FINAL COPY

ITU PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE 2014

BUSAN, KOREA

28 OCTOBER 2014

ROOM B

SIXTH MEETING OF COM 5

11:00

Services provided by:

Caption First, Inc.

P.O. Box 3066

Monument, CO 80132

1-877-825-5234

+001-719-481-9835

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

\*\*\*

This text is being provided in a rough draft format.

Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided

in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may

not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

\*\*\*

>> CHAIRMAN: I will begin the meeting of Committee 5. So I would ask you to look at Document ADM/33, ADM/33. You have before you the agenda of our Sixth Meeting, are there any comments on this draft agenda? I see none. It is adopted. Many thanks. Let us move on then on the basis of Document 33, we will look at item 3, this is the DT/24. If you recall, we set up an ad hoc group on a Stable Constitution and Convention, so now we have Document DT/24 from the ad hoc group, and what I suggest is that our colleague from the Russian Federation present the results of the work of the ad hoc group. I would like to give the floor to our colleague from the Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Many thanks, sir. Good morning colleagues. I have good news. Our group had one meeting and during the meeting have come to one conclusion. Unfortunately, and to my surprise, I found out that the Document on this very important issue was not translated into the other official languages of the Union. We are in luck because the Document is very short, so we can read it out very quickly so that delegates who use other languages could get the gist of its content.

On the stable Constitution and Convention here in after called in short AHGCSCV made from 9:30 to 12:30 and took action with the terms of reference defined by Com 5 as described in Document DT/12. The discussion we are concentrated on issues concerning the ways and means to provide stability of the ITU constitution and the ITU conventions up to 2018 and beyond 2018.

In addition, AHGCSCV considered two suggestions, the stability of the Constitution and Convention. Two examples represented that propose to create two steps procedural process either directly modifying Article 55 of the Constitution and Article 42 of the Convention or by modifying provision 57 of the Constitution which points to Article 55 for the Constitution and the relevant provisions of the conventions.

Both options were suggested in the suppression of Resolution 114. AHGCSCV reaches the following conclusions by consensus, I underline by consensus. That no modification to the structure of between the Constitution and Convention is currently separated in the relevant parts of Article 4 of the Constitution and no amendment to any individual provisions of the Constitution and the Convention should be adopted at PP‑14. Second, to suppress Resolution 163, not to reactivate the Council Working Group on the issue of a stable Constitution established under resolution 163 Guadalajara 2010.

It was also noted that in view of the complexity of the questions raised by that Council Working Group on the stable Constitution, it would not be productive to establish another Council Working Group until the matter is further discussed and examined by PP‑18. During the discussion the notion of increasing the stability of the Constitution and the Convention was also raised and noted. However, in view of the conclusion reached by the AHGCSCV as outlined above, further actions of such mechanisms needs not to be undertaken by this Conference due to the fact that the matter requires careful consideration and harmonized action by the Member States after PP‑14. The AHGCSCV recognized actions taken and the results achieved by the Council Working Group on the stable Constitution and pointed out that Document PP‑14/52 could serve as a helpful reference in supporting elements for Member States as well as regional telecommunication organizations, and future Plenipotentiary Conference for further consideration of this matter.

So these are the conclusions of the group, and I would like to thank all of the participants in the group for the spirit of compromise they showed, and also for their willingness to find a common ground for consensus. Many thanks to all.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir, for the presentation and the conclusions of your group. I see you have arrived at a consensus. I think this would be good if we were also able to come to a consensus here in the room. Is everyone in agreement with these conclusions or are there any concerns? Iran, are you asking for the floor?

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: No, I have no difficulty with that. I think that now, from Tuesday, we start to work and the first Busan consensus is built up. The first one in the Busan Plenipotentiary consensus now resulted to have this Document agreed by everybody. There is no difficulty. The only little addition, perhaps, in addition to Document 52, the other Document which is summary of discussion took place at the Council also would be useful Document to be added to the Document mentioned by the Chairman of the group, and one little word instead of reactivate, we propose disband, but not reactivate. The correct word is disband. That means we close this Council Working Group, but reactivate is not sufficient to address the issue. Otherwise, we have no difficulty, and we are all happy that all distinguished colleagues collaboratively worked together and the fist consensus was built. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I want to thank the delegate from Iran. I don't want to prolong the debate unless other people would like to take the floor. United Arab Emirates, go ahead.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, sir. Good morning, everyone. Chair, I would just like to express my thanks to Mr. Vasilia for his efforts and to all those who participated in this ad hoc Working Group on the stable Constitution and who arrived at a consensus after long discussions. I just want to make a comment, sir, namely during the meeting there were two proposals on the table, but there were also other points of view expressed, and I would like that to be reflected in the conclusions of this ad hoc group. There were other proposals made. That is a fact.

And they were aimed at finding a relative stability toward the Constitution. They should be transferred to the plenary. These different positions were not reflected in the final text. So this is the only proposal we would make and we would like to thank once again all those who participated in the proceedings of this group. And we have been able to resolve a very delicate issue, so thanks to the Chair and everyone who participated in this group.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, UAE. I will put in my report your remark that there were other ideas in the group. I see that there are other requests for the floor. Please, if we have a consensus, let us not continue the debate uselessly. Philippines.

