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>> Ladies and gentlemen, please take your places. We're about to start Com 4. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Before I open the first Committee 4 meeting, I would like to check the channels for interpretation. Channel 1, English.

>> Good morning, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Mine has a problem. Channel 1, English?

>> Good morning, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Please wait. My setup is not working.

Okay, I repeat again. So please check the English channel.

>> Very good morning, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Channel 2, French. Thank you. Merci.

Channel 3, Spanish.

Gracias.

Channel 4, Russia?

And channel 5, Chinese?

And channel 6, Arabic?

I think it looks like the channels are okay. Any problem?

Okay, let's start. My name is Yoichi Maeda, TSB Japan and the Chair of Study Group 15. I'm very happy to be here the Chair for the Committee 4. I'd like to express my warm welcome to all of you to Dubai for Committee 4 meeting.

Now I would like to introduce our management team to you including the Vice‑Chairman, Working Group Chairman, and Secretariat. TD7 was reviewed in the Plenary yesterday. TD7 shows there are three Vice‑Chairman, and three Vice‑Chairman, Fabio Bigi from Italy, and Liu Duo from China, and Hassan Talib from Morocco. From Committee 4 we have two Working Groups. One is 4A and Chairman of the Working Group 4A is Fabio Bigi. And Working Group 4B is chaired by Joshua Peprah. from Ghana.

And the secretary, Mr. Simao Campos counselor Com 4 left of me and assisted by Mr. Martin Euchner. So if you have any questions for this meeting please do not hesitate to contact us. I will do my best to progress the work in this meeting. I'd like to ask your cooperation to conclude this opening Plenary for Committee 4 within the first quarter today. It is only 75 minutes.

TD4 describes time of reference of Committee 4. First is to submit to the Plenary Meeting report including proposal on the programme and organisation of the work of ITU consistent with ITU‑T strategy and priorities on the basis of the proposing of ITU Member States and ITU‑T Sector Members and the TSAG report submitted to the Assembly as we review yesterday. To review the proposal regarding Resolution outlining TD1, and another issue is to review the proposal of Working Group 4A and 4B of Committee 4 and submit proposal to Plenary, the presentation of proposal relate to Working Group with Working Group 4A and 4B respectively noting Committee 4. And result will be reviewed in this Committee and the reviewing will be made in the Committee 4 session in the next week.

Now I'd like to ask you to take the document ADM3 for today's agenda. Yes, please show the project. I think this slide will be much better than the photo of me. So please, next page. It's just the same as your contents of agenda containing ADM3, but I'd like to ask you a correction, as shown in Item 3, TD4 should be replaced by TD9. That correction should be made. And in addition to that correction, if you visit TD9, also TD number 4 should be replaced by TD9.

Also, we listed Resolution number 75 should be replaced by 76, so the number of the Resolution quoted in that TD document has minor errors.

So in item issue number 3 of TD9, so Resolution number 75, please replace by 76. That's a correction for the agenda which I have found.

And go back to the admin 3. TD1, document list proposal which has been allocated to this Committee and to be examined by Plenary, the various Committees and Working Group. Study issues for Committee 4 are listed on page 10 and 11 of TD1. TD3 agreed time allocation in yesterday's Plenary. Com 4 will have 7 sessions of 75 minutes. Due to the limited time, I'd like to ask you to make your presentation as concise, as short, as possible.

The maximum of your speech time should be the maximum is 5 minutes, but 3 minutes will be preferred to introduce your key contents. Also, I would like to use ad hoc group and drafting groups to progress detail as much as possible. Can I ask you to support this general meeting guideline? Any comment?

So Korea, please?

>> KOREA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was making a comment for DT1 about the allocation of the contribution document. Page 11 on structure regarding the ITU‑T Study Group restructuring principles, there is only one source, but I think ACP/35A, Addendum 13, should be added, because this proposal provides principles for ITU‑T structures, and also, next item ITU‑T Study Group structures, we have a proposal ACP/35, Addendum 7, which is modification of the Resolution 2. However, this is ‑‑ this document suggests ITU‑T structure, also. So I repeat, ACP/35A7 should be allocated under the ITU‑T Study Group structure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your comment, and we take the note, and future agenda for the detailed discussion, your information will be included. Thank you very much.

So is there any other comment? So I'd like to take the note our general meeting guidelines, and in our meeting minutes. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, good morning to you and to anybody. Chairman with respect to any addition to your agenda I suggest the representative of each organisation contact you and Secretariat directly in order to save time of the Plenary of this meeting so we don't need to say which document should be added or not added to Agenda Item. We leave it to the proponent of the proposal and the Committee under your Chairmanship to discuss this outside the meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your suggestion. And U.S?

