with the initial proposal

that was made, and this was in a spirit of cooperation and to have a compromise and consensus to move forward, as I said at the beginning.

The title was changed, now we are no longer referring to OTTs. In the proposal to include the word, is also with reference to security, that was also removed. So our aim is to have studies launched so that we can avoid having different regulations taken in all countries, particularly developing countries. We tried also to restrict the scope by talking about telecommunication operators in developing countries. I think this is in the spirit of consensus.

Just to clarify, one last time, that this does not concern, for example, E-mail messaging. We spoke about instant messaging. So just to limit the scope. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Senegal. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. In brief terms, we support the proposal presented by the African Group, and we also support the modification to this title which was presented by RCC. And we would like to see this modification taken into account. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chairman. We seem to have

moved very quickly, and I think that we have missed the proposal from CITELE, which I think was introduced but has not been considered as yet.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia. We have considered, they have considered to have your views on the proposal of the common African proposal, and then to the proposal of CITELE. Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm afraid that we are about to get back to the endless debates we have had on this topic and were not able to reach a consensus which is why CITELE as a group came forward with a compromise proposal to have some text in the Director's report, and no new resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, CITELE. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, we support the title proposed by the African Group as we always share the word is that the previous title will exclude many of the OTTs that are not using the public numbering resources. So thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. UAE.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. UAE also supports the proposal by African colleagues. However, after some off line consultation with other Russian delegation, distinguished colleague

from Russia, I think we can have a recognize a term back and to say recognized operating agencies, which is a terminology used in the ITU, and it's already well-defined within the ITU. So because the OTT normally are not ROA, are not recognized operating agencies, within most of the countries. So it would be better to use the impact on those recognized operating agencies rather than using a terminology which is not clear. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. I would like now to close the debate on the proposal made by the African region. I have two more requests for the floor. I would like to ask you to be brief, and to give your position on the proposal made by the African region. Then I will move on to the proposal made by CITELE. So as to be able to conclude on these topics, as we have been, you have been discussing either the substance or on this subject for quite a long time. So Sweden, you have the floor. Then Kuwait, and I propose to close the list on this proposal. Thank you.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: I see the U.S. in the list also. Sorry. Sweden, please.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. Well, I think one

problem here is that we have had discussions and then the discussions were moved to plenary. We went from evening discussions yesterday, and now we are presented with a completely new title, including references to operating, operating agencies, restricting this to developing countries. The scope of this instrument is unclear, and as we have been discussed there are some concerns in relation to the need and the scope of the document of the resolution.

So we are just now presented a new title, which we didn't even discuss yesterday, in relation to what the resolution as such would bring as value for the concerned colleagues.

So I don't know what will happen after this title is adopted. Are we going to discuss the content of the resolution? Or will we just accept the resolution as such? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sweden. Regarding your question what we will do afterwards, this is a document that is submitted to us for the plenary, and we have to deal with. I mean we have to decide on it. I have understood that the major issue is the title itself because in the rest of the resolution, what is agreed upon is almost everything, except the reference to the

title, the same wording as for the title. This is why we are not going to discuss all the proposal, but if we fix the issue of the title, we would be able to close and to agree on the global resolution. This is why we are discussing here, I am giving you the floor which is your right, and I see that you like to take the floor to express your opinion. But here again, it is you who decides the time we spend on any topics, whether it seems very important, it is very important to you or not.

And just giving the floor to Member States who are requesting it, so I will summarize what I have heard at a certain point of time, and we will go forward, either for a decision on one proposal or the other or alternative proposal that I may personally do.

So next speakers, next floor for Kuwait, United States and Cameroon who joined almost after it was the list. Please let us take these three interventions and then we can move forward. I would like you to prepare your opinion on the CITELE proposal, and then please we go forward on that.

Kuwait is asking for the floor.

>> Kuwait: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, our understanding is that the content of the new resolution is being discussed in com 4 and that's agreed upon. The

only thing that is not agreed upon was the title. This is our understanding. I hope our understanding is right. This is first. Second, we agree with the African proposal. However, to be consistent with other resolutions, I would say operating agencies/Telecom operators, so I wouldn't delete that Telecom operators and instead put a slash after agencies and keeping the Telecom operators as is. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

It's not just the title we are discussing. This phraseology appears in the title as well as five other parts of this resolution, two in the considerings, one in the resolves, one in the instructs the Director, and another in instructs Study Groups.