>> PHILIPPINES: Very short, Mr. Chairman. We join the first two speakers in proposing that while we recognize the work of the Council Working Group on the stable Constitution, nonetheless, the reactions thereon particularly the proposals of the states as the reaction to the report as well as the discussions on the floor on these proposals of the states would indeed be very beneficial should we reactivate a study on the report of the Council Working Group. Thus, like the two gentlemen before me, we also move that these proposals be made by the last portion of the report. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Very well. Thank you. Like I was saying, I added a sentence to the effect that in the report, we had this issue. So I will make this change to the verb reactivate or activate, we will use disband. And on that note, I think that we can adopt this Document. And I will report on the results of the work of this group. Thank you.

It is so decided.

(Applause).

I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to thank all who were part of the consensus and particularly the Chair of the group, Mr. Arasteh, this is the first consensus we have arrived at in Busan. I'm pleased that it is here in Com 5 that we reached this consensus, that means we are working hand in hand in a good spirit and we are able to move forward and let me thank you all for that. On that note, let us move onto the next item on our agenda. Here I will give the floor to our colleague from Germany very briefly. He will give us an update of the situation. Germany, please..

>> GERMANY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And my apologies for the interruption. Yes, indeed, with regard to the ad hoc group on flight tracking, we had some official meetings and a lot of informal meetings, and with regard to the compromise we are looking for, I think we are close to finding a compromise on a resolution text since we have had yesterday late in the evening an informal meeting where all participants from all regions attended the meeting and we had a strong discussion and a very fruitful discussion, so I think we can conclude on the compromise we achieved yesterday evening in the ad hoc group meeting which is planned for the lunch break today. So give us with your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, a little bit more time to agree on and I would like to come back in the next meeting for final report.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. Thank you, Germany. Yes, I can give you extra time until tomorrow. This is the consensus of the meeting since we have ‑‑ if we get a consensus in an informal group we will be very pleased about that, so I wish you well. Iran, I would like to give you the floor now.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In fact, I wanted to compliment our distinguished Chairman, and distinguished delegate of Germany mentioned in fact, we have reached full consensus in informal meeting. The only thing to formalize that people said 5 to 10 minutes, very good, maybe 15 minutes, but we don't come back to discussions. Everything has been settled, but we need to formalize the issue not to exclude any distinguished colleagues from any final meeting, but we have reached agreement at 10:20 or 10:15 last night in the evening, Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Arasteh. Like we say in France, I'm going to put the thumb screws on you until we get the final draft, Canada.

>> CANADA: Mr. Chairman, we would thank the effort of our Chairman. I think it was late last night when we had ‑‑ we terminated our discussions, and, of course, after a lot of back and forth and compromises, I would just like to know that it seems to us that there may be some issues with the text as presented in the temporary documents that we are looking at today. And so we will be working with the Chairman to insure that the proper reflection of yesterday's discussion appears appropriately in the Document. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Canada, for your efforts, for your contribution to the consensus on this issue.

So I think we will wait until tomorrow for the DT and we will put it on our agenda. I am going to take this opportunity following the remark from the Russian Federation that the DTs are not translated. This is a comment for the Secretariat, they have not been translated into all six languages, so this is something that I have just heard.

So let's go back to the agenda. And we will look at number 5, SATCOL satellite system, and here I would like to give the floor to our colleague from Colombia on this issue.

>> COLOMBIA: Thank you, Chairman, and good morning to everyone. Yes, according to the indications we received last week when we presented Document 87, I would like to inform you that we have met as representatives of the radiocommunications office, along with a number of countries who agreed with Colombia's request, and I'd like to make a proposal in relation to Colombia's request now.

This contains the following, one, the radiocommunications office had looked at the procedures that had been used in the past in these cases, we proposed the inclusion of a text in relation to this, which will be included in the report to the plenary, and it will, therefore, appear in the final minutes of the Conference. If you would allow me to do this, I would like to read the proposed text as follows: Regarding the request from Colombia related to the Colombian satellite network SATCOL 1B, SATCOL 1P and SATCOL 1Q, it is understood that only SATCOL 1B's frequency experiments would expire before WRC15. Therefore, it was agreed that the following text be included in the minutes of the plenary.

Regarding the SATCOL 1B satellite network, should the administration of Colombia not be in a position to comply with the regulatory deadliness for bringing into use, it is recommended that the administration of Colombia bring the matter before WRC-15 for action, as appropriate, taking into account Article 44 of the ITU Constitution and the difficulties this developing country has and is experiencing bringing the frequency assignments into use.

On an exceptional basis, it is also recommended that the Radiocommunication Bureau should take any appropriate action to facilitate consideration of the case by the 2015 World Radiocommunication Conference. So I have read the text out, and I would like to draw your attention to the fact that this text meets my country's needs. I would like to, therefore, submit it through you to the room for consideration. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Many thanks, Colombia, for proposing this text, which I do hope will be approved by the meeting. To my mind, it should not raise any issues. I see no requests for the floor at this point. So this text will be part of my report, the report that I will turn over to the plenary. The text that you just read out, it is so decided. On that note, I would like to thank you once again, Colombia, for resolving that issue, I believe with the help of the Secretariat.

So we will go, we will work on the basis as I have stated so I will put it in my report. Now, let's move on to the next item on the agenda, item 6, proposed amendments to Article 36 of the Convention. So we have several documents to be introduced. In reality the documents come from one region that is making numerous proposals in Document 69A1 under numbers 1, 2 and 3. So AFCP/69A1/1,/2,/3. I would ask a representative from the African region, Cameroon, to make a presentation of this Document. Cameroon, you have the floor.