>> UNITED STATES: Good morning, Chairman. Question, there are a couple of items on cloud computing and division of responsibility between 13 and 17. When would you intend to take them up? I don't see them on the agenda.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And if you want to see the whole general agenda, and the whole view of Com 4, please check TD9, and ADM3 just shows today's agenda, and my proposed agenda is regarding the SG structure issue. Today I'd like to focus on the more general principles, and also the number of the Study Group.

After we reach agreement in this meeting, I'd like to have another refinement discussion of mandate and the question contents that will be discussed tomorrow. It's okay? Okay, thank you very much.

So I have already had a question from U.S., but I'd like to add some information. So TD9, this is the general agenda for Com 4 and shows the study items and the relevant documents to be reviewed.

The first item of admin 3 for Com 4 Plenary, I'd like to have your approval of the meeting agenda for today. So please take the Admin 3, and we'll have a very limited topics. So after opening remarks, I'd like to discuss Study Group structure, just overview aspect, and my goal of this meeting is to make a decision on the number of the Study Group.

And also, I'd like to have a discussion on strategic review Committee proposal, original proposal containing contribution 39 from Japan. Also, I add informational document from GSS, and I'm very happy to invite Malcolm Johnson to introduce this document 69 on this subject.

Also, I have more items and we have several Resolutions in Committee 4, but I'd like to take two important Resolutions, Resolution 72 and 73, within just 75 minutes. So this is the contents of the agenda for today.

Are there any comments to my proposed agenda? Okay. I see none. So agenda in ADM3 is approved. Thank you very much.

Okay, so let's move to the discussion item, and I have introduced Item 3, work plan and allocation of documents, and we refer the documents 1, 3, and 9, and regarding the Item Number 4, intercommittee issues, we do not have any relevant documents for today, but I'd like to remind you that some discussion to be held in other Committees, such as one example is conformance testing in Resolution 76. We have to carefully check the impact of the discussion, and we have to consider some text for the Resolution 2 mandate in output. Thus should be considered. So I just want to remind that aspect of intercommittee issue for your future study items.

So in this meeting, there are no relevant documents, and I do not have any specific discussion. Okay? Can I move to the first main topic in issue number 5? So number 5 is Study Group structure, and it says overview of basic documents. I have listed 6 contributions, and as I said before, today I'd like to focus on general structure, and I'd like to reach agreement on the number of the Study Group. So to that purpose, I'd like to ask each proposal to make a brief, concise presentation, and then I'd like to have a discussion. So first contribution, ACP35/A13. Who has floor?

If not, I have to move to the next one. Korea, please.

>> KOREA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I briefly explain the ACP contribution, contribution 35, Addendum 13. This contribution provides principles and Study Group structures and a number of Study Group structure is 10 Study Group structure as it is. In the current Study Group structure, and also we suggest co‑location between Study Group 11 and Study Group 13, and also co‑location of Study Group 9 and Study Group 16, the same co‑location schemes what we have done current study period, but in the next study period, we would like to suggest co‑locations is normally co‑located, just keeping the rooms for the two Study Groups concerned have a little freedom to host their meetings in a different regions. That's all. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your concise presentation. And I do not have any discussion at this stage but then is there question for clarification? If not, I'd like to move to next one, RCC44, Addendum 1, Federation of Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, allow me to begin on behalf of my Delegation by congratulating you and your Deputies on your election to your Post. You have important work to do and I wish you every success. The RCC has considered with some care the Study Group structure. We have analyzed the work that has been done. We consider that the decision taken at the last Assembly with reference to the organisation of the Study Groups in terms of 10 Study Groups, and the idea of having joint work done by several groups has indeed been justified. We therefore would say that we've just gone through the first period with this new structure. We consider, however, that the success that we noted at the Plenary when the chairs of the Study Groups submitted their results speaks for itself. It's clear that there is no need to change the structure of the Study Groups at this stage. Certainly we would not need to do this so quickly. For that would reason we support the current structure for the Study Groups and propose it be retained in the next study period in the format as we have it and we'll see in future. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Any comment? Thank you. So let's move to the next one, EUR45, Addendum 1. U.K., please.

>> United Kingdom: Thank you, Chairman, good morning. I'd like to present EUR45A/1, the proposal from CEPT presents a number of principles upon which discussions occurred to review the structure of ITU‑T in order for it to carry out its work. The proposal that we make is intended to leverage the expertise within the ITU‑T, provide for efficient and effective working, and to ensure no duplication of effort.