What we are talking about is defining the entire scope of the resolution, and not just the title. To be clear, the United States cannot support this resolution, and we feel that the CITELE proposal is at a disadvantage here because we do not see a document or ample discussion on our proposal. Thank you, Chair.

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

>> CAMEROON: Thank you, Chair. The African proposal, we would add our voice to support the proposal

from the African Group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I have two additional candidates for the floor. May I appeal to you that we stop on this proposal, I have heard, we have heard many position of Member States. May I appeal you, appeal on you to be brief on this proposal, so that we can have a short debate on the CITELE proposal, and a way forward after that. Cuba, please.

>> CUBA: Thank you, Chair. We support the African Group's proposal as amended by Kuwait. It seems to me that we could use this in the document. We don't agree with the proposal from CITELE, which also sets forth, well, we don't agree with CITELE's proposal. That is our position. We support the African proposal as amended by Kuwait, however.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Cuba. I have Mexico.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. Sorry to take the floor again. But indeed, to confirm what was said by the Distinguished Delegate of the United States, I think that we are disadvantaged here because our proposal is the third on the list. The others have had the opportunity to express their opinion and give their points of view on theirs. We still don't see the text that CITELE has advanced, which could be a possible solution, compromise

solution. If you think that it might be advisable, I could read it out, so that you could put this up on the screen. There is, as I said, a compromise solution, in which we could submit a text for the Director's report, specifically based on what is under 9/3. This is not an unknown text to us. We think that this, in this way, we could solve the problem in so far as resolution on OTTs are concerned. And since the others seem to be fairly controversial, it might be a way to move forward. Please, Chair, tell me if you think the time is appropriate for us to introduce the text we have to propose. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Should read it, can you read it again. Can we have it on the screen.

>> MEXICO: It would read in the following way, sir. 2 and 3, to continue to study -- I don't know if you -- okay -- 2 and 3, to continue, I will read it again from the beginning. To Study Group 2 and 3, so the first part is to a Study Group 2 and 3 to continue to study the economic, comma, operational and regulatory impact of the Internet, comma, convergence, with services or infrastructure and new services, comma, such as OTT, comma, on international telecommunication services and networks. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Now we have that you are not

disadvantaged. We have here the text that CITELE proposed as to be inserted in the summary report of this Assembly, and I will read it again. To instruct, to SG 2 and 3, what is the verb? Please, to instruct Study Group 2 and 3 to continue to study the economic operational and regulatory impact of the Internet, convergence with services or infrastructure and new services such as OTT on international telecommunication services and networks.

So the proposal of CITELE is to have this text inserted in the draft, in the summary report, sorry, of the Assembly. I see Paraguay asking for the floor. Please, I would like to ask you because we have spent so much time on this OTT draft resolution, I would like you to have brief intervention. We have a clear view now on what is required, what is the objective of the initial proposal from Africa region on OTT. I think this is clear. So please give me your position in a very brief way. Paraguay.

>> PARAGUAY: Thank you very much, Chair. Just to support the CITELE proposal, and I'd like to, I would like to have gone into this a little bit more, but because of the time constraints, I will follow your wishes. Just to say therefore that we support the proposal from the CITELE region.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Paraguay, for your cooperation. Brazil, briefly, please.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair, very quickly, Brazil believes that this proposal from CITEEL it does capture the spirit that was intended in the draft resolution, since we have so much controversy on the resolution itself we believe it's the best way forward for this Assembly. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. I will be short. On behalf of CEPT, we support the CITEEL proposal.

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

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. I'll also be brief. We support the CITEEL proposal, and wish to clarify that the CITEEL proposal was to include this text in the summary record, instead of the draft new resolution being approved. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, U.S.

Senegal.

>> SENEGAL: Yes, thank you, Chair. Just to say that we do not support the CITEEL proposal here. Question 9, in fact most of the experts in this room participate in that group, all know that this is a vast subject. Now if we have come to this meeting to ask for focus

on OTTs, it's because this is a very serious problem for developing countries, so we cannot just support coming to just a mention in the summary report with all of this.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Zimbabwe.

>> ZIMBABWE: Thank you, Chairman. To be short, we do not support the proposal from CITELE. We believe a resolution is the appropriate tool to address our objectives. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Zimbabwe. Uruguay.

>> Uruguay supports the CITELE proposal. We see this as an excellent means to respond to the situation that we face with OTTs in both developing and developed countries. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Dominican Republic.