>> CAMEROON: Thank you, colleagues. It is an honour to represent this Document A1, 1, 2, 3. This Document proposes to make a change to the French version with changing the words tariff to tax in the French version. The word tax is used in Article 36, Article 496 and the delegate is citing the French version. This doesn't affect the English version, and in Paragraph 500 of Article 38.

In the absence of special arrangements concluded between Member States ‑‑ international communications services and in the establishment of international accounts shall be ‑‑ this use of the word tax in French can lead to confusion because it's not appropriate given the context of Articles 36 and 38, which define the telecommunications tariffs in general, so the French word tariff shall be used. Tax in French means fiscal deductions destined for the State Treasury taken from a local collectivity rather than something given in return for a service providing.

In the banking and financial sector a tax is considered as a fiscal measure of a direct or indirect measure which can be applied to different products and services given the laws in force. The African Group suggests that in the French version of the Convention, particularly in Articles 36 and 38, the word tax should be replaced by tariff. A consensus has been garnered for this amendment to be made to the Constitution and the Convention.

And we shouldn't reinitiate work with the Working Group on a stable Constitution. I would like this proposal thus to be reflected in the minutes so that this move can be made to amend this because this is a translation problem. The translation should reflect reality. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Thank you for that wise proposal. This is a change which affects merely the French version. A number of countries which are French speaking have concerns about the way in which this text was translated from other languages. This is a problem which purely affects the French version and which concerns a number of the Union's members.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, this matter was raised at a recent conference and we agree with our African friend about the translation of this term into French. In French, the correct term should be used to reflect the situation. We are also pleased to better the recent consensus which we garnered the first Busan Conference with be respected and that this can be reflected in the minutes. Perhaps we could refer this to the legal team and find a more appropriate way of taking note of this concern to avoid changing the Constitution and the Convention.

Our position is that we should find a way to include this in the minutes of the plenary or perhaps another way to reflect this concern. We completely agree with the concern, but I think we need to think about the best way to have this concern reflected.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Iran. Yes, we have decided not to amend the Constitution and the Convention, but there is a problem to be resolved here. So with your permission I would like us to see how best to reflect this. Should it be mentioned in a report or should we find some other way of resolving the situation? Please, therefore, give me the latitude to discuss this with the legal team and I will then offer further explanation in due course as to whether the inclusion of this in a report is sufficient or whether there is some other means to have this reflected, and that's with a view to including this in some future round of amendments to the core text. Does everyone agree with that approach? It seems to be the case, and it's so decided, therefore.

I suggest that we move now to item 7 of our agenda, proposed amendments to number 166 of the General Rules For Conferences, Assemblies and Meetings. This is Document ARB/79A1/1, so please take that Document out. And I would call upon representative of the Arab region to introduce this Document. Egypt, please go ahead.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, everyone. The Egyptian administration has the honour of introducing this proposal on behalf of the Arab group. We deemed it necessary to update this text and more specifically Article 166. This is Rule 30 on franking privileges. This affects the second Paragraph of the General Rules for Conferences, Assemblies and Meetings. This amendment comes in the wake of observations made by a number of Arab states which underwent a number of international and regional events, and which have faced the difficulties which resulted from the implementation of this Article as a host country or convening country.

Chairman, you are well aware that we today are witnessing dizzying developments where ITCs are concerned. Great efforts are being made to spur innovation, to facilitate communication, and communication is being carried out in excellent conditions. As the Arab group, we suggest that this Paragraph be amended, and this is with a view to bringing it in line with the current situation in the ITC sector, and also to bring it in line with the increasing developments which are taking place with regard to the use of mobile phones and Internet related services.

These services are being used more now than fixed mobile services. We know that there are a number of services used by ITU staff. We have fax services, we have fixed line telephones, and we provide the same services for all delegates participating in the various meetings, conferences and assemblies. So this is the relevance, hence the relevance of this.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Egypt for introducing that Document. I would like to open the floor then in this regard now. Iran.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are grateful to distinguished delegate of Egypt on behalf of Arab group to proposing this modification to the Rules of Conference, Meeting and Assemblies with the logic and reason was given, yes, the situation prevailing today is entirely different of what was some 20 or 30 years ago. Chairman, we have discussed that at WCIT, Dubai, and I think to some extent the issue was reflected. We exactly don't know whether we need to take that wording or whether just to leave it as it is and reflect something in the minute of the plenary that situation in 166 does not prevail today, and refer something rather than making one changes to the rules, so on, so forth. We have no difficulty if really colleagues wish to strictly modify the rules, but reflecting that in different manner and not making a change at this stage because there might be other rules that we have to change and if we open the door for changes, there might be something else, but we are open for some discussions to find the ways and means how to better reflect the situations as we have mentioned, we have discussed that in 2012 in Dubai, and also we need to see whether in putting something in the minute of plenary would be sufficient to reflect the situation.

Chairman, from the time that I remember during the last few days after the privatizations, in fact none of the colleagues had asked any privilege communication. We know the situations that this service will not be available, and I think the hosting country, if some of the elected officials or members so on, so forth, want to make something, I think they make it inofficially or unofficially. Whether or not we need to mention that, that is entirely, Chairman, up to you whether you want to open the changes or whether you reflect that in a different manner, but we have no problems with the basis or basic proposal or with the thrust of the proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Iran. I see no further requests for the floor at this stage and so I turn back to Egypt. I ask Egypt what the Egyptian delegation makes of the Iranian suggestion.