To that extent, we make two proposals regarding possible structures of work for the ITU‑T, which are contained in Annex 1 and Annex 2 to EUR45A/1, and I therefore place before this group for its consideration.

The detail is in the annexes and is there for people to review and comment upon, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Any comment to the presentation? I see none, so let's move to the next one, AFCP56, Addendum 1, please. Document number 56, Addendum 1. No presenters?

Okay, may I move to next one? The next one is B, Brazil, document 57, and Addendum 8 and Addendum 12. Can I ask Brazil to make a presentation.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and good morning, everyone. Just as RCC, would support the current structure of 10 Study Groups with whatever changes are made to make them more efficient and more effective. Plus we think that as general principle we should eliminate redundant work and avoid as much as possible the duplication of work.

Also, in order to bridge the standardization gap, it would be interesting to consider members from developing countries as members of TSAG and Study Group management teams. Another basic principle is to allocate long‑term tasks, to establish stable Study Groups in ITU‑T and keep them in scope and time scale. Should also take into consideration a minimum need for focus groups, JCAs and other groups resulting in reduction number of meetings and expenditures. This would benefit developing countries, as well.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. So anyone to present document 56, Addendum 1? If not, we just take that contents.

Okay, I'd like to move to the ‑‑ yeah, discussion.

So as far as I observe your high‑level presentation on the SG structuring, I found some aspect mainly 3 or 4 aspects. First one, basic principle for the structuring, and second issue would be high‑level consideration such as number of the Study Groups. Then we will get into more detail and such as transfer of blocks of work among or between the Study Groups, and then further refinement of the questions.

As far as I observe the proposed principles from Asia, Brazil, and from Europe, I think those proposed principles are very variable, and those texts would be good guidance for future discussion.

So regarding the principles, I'd like to propose to take note in the meeting and if it is okay for you, I'd like to ask you to discuss how many number of Study Groups should be considered.

So is there any comment to the principles? My proposal is to take note in our meeting minutes.

Okay, I see ‑‑ okay, first Brazil and Dominic and China. So Brazil, first.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There was a little misunderstanding. I was just talking about 57A8 and we were supposed to present also 57A12 so if you allow us we would like to make a short presentation on A12, okay?

>> CHAIR: Thank you for reminding us. Yes, please.

>> Dominican Republic: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would like to present briefly our considerations regarding the Resolution 178 of the 10PP and the work on technical aspect of telecommunication aspects. In accordance of item 1 the Director of TSB and in consultation with TSAG a correspondence group was set up in order to the other member states views and contributions to this matter. So in conclusion, this group suggests that JCA approach seems to be the most optimal and efficient solution in response to the creation of specific Study Group. Also, it was discussed in the SAG meeting held on last July and it was agreed to advise the TSB Director to report to the WTSA the position of the correspondence group pursuant to resolution 178, so the doc 26 was issued by the Director of TSB, but should this WTSA‑12, before this discussion and also the terms of this JCA.

So considering the ongoing work of the newly created Working Group on International Internet Related Public Policy issues, that should guide the activities of the Sector on these matters, and also considering the proposals on Resolution actually the Resolution 75, with JCA approach that will be discussed here in this WTSA‑12, it is a good way to address these issues.

So Brazil does not see the need for specific Study Group under ITU‑T structure on this matter at this time. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. So regarding the number of the Study Groups and no need for the changing the number. Thank you very much.

So next Dominic.

>> Egypt: Sorry, Mr. Chairman, it is Egypt because we are sitting at this microphone. Regarding restructuring we think that the structuring should be kept as is, without a new Study Group for Internet issues. It is going well with Council Working Group and we should investigate the term of reference of the JCA178. This JCA should focus on organising the work within the ITU Study Groups so the term of reference should be revised correctly to reflect this principle.

You have come into the African common proposal document 56 so that I was not in the room. If you allow me to make a presentation, very quick presentation of this document, document 56 of the African proposal.

>> CHAIR: Yes, please.