>> Thank you, Chair. I'll take this opportunity to express our support for the CITELE proposal without taking any further time. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Cote d'Ivoire.

>> Thank you, Chair. We wish to support the remarks made by Zimbabwe and Senegal, that is we don't support the proposal from CITELE. We believe, we believe that in a substantive way our needs won't be accurately translated into a summary report. We wanted to have a

resolution which translated this problem in full. So we wish to have a resolution to deal with this.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Cote d'Ivoire. Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We would like to support CITELE proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan. Germany.

>> Germany: Thank you, Chair. Quite briefly, we support the CITELE proposal, sir.

>> CHAIR: I'm sorry. I'm confused because I have Germany here.

(laughter).

>> He spoke in Spanish.

>> CHAIR: Germany speaking Spanish.

(applause and laughter).

Congratulations.

So, Germany was supporting CITELE proposal. Okay. Thank you. I would propose to stop the debate here. I have many other requests for the floor. I have roughly eight requests for the floor.

I would like to stop the debate here, and to go for a decision. I have now much more requests for the floor. But I appeal to you, I think we have heard the quite benefit positions from all the regions of the world, and I would like now to spare our time, to go for decision,

and to go to the next item.

So, I'm appealing you, if you accept withdraw your decision, your request for the floor, I see here quite balanced also requests for the floor in different regions but we have spent so much time on this issue and would like to go for a decision.

So it's up to you, I'm appealing you again to withdraw your request for the floor, until I can, in a way that I can go for decision. I still have six requests for the floor. I still have five. I'm transparent with you. I have four. Three. This is good for countdown for the decision I would propose. I have three requests for the floor. It will not work this way. No one is withdrawing. But I can tell you those three requests are from three different regions. So far it's balanced. Do you agree that I propose to you that we take this three requests insisting, and then we go for a proposal from my side. Okay?

South Africa, please.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you very much, honorable Chairperson. Sorry for insisting. But I've heard that part of the discussion that we had they didn't touch on some important proposals that were made in terms of the African position, which I think were very balanced,

because we actually spent the time looking at one or the other, and I think that, and I would like to thank the colleagues from Saudi Arabia and Russia who actually made some very useful suggestions. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, South Africa. Australia and Japan and we will close the debate on it. If you accept of course. Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Australia had previously requested to see the text of the CITELE proposal on the screen. We would now like to voice our support for the CITELE proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia. Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I requested the floor as the Chairman of Study Group 3, as Japan has already expressed their support for the CITELE proposal. And as the Chairman of Study Group 3, we have already embarked in the study of OTT, and with this instruction, we are committed to continue our work. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan. So my proposal, it will not be to take a decision. I have it in mind. But I would like to give Distinguished Delegates few more minutes to think of one of the two options that we have on hand, and the third one that maybe they may rise from

nonconsensus on any of them. So I suggest that we go for a short coffee break. And I would like just you to think of this. We have two proposals on the screen, and we have another one which will be derived from the fact that there is no consensus on any of the two. You understand what I mean by that.

So, let's go for a short coffee. We have spent roughly one hour and a half on this subject. I know it's strategic. I know it's very important. I know also that you need to debate. So we did it. Let's go for a short break. And then 15 minutes, it's okay? It's too short? Too short, 15 is okay? 15 minutes break. And then we resume, and we decide on that. Okay? Thank you very much. And we will resume in 15 minutes.

Sorry. Bolivia requested the floor -- what is this ...

(break).

(standing by).

>> Ladies and gentlemen, ladies and gentlemen, may I have your attention, please, we are going to resume the plenary session, if you could have your seats, please. Thank you. If you could resume, we will be resuming the session momentarily. If you could be seated, please. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Hello again. Welcome again. Now we will resume where we have stopped. We have been discussing for a long time the draft new resolution proposed by Africa Group, African Group on over the top. We have here on the screen the two new proposals that came up, one from Senegal on behalf of Africa Group, and one from CITELE.

We have heard the position of many Member States. And as I said, I didn't see, I see, I rather saw a balanced position on the two proposals that have been made. This is why now as we need to go to come to a decisions, I would like to give the floor to Ghana, to in fact Chairman of com 4, to have his view and potential proposal. Mr. Kwame, please.

>> KWAME BAAH-ACHEAMFUOR: Thank you very much, Chair.