>> EGYPT: Thank you very much, Chairman. I'd like to thank the distinguished delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran. As the Arab group, we have no qualms about that solution, and it could perhaps be mentioned in the minutes of the plenary that the group of Arab states submitted this proposal. We could also modify other rules but this proposal could be reflected in the minutes of the plenary and the proposal could then be submitted to the next Plenipotentiary Conference. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Egypt, for your collaborative spirit. I would like now to give the floor to Iran.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Once again we are very grateful for the generous actions taken by our distinguished Arab representatives, but just I would like to compliment what is said. If you put it in minute of plenary, it would be in the name of the whole Plenipotentiary Conference, not only Arab group, proposal made by them and we agree with that to put in the plenary. So we would not be saying that Arab group proposed and that is in minute of plenary. You could say Plenipotentiary received proposal or modification 166. In light of the situation it was felt appropriate or necessary or sufficient to put it in the minute of plenary and we put the text in the name of the entire Plenipotentiary Conference supporting our proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I give the floor back to Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. I fully espouse the view which has just been expressed by Iran and thank Iran for his support for this proposal from the Arab group. We agree fully for this proposal to be put as a proposal from all Member States.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you. It seems then that we agree that I put this forward to the plenary in my report given the current situation in regard to 166. Everyone seems to agree with that and it's so decided. Thank you very much to all of you for your constructive spirit and your collaboration in this discussion. I suggest that we move on now to item 8. Resolution 21, this relates to special measures concerning alternative procedures as they are called and we have a number of documents to examine here.

The first is in Document 69A1/5, and this is a proposal from the African Union. 69A1/5. I would like to ask for a country from the African Union to take the floor on this. Egypt, please go ahead.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning, colleagues. On behalf of the African region I have the pleasure of presenting our contribution on Resolution 21, Document C and 69, Addendum 1 part 4 or part 5, sorry. Mr. Chair, Resolution 21 is on the alternative calling procedures. We believe that the majority of alternative calling procedures became effect in our daily life and for most of the people they are considered a main source of communication, not an alternative one. Thus at the beginning we proposed to make the title of the resolution appropriate measures concerning alternative calling procedures on international telecommunications networks, instead of special measures.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that we cannot avoid all kinds of calling procedures even if some forms of them have negative effects, the importance is how to minimize this negative effect by focusing on identification of the origin of calls as well as for proper charging in addition to focusing on the quality of service and quality of experience and these points are affected in the recognized part of this resolution on this proposal. In this contribution, we want also, we wanted also to highlight the role of the ITU T Study Group 2 and 3 as reflected in Resolution 29 in WTSA2012 in Dubai in particular, and it's results part number 1 and 2 and to reflect the new text as decided in WTSA2012.

On the other hand, we worked to reflect under the noting part the output of WTDC2014, especially Resolution 22 regarding the actions to be taken by the Director of telecommunication development group to support joint activities with ITU‑T Study Group 3 and ITU‑T Study Group 2. And finally we reflected all of the points in the results marked by adding the Paragraph of encouraging administrations and operating agencies authorized by Member States to take the appropriate measures to insure acceptable level of quality of service, quality of experience and to insure the delivery of international calling line identification and original, and origin identification information and to insure the proper charging taking into account the relevant ITU recommendations. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that introduction. Our next Document comes from Brazil, 75/2 and I, therefore, give the floor to Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The recent growing access to international telecommunication networks has brought some side effects related to the inappropriate use of the networks, such as fraudulent misappropriation, misuse of national telephone numbers and country codes. These practices are harmful to countries and causes losses on operators' revenues. Resolution 61 of WTSA2012 for combating misappropriation and misuse of international telecommunication numbering resources. This revision aims to update Resolution 21 in order to align those provisions instructing ITU‑T Study Groups to give special attention to the misappropriation issues. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN: Many thanks to our Brazilian colleague for that presentation. We have another Document now from the Arab states, 79/2/2. Egypt will be introducing this Document.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. It's an honour for me on behalf of the Arab ran group to introduce this Document 79 Addendum 2/2 on appropriate measures concerning alternative calling procedures on international telecommunication networks, Resolution 21. These measures are an integral part of our lives and of telecommunications services. We need to amend this title and instead of special measures, we need to amend it to appropriate measures concerning calling procedures.

We can't overlook the many different alternative calling procedures which exist. Some of these procedures have negative effects, but we must nonetheless include them. We need to establish appropriate taxation and we need to establish the origin of telecommunications. We have also mentioned Study Groups 2 and 3 as occurred at the WTSA Dubai 2012 and WTDC 2014 as well as Resolution 22. In the results we have mentioned the need to encourage administration and other stakeholders to take the necessary measures to insure acceptable level of quality of service and quality of experience in the delivery of international calling line identification when taking into account what's behind charging procedures.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Egypt, for that introduction. We have another Document to introduce now from a number of countries, and this is Document 83. 83/1 and I suppose that the U.K. will be introducing these documents and I give them the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chairman. The evolution of telecommunications has resulted in increased choice and decrease in cost removing barriers to communication, but understanding what is and what is not an alternative calling procedure in today's context may be different from that originally envisioned in the text of this resolution. The alternative calling procedures present in existing text are on the one hand a commercial issue refiling, and on the other not a significant issue call back.