>> Egypt: This proposal just invite creation of regional group for Study Group 13 in the African region, because you know the NGN and the future networks are being of great interest for the region, for the African region, and we should be involved in the early stages of development of standards for the NGN and future networks. You know that the African countries is still virgin in terms of infrastructure and she's a good way for creating networks, so it would be very effective if African countries are involved in the development of standards and the work of future networks and NGNs.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your kind support. Next is China.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. China supports Korea, Russia, Brazil, and Dominican Republic, and Egypt for their intervention. We suggest to maintain the current 10 Study Group structure, because right now, RCD is developing very fast worldwide and there's a growing need for international standards. ITU‑T should maintain sufficient number of Study Groups to attract best expertise to participate in the studies of the Study Group in ITU. In order to maintain the position of ITU‑T in the world. Therefore, China suggests maintain the current 10 number of Study Groups. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I have another request from Iran but I'd like to close comment and try to move to the discussion. It's okay? So I'd like to give the floor to Arab. UAE, please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman. And good morning. Since it is the first time that we are taking the floor, we would like to congratulate you Mr. Chairman for your election to the leadership of this group. As to the proposal, we listened to the presentations of the regional groups with great interest. I should now like to speak to the Arab group's proposals briefly.

We would support the current structure of the Study Groups and the current number, that is 10 Study Groups. We would also support the proposals of the RTC of Brazil and indeed the other proponents this morning. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. And I have request from Tunisia. Do you have any specific comment?

>> Tunisia: Thank you, Chairman. Thank you, Chairman. I too would congratulate you on your election. I should really wish to second the proposals contained in document 56 of the African group and this recommendation from the African group, which participated in a workshop which had been organised by the TSB in Tunis, and where the wish was expressed to contribute specifically to the work of the Study Group, most particularly in order to contribute to the issues discussed in the Study Group and which are of particular interest to the African states. Therefore, we hope to see this proposal validated during this Assembly. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. And let me close the list.

So thank you for your suggestions, and this slide shows just the key contents based on the written contributions, but as far ace observe regarding the number of the Study Groups, majority some forts 10 Study Groups, and as we have now. And even in proposal from Europe, they propose they prefer 8 Study Groups but those are the proposed 10 Study Groups. So I'd like to ask you to reach agreement and first I'd like to have any comment from Europe on this number of Study Groups.

U.K., please.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The proposal from Europe, whilst putting forward 8 Study Groups as our preferred alternative, was only one alternative. I think going forward we can consider 10 Study Groups, and look at refining some of the work that the Study Groups do.

I think the principles on which we based our assessment talking about leveraging the expertise, avoiding duplication, not only of effort within the Study Groups but also of focus groups, are things that we can consider as part of the discussion on the refinement of the work.

And I think also taking into account the proposal from Japan on the review group is additionally an activity that will enable us to look and to assess going forward. To that end, we would suggest that proposing 10 Study Groups given the weight of comment from other regions and Delegations is one that we can live with. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So as far as we have discussed, now I'd like to ask you to take the one of the important decisions, to keep the number of Study Groups of 10, 10 Study Groups. Is there any objection to make this decision?

Okay, I see none, so keeping the 10 Study Group structure is agreed. Thank you very much.

So after this discussion, we would like to have more detailed discussion, and I don't want to call this decision restructuring so it is now based on existing structure refinement would be appropriate, so Study Groups structure refinement to be our next study item.

And due to the lack of time, I'd like to suspend more detailed discussion on the structuring at this stage, and I'd like to have another session tomorrow, and after the discussion for main item, I'd like to show you some homework for today on the refinement discussion, but I will touch that aspect later.

So I'd like to move to the next study item, to Item Number 6, strategic review Committee proposal, and I'd like to invite Japan, and also Malcolm Johnson to introduce contribution 69.

So first I'd like to give the floor to Japan. Japan, please.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This document number 39, this is a proposal of draft new Resolution on strengthening strategic and structural studies for ITU‑T through establishment of an ITU‑T Review Committee. In terms of standardization work in ITU‑T, Study Groups in each area developing recommendations and those Study Group meetings are held separately, so therefore, effective coordination among Study Groups has been important issues and has been discussed for many years.

So nowadays as a result of such discussions, we have options to have so‑called other groups and JCA or GSI, TSR established to facilitate effective coordination among Study Groups and other organisations, in addition, the focus groups with participation of no members established and they have proved particularly effective as a tool for coordination and organisation.

However, on the other hand, there are some views that the current structure of ITU‑T consisting of Study Groups supplemented by JCA, focus groups, et cetera, is not good enough to respond fully to the rapid change of technologies and market needs in a timely and appropriate manner in today's standardization environment.

For example, the number of focus groups and other groups are increasing rapidly, and coordination will be needed. In terms of the structure of ITU‑T, Study Groups should be restructured and/or the current structure arrangement including the purpose and objectives of JCA, GSI, TSR, Focus Group should be examined.