We took advantage of the coffee break to be able to consult with the interested parties on this matter. So I managed to consult CITELE on their proposal, and also the African Group and other regions and Member States. The agreement we had was that for instructions to Study Groups on their studies, usually if we accept as CITELE has put it, it should be adjusted in resolution 2, as resolution 2 is titled, as Study Group responsibility

and mandate. If you should go into resolution 2, somewhere under, somewhere under considering, it talks about the mandate of the Study Group clearly defined to avoid duplication.

In order to find a text in a very commonplace for both Study Groups and not to look for it in a summary record, I will propose the following to the meeting based on our agreement that we look at the part 1 of resolution 1 for Study Group 2 and insert to study the operational impact of the Internet. For Study Group 2 it will be the operational impact. For Study Group 3, consistently it will be the economic and regulatory impact.

So that the work as we are instructing to both Study Group 2 and Study Group 3 could be defined clearly. Chair, this is my proposal based on the agreement from interested parties. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Kwame for this proposal, which look as a kind of compromise considering the text proposed by CITEEL and including it in resolution 2. I would like to open the floor now for your comments on this third proposal which looks like a compromise between the two, and with particularly ask representatives of African Group to give his opinion on this proposal. Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the spirit of cooperation and compromise I think we could accept this proposal from Mr. Kwame. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. I see Brazil. Brazil, please.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chairman. So after the discussions we think that maybe it could be better to insert the whole text proposed by CITELE in the 3 resolution section 2 annex B where there is a point of guidance of ITU-T Study Groups and we could take all of the text proposed by CITELE as a new paragraph named B3, I think it could be clear what we are talking, and after the discussions I think it could be more clear what we are, the correct text that we are discussing, and I think that it could be a good solution. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Now we are having amendment to the third proposal. We are having many proposal. But I see we are moving to the, to a consensus on it. Senegal, please.

>> SENEGAL: Thank you, Chair. We can support the proposal from the Chair of com 4 as proposed, without the amendment that's just been added by CITELE. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Senegal. Just to make sure the proposal from Brazil came from CITELE or from Brazil.

Brazil, please. Can you answer that?

>> BRAZIL: Chairman, this is from Brazil, because we didn't have time to agree with other countries. Maybe you could ask for the other CITELE members. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. Sweden, please.

>> SWEDEN: On behalf of CEPT and in interest of keeping this language in one place, as we also discussed during the break, I think that two alternatives are almost identical, although the Brazilian proposal would be more clear to keep this as a new B3.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sweden. Ghana, or Chair of com 4.

>> Thank you, I'll speak as Chairman of com 4. I understand the position of Brazil, but just to look at what B1 and B2 stands for, the terms relate to all Study Groups. When you introduce a B3 which is talking about two Study Groups, it seems to be out of place. And also, the reasoning and the rationale behind splitting it into two sentences and placing it under the two Study Groups is that now, if you put it in a singular sentence then which Study Group are you saying should do the operational part and which Study Group are you saying should do the regulatory part? It could be confusing. It will become another conflict for the two Study Groups, in the singular

text. Just to make it easy, split it out and just as the mandate of resolution 2 is saying clearly defined. So if you want to clearly define it, I think that these two separate sentences under Study Group 2 and Study Group 3 really prescribe which, what their scopes are, will be very appropriate. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

So if everyone could consider these two sentences in resolution 2 to go under the part 1 for each of the Study Groups, it will help give clarity to the mandate in respect of this subject. Thank you very much, Chair.

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

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. Just to briefly say you had asked if this was from CITEEL or just Brazil, I wanted to say that we supported Brazil. Thank you.

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

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. We are speaking, we would like to speak on behalf of CITEEL but we haven't gotten any responses from the other members. However, the majority of CITEEL members would agree with this proposal, that you have just made, Chair, with the precisions made by Brazil. I think this would be a way to move forward on this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Nigeria.