It's also apparent that in discussions within the technical group dealing with alternative calling procedures, that is Study Group 2, the concept of these alternative calling procedures remains unclear. Since the approval of the resolution, telecommunications has evolved and the impact on all parties to occur. We need to understand what those impacts are, both positive and negative. Part of the change is that commercial models are providing service have significantly evolved, and this means that that evolution includes revenue moving from the termination of calls to the provision of broadband services.

The changes to the resolves section currently focuses upon Member States which we believe is more appropriate to the invites Member States element of this resolution. We believe that there is a need to study what is an alternative calling procedure, what role is relevant to the international aspects, and what falls under the purview of national regulatory requirements.

Understanding alternative calling procedures within these environments will then enable guidance to be given to Member States on the implications and use of alternative calling procedures. And the changes that we propose within this Document reflect that view. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for introducing that Document. We have now heard the various introductions and presentations on Resolution 21, and so I open the floor for discussion of these various proposals. Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. We are very grateful to the administrations and regional organizations who made these proposals, and many of these proposals we can support. At the same time, however, we like to stress that we need to be extremely cautious when it comes to changing the title of this resolution so that we don't take backwards steps with the scope of application of this resolution. Furthermore, we believe that it would be unwise to alter the text which calls for administrations and telecommunications operators to apply the recommendations of the ITU‑T with a view to limiting negative consequences.

This text seeks to define those negative consequences. The definition is only part of the action which needs to be taken to insure the regular functioning of networks. This, then, is why it's important here not to delve into amending this text. We need simply to seek to improve it. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you to the Russian Federation. The United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. United States would like to thank all of the Member States that made proposals on this resolution and giving us the opportunity to discuss this important issue. We have over the years revised this resolution several times, and there are similar resolutions in the WTSA. So clearly this remains an important topic for Member States.

Throughout the years as we discussed this resolution and the related resolutions, it has been clear though that there is a difference of view over the use of alternative calling procedures. This resolution reflects a delicate balance between those administrations who are not concerned by and in fact find alternative calling procedures that do not degrade the network to be of benefit to consumers and to be a pro competitive innovation, and those administrations who consider those types of alternative calling procedures to be a problem.

With that background in mind, I wanted to address a few of the proposals to revise the resolution. In particular, the proposal to resolve, to encourage administrations and operating agencies to provide calling line identification information is of particular concern to us. We believe that it could intrude on commercially negotiated arrangements to root and terminate traffic which could in term lead to increased costs for consumers and thwart innovation and investment.

We would also note that given the dynamic nature of the international telecommunications services markets, and the rapid evolution of technologies used to provide those services, it would be nearly impossible for countries to track the origin of traffic coming into their countries, and notably it would be inefficient and cost prohibitive to make service providers try.

We would also note that with respect to the proposals to add the issue of misuse to this resolution, we are concerned that there is a conflating of issues. From the United States' perspective, alternative calling procedures that do not degrade the network are not misuse. Misuse, numbering misuse of the type currently being addressed in ITU‑T Study Group 2 is, though, a very important issue. And we want to insure that efforts to address numbering misuse and the studies going on in the T sector at this time do not get side tracked by proposals to characterize alternative calling procedures as misuse.

We would also note that the WTSA adopted a resolution on misuse, and that work is under way to address that issue in the T sector. Finally, one note on proposals to add the issue of quality of service to this resolution, again, this goes back to a difference of views about how one characterizes alternative calling procedures. Alternative calling procedures may not be of the same level of quality as PSTN calls, but from our perspective that is a consumer issue. That is a tradeoff a consumer might make in order to receive a lower cost service, and so we should not look to require that these services meet the same quality of service as PSTN calls. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, United States, for all of those clarifications. Now, I would like to give the floor to Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chairman. Just to clarify a little bit at least in Brazilian's view and proposals not that all alternative calling procedures are a bad thing. Actually the resolution deals with this very specifically, it says that there are some kinds that might bring some kind of problem not in the general sense is not a problem by itself. What we were proposing is bringing another issue that's very important to us, which is the issue of misuse of numbering. I understand what the U.S. mentioned about not trying to get different ideas on the same resolution, but if we can agree on the concept, we could probably try to separate these two into different resolutions or something like that. We will be fine with that as well. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Many thanks. We have taken note of your suggestion, Brazil. Iran, you have the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are grateful to our distinguished colleagues that proposed the modifications to this Resolution 21 which was subject of the very lengthy extensive and heated discussions in all conferences WTDC, WTSA and Plenipotentiary and God bless our friend Mr. Kasavi who was the main player at the Plenipotentiary 2010 dealing with another administration one by one sitting aside each other and trying to have this resolution be finalized. Chairman, I think there are issues of misuse of numbering or use of the numbers which was brought to the 2008WTSA in Johannesburg under the high jacking of the numbers then it was put misappropriations or misuse and so on, so forth, went to the Study Groups.

Under the study, it is one issue, quality of service originating the call. That was all discussed at length and at length at that WCIT in 2012. Having said that, Chairman, I think perhaps you may wish to consider having a little group, a few people getting together and giving to some of the proponents of this proposal to finalize, but perhaps the preference, Chairman, would be not to mix up the issue of the misappropriation or misuse with the alternative calling system.