There is a need to examine whether the current coordination and collaboration arrangement between ITU‑T and other entities such as ISO, IEC, JTCI, IEEE, IETF are sufficient or not. Regarding the relationship with regional and National SDOs there still room for improvement, despite MOUs have been established between ITU and some regional and national SDOs. So we also have to bear in mind that TSAG meetings are held only once a year and it would be difficult to have in‑depth discussions about such strategic issues in TSAG as it often has a very full agenda in the limited time available.

So in order that ITU‑T could address the rapidly changing standardization environment and market needs timely and appropriately, it is necessary to have more extensive discussions and examine the measures to further evolution of ITU‑T taking into account the activity of all Study Groups of ITU‑T, ITU‑R and ITU‑D and work relationships with other organisations, as well as future desirable study structure of ITU‑T. So therefore it is proposed that WTSA‑12 should establish a Review Committee for examining measures for widening the evolution of ITU‑T by adopting the new Resolution shown in the Annex of this document. The Review Committee would report to WTSA and conduct its initial review in a timely manner so as to provide input I'm me megs of the strategic plan. The Review Committee will focus on continuing resolution of ITU‑T including measures to further the evolution and improvement of ITU‑T in today's standardization environment and desirable future study structure of ITU‑T after the next WTSA and designation of studies to be undertaken in the ITU‑T and improve the coordination collaboration mechanism with other standardization bodies. Regarding the management of the Review Committee it received minimum support from TSB result budget implications, meeting of the Review Committee and TSAG should be organised back to back to the extent possible, for example one or two days meeting of the Review Committee followed by 3 days meeting of TSAG, et cetera. Working language of the Review Committee should be in English. The Annex contains draft new Resolution we propose to adopt during this Assembly.

We strongly believe that cooperation and collaboration among SDOs are extremely important in the current standardization environment, and the establishment of this group and having deep discussion will help ITU‑T to continue to keep its position as a unique global Telecommunication Standardization organisation. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan. I'd like to have a discussion after the presentation on the contribution 69. Is there any specific question for clarification? If not, I'd like to invite Malcolm to relate to the GSS, and also he may touch on CTO discussion. So Malcolm, please.

>> M. JOHNSON: Thank you very much, Chairman. Good morning, everybody. Document 69 is the report of the Global Standards Symposium that was held on Monday, and it was agreed at the end of the day in the Symposium. The Symposium was very well attended and we were fortunate to have very high representation on the panels and the three sessions discussing the three issues shown in Section 2 under main conclusions. The first one was on the Bridging the Standardization Gap, and identified the four points you see there in the bullet points as issues that I would recommend considered in Committee 4 in looking at Resolution 44 on Bridging the Standardization Gap. I think there were some very good suggestions put forward, so I'd recommend Committee 4 consider them.

The second session was entitled: Global Standards Challenges, and this was looking at how we can better interface with the vertical sectors that we need to now, such as the utilities, transportation, and health sectors. That's quite a challenge, and that is something that is new to ITU that we need to develop a good relationship with these vertical sectors that historically have had little involvement in ITU.

Then the third issue, and perhaps most closely related to the proposal from Japan, addressed the difficult issue of collaboration with other standards bodies, and we had representation in the discussion from ISO, IEC, IEEE, IETF, and it was recognized that it's a challenge ensuring this good collaboration. Things are changing due to the convergence of technologies. There's more and more overlap between the work in different bodies, and we need to look at ways of ensuring we work towards the development of either common standards or compatible standards, and avoid competing standards, and avoid duplication.

So you see the three proposals there, in particular, the need to look at a new mechanism to identify the best place to carry out new work and a common approach to bring together all the various bodies dealing with that topic.

So I'd recommend that Committee 4 take account of the conclusions of the GSS in its further consideration of bridging the standards gap and the future relationship between ITU and other standards bodies, which I think has been picked up very clearly in the proposal from Japan.

Also, as you know, on Sunday, we had a meeting of the Chief Technology Officers group, and the relationship between different standards bodies is a major concern for CTOs needing to decide where they place their resources in which standards body. That's been one of the main topics of discussion in the CTO group and is a major concern to industry.

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the proposal put forward by Japan is very timely, looking at the discussion we had this week in the CTO group, and also in the GSS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Malcolm, and thank you for your information, and the meeting, this is input for information, so the Chairman, this proposal of creating the new strategic review group is proposal from Japan and if there's not any other support, I have to put outside the meeting.

So I'd like to ask first, is there any support for the Japanese proposal to create a Review Committee for future activity? So I'd like to have your comment and ideas.

First is Tunisia.