>> Thank you very much, Chairman. I think Nigeria we go with the proposal of com 4 Chairman. I think it is a good way for us to move ahead. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. It looks like we are back again on the debate. I have again here nine requests for the floor. And we can have even more. So please, let's avoid this Ping-Pong game. Now I think we have comprehensive proposal that have been proposal of modification maybe in the good sense or not, I don't know, but we are here again in the Ping-Pong game, that I would like kindly ask you to move on, let us say consensus, and cooperative mood and mind-set. We cannot, in my opinion, we cannot do all the work that we have here, if we continue in this Ping-Pong game. This is my opinion, my perception. But if it's your decision to, either we go to close this debate and take a decision, or continue with this Ping-Pong game. I have here 1, 2, 3, 4, almost ten requests for the floor. I see that it is probably again a Ping-Pong game. So, I appeal to you again, we have had two first proposals, we have been discussing them on the substance, and on the wording, and then we are now almost, well, almost agreement, if I see on the third and amendment, the third proposal and amendment that is to include the text taken from Study Group 9, question

9 of Study Group 3, as proposed by CITEI, and to include it in the resolution 2. This is we already agreed globally, I feel that we can agree on that. Now the question is whether it is in the annex B3 or in Study Group 2 and 3. I have heard the argument of both of you. But I don't think it is something that needs that we continue discussing debating about it for one more hour.

So what I would suggest, but please, this is my suggestion, I have discussed with Chair of com 4, who has, I believe, appropriate analysis, because he have been dealing with the resolution 2 during this past ten days, and this is his proposal, looks to me appropriate. Now, the proposal of Brazil looks also appropriate. But it's up to you to let us say, to go beyond this Ping-Pong game, and to propose something comprehensive that may help us to go on.

I would like to give the floor now to Brazil, but please let us not continue on this Ping-Pong game. Brazil, you have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chairman. Brazil's proposal was in order to try to maintain the text as was the first proposal from CITEI. But in line to compromise, make a good compromise here, I think we can agree the proposal from com 4 Chairman on behalf of CITEI. Thank you very

much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Brazil. I much appreciate.

(applause).

We all, I see that we all appreciate your cooperative mind-set. I really appreciate it personally, and I hope that we will have it all around the room for the coming debates we will have. I see here only one request for the floor. And I would ask it to withdraw, which is done. Thank you very much, Egypt, for withdrawing your request. I consider that the decision on this new resolution OTT is not to have resolution, not to have resolution yet, but to insert the text extracted from question 9 of Study Group 3, as proposed by CITELE, and to include it separately in the resolution 2, on the mandate of Study Group 2, and Study Group 3. If it is agreeable to you, we can consider this as approved.

I see no objection from the floor.

(gavel).

So we approve this decision. Let's move on the next item, and I would like again to thank Brazil and to thank Chairman of com 4 for the real cooperative work they have done on their both regions, which is now balanced, agreeably between the two decisions. Thank you very much

for that.

Let's move now to the resolution 29, it is, 29. I will ask Phil Reston who had in charge, was the convener of the drafting group on this resolution 29, to give us the status and maybe the way forward. Phil. Where is Phil?

>> I'm here, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Okay.

>> Good afternoon. And resolution 29 on alternative calling procedures has been discussed and updated for consideration. If you go to page 4 under resolves 4 and 5, you will see two paragraphs in square brackets. The text in those square brackets were pending the decision of your previous agenda item. In order to go forward with the texts in the paragraphs 4 and 5 as they are there, I would suggest first removing the square brackets around 4 and paragraphs 4 and paragraphs 5. That I think would make paragraph 4 stable. Paragraph 5 would also have some square brackets remaining.

I would suggest copying the text from paragraph 4 down to paragraph 5, in replacement of the square brackets to align the two paragraphs. Specifically, or even if people wish, given the light of the decision taken in your previous agenda item, we could also consider

deleting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Phil. Are there any -- I see Egypt asking for the floor. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to thank Mr. Phil Reston for his effort but unfortunately, I think we need the text inside the square brackets, and I think I want to make some clarification. There is many differences between this contribution regarding alternative calling procedure, which the main goal of it is to study the alternative calling procedure and fraud, misuse and the other one comes from declaration of OTT, the other resolution discussed before.

I think in resolution 29, we need to declare explicitly the OTT fraud, and the OTT fraud here by what is mentioned between the square brackets is already accepted and proposed from our colleagues from U.S., United States, in their previous resolution. So I think we need to remain or maintain the text between the square brackets.

Also, and this is final point, I think it's the position that you have taken in the previous resolution is to put it as one item in the resolution 2 to be studied in Study Group 2. That is exactly support our point of view. So you took a decision to include the study of

the OTT as a part of Study Group 2, and now we are talking in Study Group 2 toward the same OTT issue. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Mexico.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. Let me thank Egypt for those remarks. Chair, as CITELE is seeking a definition and has reached an agreement a few minutes ago, we believe that it is not necessary to try to specify, specify concepts that were already generally defined in resolution 2. We think that we need to try to be general in our resolutions, and have time to move forward in other areas of interest to this plenary.