They are quite, almost separate issues. We have to address that. And the issue of the originating calling numbers and so on, so forth, may be look at carefully to see where it fits, Chairman. It might be difficult to include various components of a call in one single resolution. Perhaps it may be more easy to see whether we can find other solution. Having said that, Chairman, perhaps you need to consider to having a little group to discuss the matter. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Iran. You have highlighted the issue of the various questions under discussion, and in Resolution 21 and inter alia misuse and on the other hand alternative calling procedures, so I'm wondering if we should not separate the two issues so that is a question that I raise. Egypt would like the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to thank our dear colleagues for their interventions, and I would like to clarify something that we believe that the importance of the alternative calling procedures and as we had mentioned in my previous intervention that we believe in the importance and they are important to a certain category of users, and we know that. Concerning the calling line identification, we also know the technical difficulties and in order to do the service or and also the financial problems that may report from this service, but we see that core line identification is mandatory in some states. Also for the quality of service, we agree also that quality of service is a user issue, but in some states we ‑‑ they have frameworks that ‑‑ for quality of service, and they might not allow lower than this framework of quality of service which was approved in this country. So this is one of the things that we will leave in. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you for those additional comments. At this stage I see no further requests for the floor. Now, I have heard the suggestion that perhaps we should create a small group to discuss these issues and try to come up with a minimum number of common ideas. I have also heard the discussion that we might divide the resolution into two parts and come up with two resolutions, one on misuse and another resolution on the issue of alternative calling procedures.

This might be an avenue that would be worthwhile exploring. I'm well aware that we often have a great number of concerns surrounding this issue and it's come up in many conferences, inter alia in Guadalajara so it would be good if together we could find a solution that would be satisfactory to all parties involved.

Now, I'm ready to create an ad hoc group, but at this point in time, I see no volunteers to Chair the group. Mr. Arasteh, I'm wondering if, you sir, would be ready to take the responsibility of leading the discussions in a small group on these issues. I have Iran and then cat you to on my list of speakers Iran first.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Thank you for the confidence. I wish I could have done that but we are very limited in number, Chairman. We are only three delegates here. One of them is taken by you as Vice Chairman. He is busy with the management team of Com 5 and with so many groups, but I will contribute, Chairman, to the extent possible, but perhaps you give it to someone else and we do our best to contribute to the matter. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Very well then, Qatar.

>> QATAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I intend to take the floor and suggest that Mr. Arasteh is the most capable man and since the idea came from him. So unfortunately, of course, he declined. So that was my reason for taking the floor, Mr. Chairman. If you could persuade him, I think he has got the most experience and background in this issue, and it's a very important issue, mainly for Developing Countries. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN: Many thanks, Qatar. Maybe you could give me a few minutes to think and toward the end of the meeting I may be able to come up with a name and give you suggestion on someone to Chair that group. Let's put that issue aside and I will get back to it as soon as possible. So what I am suggesting is we suspend discussion on this issue of creating a small group and deciding on who the Chair of the group might be, and noting that this group will try to bring together all of the various contributing authors of various proposals and see insofar as possible if they could come up with a result in the form of one or two resolutions.

So on that note, let us move onto the next item, Resolution 22 under item 9 of the agenda. Here we have two proposals. We have ACP/67A1/9. That's the first thing. Asia‑Pacific region. All of this has to do with the apportionment of revenues coming from international telecommunications services. Now, do we have a representative from the Asia‑Pacific region in the room to introduce this proposal? China. Very well, go ahead, China.

>> CHINA: Thank you very much. On behalf of APT I would like to present this proposal from APT on Resolution 22. And this proposal is based on the proposal 20 in 2006, and we added some information on this resolution. From 2006 until now, we have included some of our work since then. For example, in 2008 in Johannesburg, we held the WTSA and during that WTSA, we approved the ITU‑T D156 recommendation. In addition the ITU‑T Study Group 3 in its meeting in May 2005 approved the annex A to recommendation D156.

In addition, we also included that in the WTSA2012, it approved that all of the stakeholders need to take into consideration the progresses that have been made since then, and in this way we can really promote the work. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, China. We have another Document this time from Brazil. It is 75/3, and let me give the floor to Brazil to present this Document. Go ahead, Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Brazil believes that the revision of charging principles between developed and Developing Countries for international Internet connection is imperative to keep the promotion of the growing access to the Internet and benefits for Developing Countries. In this sense, proposed revision mainly aims to instruct ITU‑T of networks and international connects and develop appropriate cost methodologies for them. Additionally theory vision proposes updates in the text including references to outputs of the last WTDC 2014 and the leading references is to the work on costing methodologies for international traffic in relation to both fixed services since this work has already been completed by TTSG3. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Many thanks for those introductions. So we have two proposals on the table, two proposals to adapt the text of Resolution 22. This to take into account the work that has been conducted inter alia and the WCIT. Rather the WTSA and WTDC. So I will open the floor for discussions now. There doesn't seem to be too much enthusiasm. The United States of America.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We just had some questions and likely some concerns about Brazil's proposal to revise Resolution 22. From Brazil's revisions, it appears that they are looking to shift the focus of the Resolution from international telecommunications services to international Internet connectivity. And we would be concerned with such a shift, but we are also puzzled by that proposal because by the very terms of the Resolution, it applies to the bilateral exchange of traffic under the accounting rate system, which, of course, does not apply to international Internet connectivity, so there seems to be a mismatch between Brazil's proposal and the very terms of this Resolution. So we would seek some clarification from our colleagues about the intent and the scope of their proposed modifications. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Brazil, I will leave it up to you to respond to react to the concerns voiced by the United States. Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Yes, thank you, Chairman. I understand what the delegation of the United States is mentioning, but basically the idea here is to have focus on the study of Study Group 3 specifically in the ITU‑T in regards to this matter we have been called quite a few times in the group to try to come up with some work on this, and since we have done already the part related to regular circuit switch networks, this is already in a few recommendations done by the ITU‑T and the next step forward for international connectivity, it is the one related with the Internet, and we are not thinking about imposing anything or having a specific measure already being taken by the Plenipotentiary Conference.