>> TUNISIA: Thank you, Chairman. I believe that the time has come to reflect upon a strategy for the organisation of Study Groups and Tunisia would support the proposal of this review group.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Tunisia, and I have received a very long list, and Brazil, Iran, Korea, Italy, Argentina, so ‑‑ too long, so first I'd like to ask you if there is any objection to the second from Tunisia, and any objection to the proposal from Japan? First I'd like to press your button to release first request to have the floor and then ‑‑ and I'd like to ask your comment and any objection to consider the proposal from Japan.

So it is ‑‑ so I have now Italy, and Dominican and U.K. Egypt, okay. I can't read the French. So Italy first.

>> ITALY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I ask the world to support Mr. Chairman the Japan proposal to improve and optimize the ITU‑T activity in the next study period. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Dominican, if you have any ‑‑ next is Algeria.

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Chairman. So far as we're concerned, Chairman, we would like to express support for the establishment of this new structure. We think that this would be a good approach to dealing with certain problems relating to coordination. Today, we see that the whole issue of coordination is one that does not arise only in terms of coordination with standardization organisations, it also relates to other activities. I certainly know as the Chair of Study Group 2 in the development Sector that coordination is very important, and certainly we've always had a lot of coordination for our activities where there are joint subjects that we've worked on with other groups, things like Climate Change, urgent telecommunications, broadband services, e‑medicine and so on. These are the kind of issues that it would be very useful for people to work together on, and that the kind of area we would want to have the level of coordination that is proposed here.

Therefore, we support also the idea of establishing regional groups who would work on this in accordance with the African proposal. We think having a regional group approach to this would be very valuable and good indeed. As well as that we believe we need to have regional groups working more broadly on joint issues like Climate Change, urgent telecommunications, cybersecurity, broadband services and e‑medicine as I have said.

So summing up, then, basically we are saying that establishing this kind of group would be a good thing. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, and thank you for your variable additional issue for consideration.

And we have also a long list, and ‑‑ yeah ‑‑ and I'd like to ‑‑ for the moment, I'd like to close the list, and I'd like to give the floor to ‑‑ and this is Egypt, and U.K. and Arabia, Saudi Arabia, and United States, Canada, and UAE.

And please focus on whether you will object or not, so please continue.

So Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm talking now on behalf of the Arab group, and I suppose that rather than yes or no we have some comments. Can we say these comments? Okay, in principle we support the creation of this group and think it's very good to have coordination among the two Study Groups.

However, we have to look at the mechanism and modality of its work. Would it be ‑‑ Working Group under WTSA or under TSAG? And we support that this group should work under TSAG like we have Council Working Group under the Council so this would be Working Group under TSAG and not over TSAG.

Second, we have to seize the mechanism of cooperation with external bodies. I think the coordination of work inside the ITU between Study Groups is very important and we see that this sort of cooperation needs some enhancement so these groups will have a very important role in coordinating the work as stated in the text of the Resolution.

Regarding the external work as you have just mentioned Mr. Malcolm Johnson have expressed very clearly and very solidly that you have to work to see how we are going to cooperate with external bodies. I'm very worried about the word "duplication," because this word should not be used to inhibit work in the ITU because something is working something. This must be ‑‑ don't want to say equal footing, but must say that we have to work in collaboration to have every person do his good amount of work and use his expertise and to have seen the very good output of that two Study Groups, even I seen yesterday the Y2770 recommendation about the inspection and it was a very good example of good work.

But this should be kept in mind to have the work in equal basis. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, and U.K? Yeah.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. The Japanese proposal for strategic Review Committee is timely and very welcome. We notice that its first terms of reference covers the adequacy of the current structure of the ITU‑T which we presume encompasses the number and activity of Study Groups as well as the role and type of other groups such as JCAs, GSIs, and focus groups.

This issue has been considered within CEPT, although I'm not speaking on behalf of CEPT, but our view was similar to that which has just been expressed by the Arab group that it does need a relationship with TSAG. I think our esteemed colleague from Egypt talked about support under TSAG, except believe it should have a relationship with TSAG and I think that needs to be within the terms of reference and clarified.

So thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, and I have a very positive discussion but regarding the detailed contents, I'd like to set another chance, so let's try to focus on the point for discussion.

And we have only 7 or 8 minutes so I have to close the list but I would like to give the floor to Saudi Arabia first.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Briefly, we would like to support the position as outlined by the delegate from Egypt. This group has reviewed ITU‑T work, as well as the mechanisms of this Sector, and also can coordinate with other groups. We would like again to support all proposals by the Egyptian delegate which have to be taken into consideration. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. The United States?