We would ask that the text in square brackets be suppressed, it having to do with OTT. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mexico. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you very much. The document that we are working on is, is it indeed 111, that is my question. And the text that -- DT11, these texts, was the document 111 or is it DT111, so that is our question.

>> CHAIR: The document I have is document 111. The document I have here it's document 111, and it's considered as contribution. Is it okay, Saudi Arabia? Saudi Arabia, you have the floor again.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: We agree then that it's document 111. Okay. But concerning the text that we have in the document, and that is up on the screen here, this is different than, well, it's not the same than what we find on the website of ITU where the text is not to be found. In the document on the website, we don't find this text. So please, clarification, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. This point is being clarified. In the meanwhile I'd like to give the floor to U.S. who requested the floor. U.S., please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Chair. Good afternoon, friends. If we can just look at the language again in the proposed resolution 29, in the explanation that we received from the UK for which we are thankful, he indicated that both of those sections resolve 4 and resolve 5 were in square brackets. That was because during the adhoc, we were awaiting the outcome of the OTT discussions. Unfortunately, because those discussions were not concluded until today, we were never able to reach consensus on either of these sections.

For example, we decided not to discuss the use of the word, fraudulent practices. That was an issue for us as that is a national matter. Fraud is described in national laws and it's described differently in every

administration.

So we do have other concerns with this text, and we would suggest that we either delete these resolves, or revert back to the original language, as there was no consensus. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, U.S.

Just for clarification for Saudi Arabia, it is DT61, rev 1. 68. Sorry. DT68. Rev 1. Senegal, please.

>> SENEGAL: Thank you, Chair. We are falling into a trap that we feared here. We have seen the resolutions go by that were so to speak rejected, at least with square brackets, especially those with OTT in them. The only link with the text that we have just seen is that OTT, that some countries don't want to see. Now, we struck it out, and it's been taken up in resolution 2. In any case, we think that this is a change that might be prejudicial. But really should not have any impact on the substantive work which is done elsewhere. It's just to keep us from going back over what has already been discussed here. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Senegal. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to, I need some declaration from Mr. Chair of the ad hoc, I think we have agreed in the ad hoc not to include all item

number 4 and item number 5 between square brackets. I think what we have agreed to be included in the square brackets is a OTT or over the top application, waiting for the result of the other resolution.

So I want a declaration or answer for my question from the Chairman of com 4 or com 4A for this question, I think the square brackets are wrong in position.

>> CHAIR: Can we have this clarification of whether it was agreed to have the full paragraph in square brackets, or only the sentence including over the top. Phil, can you -- Phil, you have the floor.

>> Thank you, Chair. The decision to put both paragraphs 4 and paragraphs 5 into square brackets because of the editor's note was taken at com 4A. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So may I ask the com 4A Chair, which is Fabio, Fabio Bigi. (off microphone).

Go ahead, Fabio.

>> FABIO BIGI: Yes, I confirm that both paragraph were in square brackets, and one item was depending the issue of OTT, but all the both paragraph were in square brackets. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Were, when they came out from Working Group 4A. Fabio, the decision regarding putting the

paragraph 4 and 5 between square bracket was taken during the meeting of Working Group 4A. Am I right?

>> FABIO BIGI: Yes.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Fabio. I think maybe there is a mistake for putting all number 4 and number 5 between square brackets. I think what we have agreed in this whole is putting only OTT and now we are accepting to what the OTT between square brackets only, and I think nobody before asked for putting number 4 and number 5, all number 4 and number 5 between square brackets. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I remember on the meeting of Committee 4A, the Chairman of the ad hoc group presented orally the issue on this document, and he referred that there is still a pending issue depending on the resolving the issue of OTT. I don't recall that there was a specifically reference to the resolve 4 and 5. He made a general statement that there is an issue with using the word OTT, and during the discussion, so I would support the Egyptian intervention on this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I come back to Fabio.

>> FABIO BIGI: Thank you. As was has been approved also in Committee 4 is my report, and in revision 4 and it's written, I read for you. The text in square brackets in TD 68 was reviewed. The meeting agreed to delete engine service from resolve 4 and resolve 5, while with square brackets still being in resolve 4 and resolve 5 for further consultation. Point. It is noted that the text in resolve 4 and resolve 5 may be influenced by the approval of resolution on OTT but that is the text. So that mean both paragraphs were in square brackets.