Basically what we are suggesting is that this is an important issue and it should be studied by ITU‑T. Basically this is what we are aiming with this contribution. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Many thanks, Brazil. Iran, I give you the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: We are thankful to distinguished colleagues that presented the amendment. Chairman, one point that we wish to raise is we have discussed at many meetings at this Plenipotentiary that PP need to remain general at the high level approach. We should not go to the detail of the level of the Study Groups, of working parties instructing so on, so forth.

There are instances like WTSA, like Study Group, Director of the TSB, but we have no problem to mention that in the Resolution, but in the very high level manner, Chairman. Because we discussed that for the interference issue, we said we don't want to go to details the business of the WRC or business of WTSA, we should maintain the same philosophy here. We discussed the global tracking. We said don't go to the details of other instances or other entities but remain high level. It has nothing to have any objection at all with the proposal, but we have to maintain, Chairman, that principle so on so forth.

And moreover, there are some issues which are quite complex, Chairman, very, very complex. Network seniority has been discussed for years and clears so son so forth. We have some presentation by a distinguished person, I don't want to name, it took four hours to explain us what is this. So on, so forth. Many dimensions so we have to be quite careful. The issue, Chairman, we would like to raise that we should put something that is implementable. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Many thanks for those clarifications. I would like to give the floor to Sweden and then to the United Kingdom, first Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We have the same concern as was expressed by the United States and having heard the explanation from Brazil and intervention from Iran, I get the impression that this issue should not be further discussed in the Plenipotentiary Conference, but it may, if there is support and proposals be discussed in Study Groups in the T sector, but we do not see this is an issue that really needs to be discussed at the Plenipotentiary Conference. We should remain high level, and furthermore, starting to be so specific in the text as proposed in Brazilian proposal may harm the studies that may be carried out in Study Group 3. So from our point of view, it is our view that we should not change the Resolution at this Conference. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Many thanks, Sweden. United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. The issue of this Resolution and the WTSA Resolution or the WTSA which passed the recommendation with regard to network externalities. Network externalities is a complex issue. This seems to extend the concept to the world of Internet connection. This is a detailed issue which needs to be explored. The appropriate place for exploring that is ITU‑T Study Group 3, and the way to do it is make a contribution to ITU Study Group 3 and indeed some work has already been undertaken on that issue in that Study Group.

So I agree with Sweden, Iran and the U.S. that it is inappropriate for Plenipotentiary Resolution to go to this level of detail. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that. Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chairman, again. Just to make a quick point hearing what presenters had said, the idea is not to say what is a network externality, the idea is to have the T sector to study it. If you look specifically in the proposal, what we are changing is the aim of the study and not saying what it is supposed to be. We are requesting the T sector to conduct studies on this matter. We don't know what the outcome is.

So basically it's what we had originally for fixed and mobile services. This is what we have already in Resolution 22, what we are suggesting is since this work has been conducted by the T sector, what our aim is, let's now expand this work to international Internet connections as well since we do have several concerns on how the balance is going on this sense. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Many thanks for that, Brazil. Sweden, and then Argentina. Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the prime proposal also raises some more principle issue how is the studies to be carried out in the Study Groups. I think the normal procedure is that you develop questions and you carry out studies in the Study Groups. That's the normal procedure, and in our sector nothing goes into the T and the D sector. I don't think it's appropriate for the Plenipotentiary Conference, however, WTSA was an exception, but we should try to limit the interventions from the Plenipotentiary Conference and leave the Study Groups to carry out studies based on questions and input documents from administrations.

So instead of starting to discuss what should be studied in the sectors at the Plenipotentiary, we should leave that to each sector, then they may bring the result to the relevant conferences in a later stage if we start to instruct the sectors on studies, I'm sure we will have hundreds of studies in the R sector, there will be a large number of studies in the D sector. It also has to go to the Plenipotentiary for approval and I don't think that's the principle we would like to set for the future. So I think we should accept Resolution 22 as it stands, that's an exception, and then continue to study based on questions in the Study Groups. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Many thanks for that. Argentina, then the Dominican Republic.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chairman. We would like to support the proposal from Brazil. We believe that it's very important for the standardization sector to complete its studies taking into account international Internet connections and we think that if we can ask the sector to carry out studies on fixed and mobile services, we can also, we can go ahead with that and that would be a good idea. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Dominican Republic, then Côte d'Ivoire.