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. Similar to the U.K. and the Arab States' comments we would like to support this proposal in principle with a couple of points of clarification with respect to the relationship between this group and TSAG and the WTSA, and what is more appropriate direct responsibility to TSAG or the WTSA.

We have another point we'd like to raise but presume there will be another discussion on the subject at another time. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Next Canada?

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Canada supports the proposal from Japan, and like some of the other colleagues, we also believe that the Review Committee would be best positioned under TSAG, and perhaps could meet for a day or two before TSAG meetings. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Next is UAE.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We would like to share the support as voiced by previous Delegates to the Japanese Delegation proposal. We have a few remarks especially with regard to the creation of such a group. We would like to know what would be the terms of reference? What would be the membership of such a group? What would be the responsibilities of Sector Members? Would it be participation in terms of observers? Or will they be actively contributing to the work of such a Committee?

Now, equally, with regard to reports, we would like to propose that reports are given to the TSAG, the Telecommunication Standardization Advisory Group who would be looking into the work of such a Committee, and we also would like to propose that such ‑‑ that the TSAG also would be giving a report on the work of the Review Committee to the WTSA.

We would like here to underline the importance that the TSAG would hold its meetings at the same time as the T Sector, especially since developing countries would have difficulties to hold their meetings in times that are different from the times of the TSAG. Therefore, we reiterate the importance that the Review Committee would hold its meetings in parallel to the TSAG.

Thank you, and thank you for your attention.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And I have already closed the list, so the last on the list, Iran, I'll give you floor. Thank you.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We will ask the floor sometimes ago but you ask we release our point, but now discussion have another direction. Chairman, you have three points here under discussion. First establishment of the Review Committee. It seems that there's general agreement for that.

Second, hierarchical relations whether it is under WTSA or under TSAG and the third is the term of reference. I think for the two issues, terms of reference you need to establish another group in order to discuss in detail and come back with the results. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your summary, and I can save the time. And I have closed the list already, so please release your button for the members.

So as was summarized I observe the general support on the principle and to create a review group. First I'd like to ask can we agree on that? Any objection?

I see none, so first we agree to create a Review Group. Thank you very much.

Then I'd like to establish a drafting group based on the Japanese proposal and ‑‑ but that group have to study the hierarchical relation between the WTSA and TSAG, and that hierarchical relation and those more detailed time of reference to be performed in that review group.

I'd like to establish a draft study issuing a drafting group. Is there any comment? Or is it better to call ad hoc?

Any specific comment? Okay, Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. In brief, it is better we call this ad hoc 1 of Committee 4. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So I'd like to use the name of ad hoc. It would be much better. So any objection to call the ad hoc group? Any other comment? Korea, do you have any other intervention?

>> KOREA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't object to your proposal, but what is important at this moment for this proposal made by Japan is the nature of the group, so I believe this point which this group will be under WTSA or under TSAG? It's very important matter, so before agreeing to establishing ad hoc group, I think we need to clarify, because clearly, as I read the proposal by Japan, it is proposing a review group under WTSA, not TSAG.

So I think this point should be cleared before establishing an ad hoc group. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any other ‑‑ so I'd like to close the list, and United States? Oh, UAE? UAE, sorry.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. With regard to the proposal given by Korea, I think that we should indeed discuss the hierarchical relationship, and we would like this Committee, Review Committee, would like to know the report of such a Committee, should it be given to the TSAG or WTSA? It is important to define such hierarchical relationship. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So as I said, I'd like to propose to create an ad hoc group, and ad hoc group to creation on Review Committee should consider the hierarchical relation among the Review Committee and TSAG and WTSA. Also for the detail on time of reference.

So is any other comment to that proposal? Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We support the Chair. That is a proper course of action, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So is there any other objection to create ad hoc group? Okay, thank you very much. Meeting agree.

So I'd like to have a report from the other group to the next ‑‑ no, no, session on Friday this week, so I'd like to ask the Chair and in the presentation I had U.K. show positive discussion including SG structuring discussion, and can I ask as far as I know Phil Rushton. Okay, U.K., please.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm happy to be Chair of the ad hoc 1 to Committee 4.

>> CHAIR: Is there any objection to nominate Dr. Phil Rushton the Chairman of the ad hoc group on the Review Committee? I see none. Thank you very much.