>> CHAIR: Egypt. Egypt, please.

>> Egypt: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think I'm still insisting that there is some mistake happened in putting all number 4 and number 5 between square brackets. What we can compromise is maybe we can accept all what we have done in ad hoc group is putting only the over the top between square brackets, still the decision of the other resolution. And I'm still insisting there is a mistake happened, in this area. The problem in the ad hoc was only in the over the top. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Jordan.

>> JORDAN: I thank you, Mr. Chair. I think an issue can be resolved if you ask any of us who participated in the ad hoc group discussion on this. The discussion

that was in regarding the OTT issue, so I don't know what is the reasoning behind putting all the resolve between square bracket. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Our recollection of the events align perfectly with that of the Chair of Working Group 4A. We therefore align with the U.S. in proposing that if there is no consensus, we should go back to the original text on those two paragraphs. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Senegal.

>> SENEGAL: Thank you, thank you, Chair. Along the same lines as Egypt, we think that even in the text there is a note saying that sections 5 and 6 may be influenced by approval of the resolution on OTT. And in relation to that resolution, the compromise that we struck was to go to G2 and G3 in resolution 2, so I think it's just a word here that is an obstacle, and in fact isn't an obstacle anymore. I think we can take these square brackets off and have the text approved.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Senegal. I still have Egypt again requesting the floor. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again we discussing the very delicate issue of introducing concept

of OTT. This issue is very important for developing countries, the issue of alternative calling procedures and also the over the top applications, Mr. Chairman. Since we already achieve an agreement and the new resolution OTT reflecting some activities for Study Group 2 and 3, regarding the OTT issues, and also in the spirit of compromise and cooperation with all delegates' views, we may propose, Mr. Chairman, for point 4, that we can end the text, until the evolution of alternative calling procedures, so we can end the text at this point, and remove the rest of the text, depending on that what we had already on the amendment revised resolution 2, and in point 5 we may propose, Mr. Chairman, to remove the part origin nonidentification or spoofing, then remove as well as until, and we continue the sentence on the efforts of developing countries until the end. This, Mr. Chairman, would reflect, as well as, yes, okay, we need to have on the effort, on the effort. Yes. So this, Mr. Chairman, would reflect what we had agreed on the OTT new resolution, and also could maintain the original or revising the original text of point 4 and 5, taken in consideration what we already had in resolution 2, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt, for your proposal. I

have United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Chair. I can be brief. I would like to thank Egypt very much for this constructive proposal and we can support it. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We thank Egypt for their proposal. However, Mr. Chairman, we believe that compromise that was reached on the resolution to have a text in resolution 2 this is a big compromise. And having this reflected now in this resolution to take out this part of the resolution, I don't think this is acceptable at this stage. So we would reconsider retaining the text in this part, the proposal from Egypt to retain this.

I believe the previous discussion will not, not having a resolution and having the text in resolution 2 this is a big compromise, but also in this resolution not reflecting this in this resolution, I don't think we can accept this, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. Concerning this resolution, during the Drafting Committee, we discussed this subject, and the approval of the text presented

here was linked to the adoption of a new resolution on OTTs. Now, since there won't be a new resolution on that subject that is OTTs, we would, therefore, propose that we adopt the proposal as coming from the Drafting Committee that is that we strike off the square brackets on 4, and that we copy the text concerning the OTTs in paragraph 5. Concerning the use of the word fraudulent, those who oppose this use of this word can maybe come up with a alternative for it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Jordan.

>> Jordan: I thank you, Mr. Chair. It seems to me that there is a confusion. Actually what was proposed is that we remove the square bracket on the reserve, under 4 -- resolve under 4 and we will use the same text to be inserted in the square bracket that is on resolve 5. This means we will remove the reference to the fraudulent, and this will solve the issue, because we will use the same wording and put it in the square bracket that is on resolve 5. So we don't have a issue to discuss. This will resolve the concern of the United States and this will resolve the concern of those who wanted to refer to the OTT. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. Can you make, you are making a proposal here, can you make it more clear?

>> It was not my proposal, it was the proposal initially made from the Chairman of the ad hoc group. He wanted to remove the square bracket from the resolve 4 and to maintain the text and use the same text that was under square bracket and to put it on the square bracket that is on 5. This means that we will remove the reference to the fraudulent. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. Phil, can you confirm this is your proposal?