>> DOMINICAN REPUBLIC: Dominican Republic agrees with Brazil and Argentina statement given the ability to expand already what was conveyed to the Telecommunication Standardization Bureau to conduct these studies. These, as Brazil said is it the evolution once it has studied international traffic of fixed and mobile to also include the international Internet access and Internet, I'm sorry, Internet service traffic.

With that said, if this is not reasonable, then the only reasonable idea, if I misunderstood it, would be to actually suppress resolution, this resolution being an exception apparently as it was stated before.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dominican Republic. Now, I don't think anyone has asked us to delete the resolution. I have heard some requests not to modify it. Now, it's 12:30. I still have four requests for the floor. I'm closing my list of speakers now. I see that there are others now. I don't want this to go on too long. If you have very brief statements to make, then we could go over the time, but the statements have to be very short. Côte d'Ivoire, United States, Burkina Faso, United Kingdom. Côte d'Ivoire, go ahead.

>> CÔTE D'IVOIRE: Thank you, sir. Côte d'Ivoire notes the pertinence of the proposal made by Brazil which we share. Having said that, we propose that this contribution be submitted to Study Group 3 as a Brazilian contribution or to the TSAG.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you. United States?

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman, and I'm sorry to take the floor again. I will be brief. I wanted to thank Brazil for their explanation of their proposal and for the speakers who supported Brazil, it helped clarify the issue for me very well. The United States remains concerned that by adding this text we are changing the focus of the resolution which currently addresses a very different topic, and the other provisions and the other references all deal with bilateral traffic exchange, however, we do understand the importance of this issue to all of the countries who spoke, but we have also heard it in other meetings.

And that is what I specifically wanted to mention is that in the ad hoc group on Internet issues, there has been a lot of discussion about inclusion of some language on international Internet connectivity that is similar to this and as well there is already a reference in Resolution 101 to this issue and to work being undertaken in the ITU. So perhaps that would be the better place to deal with this issue. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Senegal, please.

>> SENEGAL: Thank you, Chairman. Senegal would like to thank and congratulate Brazil on the relevance of its proposal which hits the African Union's concerns on the head, particularly concerning externality of networks so it's important to carry on thinking about this. We support this proposal, therefore.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Burkina Faso.

>> BURKINA FASO: Thank you very much, Chairman. I will be brief. Like others, I'd like to state the importance for my country of the studies. We, therefore, support the Brazilian proposal as Côte d'Ivoire said, we may need to look at whether there are any alternative mechanisms for this, but for this this is a very important issue. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you, United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I would like to support the intervention by Côte d'Ivoire. Côte d'Ivoire is a voice Chair of Study Group 3 or representative from Côte d'Ivoire. Question 3/3, existing question 3/3 of Study Group 3 covers study of economic and policy factors relating to the efficient provision of international telecommunication services. The question explicitly covers network externalities and I would support this going forward as a contribution to Study Group 3 for the study and conclusion. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you. A number of delegations have taken the floor on this matter relating to Resolution 22. Discussions are being focused on the matter of dealing with connectivity at the international level, internet connectivity, that is. A number of statements, quite a large number requested that the need for ITU work in this field be mentioned. A number of delegations have also stated that this concerned the ITU‑T sector and should be discussed in the Study Groups.

I don't know if that's the best avenue to explore, but at this stage my proposal would be as follows. We should hold a discussion based on the Brazilian proposal. I don't think we should create a Working Group at this stage, but I think we should hold a discussion involving Côte d'Ivoire who is involved in Study Group 3's work, and representatives of other regions as well, Africa, Europe.

I would ask all of those who have made statements to go and speak to Brazil and see whether there is an appropriate means of dealing with this concern relating to international Internet connectivity and find the best way to deal with this matter in the Plenipotentiary. We need to bear in mind that many have said that we shouldn't delve into too many details at this Plenipotentiary, that that level of detail is for the Study Groups, and we should really stay general at this Plenipotentiary. So that's a provisional proposal for solving this.

Perhaps you could go and discuss this with Brazil and we can come back at the end of the week to see how the land lies. Maybe we can have an approach which we have agreed upon by then. With that, I suggest that we adjourn this meeting. Thank you very much for your collaboration. We have made good progress today. We have forged one consensus, and our communication to the other committees that we want to avoid amending the Constitution in the Convention at this Conference. I will tell Com 6 that we have no extra expenses and I'm sure they will be very happy to hear that, to hear that we don't need to have a Council Working Group here, and I will come back to you as soon as I can about the Chairmanship of Working Group on Resolution 21. I will see you tomorrow then, we have a big day tomorrow because we have got two three hour sessions. The Secretariat has two announcements to make and I give him the floor.

>> SECRETARIAT: Yes, very quickly, Mr. Chairman, a number of announcements. The first one is that the GemTech high level dialogue will be held in half an hour room D. The GemTech is held tonight at the Epic House at 7:00, 7:00 p.m., there will be buses leaving Bexco at 6:30 p.m. for the Epic House, and obviously there will be shuttle buses to bring you back to your hotels after at around 9:00.

There will also be a side event tomorrow on ICTs and UN sustainable agenda from 8:00 to 9:00 in Room G, and finally also tomorrow, Wednesday, the Connect 2020 round tables will kick off with the first session on growth from 1:00 to 2:00 in room D. Thank you.

>> CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Thank you, sir, for that additional information. I wish you a pleasant lunch and the session stands adjourned.

(Adjourned at 12:30)
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