We have already passed the time a few minutes but we have still two other issues on Resolution, but two Resolutions has many proposals so ‑‑ and other Committee 4, I'd like to tackle with the issue on Resolution 72 on, and Resolution 73 on ICT and Climate Change but unfortunately we don't have enough time for the discussion today so I'd like to propose to create two ad hoc groups to review all the proposals and agree on the way forward, and I'd like to ask to make a report progress to Committee 4 on the session, if possible, tomorrow's session on Thursday, and if it is difficult, in Friday session this week.

So I'd like to propose to create two ad hoc on Resolution 72 and the other is ad hoc group on Resolution 73. Is there any opposition to create two ad hoc groups and leave the detailed discussion to ask in that ad hoc group? And we would like to discuss the results in Committee 4 meeting in this week, Thursday or Friday.

Okay. If so, to close this discussion, I'd like to find the Chair of each ad hoc group, and to save the time I'd like to ‑‑ yeah, have some names. As far as I understand, the issue in Resolution 72, such issue should be handled by the expert in SG5, but I'm not sure if it's the Chairman or Vice‑Chairman in Study Group 5? And how about Chair Ahmed? Oh, I see, okay. So Ahmed and ‑‑ which country?

Côte d'Ivoire, do you have comment?

>> CÔTE d'IVOIRE: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, Côte d'Ivoire suggests that it Chair the ad hoc group on Resolution 72. I'm also a vice Chair of Study Group 5.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. So I'd like to ask Chairman of SG5, Ahmed, and you to lead the discussion, and ad hoc on Resolution 72. The meeting accept it? Any objection?

Okay, thank you very much. Regarding the Chair of the ad hoc group on Resolution 73, ICT Climate Change, as far as I remember the discussion in WTSA‑08, U.K. propose provide a Chair. Is anyone ‑‑

Italy, yeah. Is there anyone volunteer to lead discussion in ad hoc on ‑‑ yes.

So the UAE and U.K. and Sudan. I give the floor first UAE.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If we go back to our agenda, we have a proposal by the Arab group, Addendum 23 of Resolution 69 regarding non‑discriminatory use of the Internet, and we would like it to be on the agenda of discussions with regard to the ‑‑ to Climate Change. So we wonder, what happened to such proposal? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. And regarding the Resolution 69, it is allocated in Working Group 4B? 4A, yeah. So I'd like to ask bring the discussion in that Working Group and if we need some intercoordination among the Committees, I'm happy. So anyhow, we will review the result of the Working Group 4A, so we can coordinate. okay?

And next, the U.K?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I'm happy to Chair the ad hoc group 3 on Resolution 73, if that is the wish of this Committee. I'm not sure if Italy put their name forward. If they did, I'm happy for Italy to Chair. But you have at least one volunteer. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. And Mr. Affleck from U.K? Is there any ‑‑ regarding the volunteer for the Chair, is there any objection? I see none, so I'd like to ask Mr. Affleck to lead the discussion.

And I have a request to give the floor from Sudan and Korea. And I'd like to close the list for today's session. It's already 10 minutes past, so Sudan, please.

>> SUDAN: May the peace of Allah be with you. I'd like to thank the Chair as well as the host UAE for hosting these discussions in regard to Climate Change. In our opinion this is a very vital and important issue. Therefore we would like to support African and Arab positions on this issue. We have a few interventions on this subject. We would like to participate by suggesting addenda with regard, I repeat, Climate Change. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. And last floor is given to Korea. Thank you.

>> KOREA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think this is quite an efficient meeting. I do not have any objection to your way of working on these three ad hoc group activities, but Korea we especially have much concern in those ad hoc group activities, especially in WTSA review group currently we are saying, and also Resolution 73. So we'd like to know the meeting place and time as early as possible, and if possible, we do not like to have those kind of ad hoc group meetings in parallel. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, but I have to ask ‑‑ the room and each Chair. So thank you for your comment.

So I have request from Italy. Any other issue? So Italy, please.

>> ITALY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to agree with what the colleague from Korea said, so possibly not to have parallel meetings on those ad hoc groups, and maybe to allow significant time for that discussion, in particular Resolution 73. There are many proposals, so probably it would take some time for getting this. Okay, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We can I will say try to the best but we may have a midnight discussion, but I would like to ask TSB to show the, yeah, the schedule and location as soon as possible.

Yes, please check the monitor. Okay, thank you very much. And I think we have finished all the main discussion, and is there any other business to be discussed today?

I see none. Thank you very much, and it is very tough meeting, and next meeting Committee 3 will start 11:15. So enjoy your coffee. Thank you very much. The meeting is adjourned.

[ End of Com 4 Meeting]

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

This text is being provided in an unedited 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.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*