>> Thank you, Chair. Yes, that was my proposal, to copy down the text that said, come from the screen, the use of over the top telephone applications that use telephone numbers. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Phil. Can we have it on the screen? In the meanwhile, I would ask the interpreters to allow us to, five minutes to finish this question.

>> That is granted, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So, I don't see the proposal of Phil implemented. We take the full paragraph after the use of, starting from there? Phil, you have the floor.

>> My proposal was to use the phraseology of over the top applications that use telephone numbers, and replace that in the square brackets in the paragraph

below. There may be need to amend slightly the grammar as we were not aware and we were awaiting the outcome of your previous item, but that is a very minor issue. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, Jordan, is that what you had understood?

>> Yes, Mr. Chair. However, I would like to add something, if you may allow me. I don't know.

>> CHAIR: Up to you.

>> JORDAN: Thank you. So the only issue is, we had that, yes, that uses telephone numbers. So I know for alternative calling procedures, maybe this can be applicable. But I don't know for Study Group 3, because the agreement that we did not limit the OTT to the OTTs that using telephone numbers. If you, my understanding it was a general agreement that we will study the widen scope of the OTT on Study Group 2, and 3, this is why I recommend we delete the reference to that use telephone numbers. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair. I think we have been through this debate in the ad hoc through many long hours. We have had some difficulty in accepting this, given the reference directly to OTT. Now we understand that

res 2 has been amended with text on OTT. Further, we heard a, we gave our position previously as suppress or no change.

Now that we have heard a proposal from Egypt, I think that potentially could be a way forward. Going back and rehashing the text, I don't feel we could support that. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. UAE.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to agree with Jordan, to remove the telephone number, and then we keep the text. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. There are no more requests for the floor. My proposal to you is to go with the proposal of Phil, and considering that we are dealing with the resolution that is related to alternative calling procedures, that we keep the text as proposed by Phil initially. Zimbabwe, you have the floor.

>> ZIMBABWE: Yes, Mr. Chair. This reference to requiring the use of the numbering is a problematic one. I would go with the Egyptian proposal, it is more encompassing than limiting proposal from Phil.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Zimbabwe, UK or Phil.

>> It's Phil. Chair, I think you have to separate out the issue between 2 and 3, if that is the proposal.

In the discussions that we have had previously in Study Group 2, it has been OTT over the top telephone applications that use telephone numbers, that have been the focus of our debate.

We have had contributions, we have had much discussion on this topic, very useful discussion that has promoted understanding by all parties. If you take out certainly for Study Group 2 the concept of telephone numbers I don't think that that would make much sense. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Phil. Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Yes, Mr. Chair. I am in line with Mr. Phil intervention. Actually on Study Group 2, they will study the issue of using the numbers to terminate the calls but on Study Group 3, we should not limit that, so I would recommend, yes, just deleting it from Study Group 3 and maintain it in Study Group 2. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Would this proposal be acceptable?
Egypt.

>> EGYPT: For us it's acceptable.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. Bahrain.

>> Bahrain: Thank you, Mr. Chair, we support the proposal by Mr. Phil Reston.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: I just would express our support to what Phil just said and suggested, and perhaps a question, with this language here in relation to Study Group 3, would add on top of what we just agreed to add in to resolution 2. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Sweden, are you saying that you agree with Phil Reston proposal?

>> SWEDEN: That is in a very complicated way. Thank you.

(laughter).

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I see that is the consensus of a proposal, very complicated way, complicated proposal by Phil and I propose to you to approve it, and to close this point. No objection.

(sound of gavel).

We consider the proposal of Phil as approved. Thank you.

(applause).

So, after this two parties of Ping-Pong, we need to have a break that could be used also for consultation, but the break is particularly because the team of interpreters will change. And for this, we need how many time? How much time? So, our next meeting will start at 7:30 p.m.

Thank you very much. Thank you. I have seen few comments, I have seen much Ping-Pong, but I have also seen spirit of cooperation from some delegations moving forward, and this is quite positive. And I appeal to you that we continue with this spirit of cooperation in order to close as much as possible the points on our agenda. Thank you very much.

(session adjourned at 1736)

Services Provided By:

Caption First, Inc.

P.O. Box 3066

Monument, CO 80132

800-825-5234

www.captionfirst.com

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