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

>> CHAIR: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. As usual, before I open the second Com 4 meeting, I'd like to check the channels for the interpretation. Good morning, all interpreters. Channel 1?

>> Good morning.

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

Merci. Channel 3, Spanish.

Gracias.

Channel 4, Russian.

Channel 5, Chinese.

Channel 6, Arabic.

It looks like the channels are okay. Let's start. So I'm Yoichi Maeda, and I don't need to repeat our management name so I'd like to start our meetings. Welcome to the second Com 4 meeting.

[ No audio ]

Okay? Okay. Thank you. So I think we had a very hard but efficient meeting yesterday. I'd like to ask your cooperation again to conclude this second session within the first quarter of this morning. We get only 75 minutes.

Now I'd like to ask you to take the document Admin 13 for today's agenda. Today's main topics are study structure refinements and review of report from Com 4 ad hoc and Working Groups. Are there any comments to the draft meeting agenda in Admin 13? Okay, there is some additional information on the agenda.

Item 7, report from the Working Group, TD14 from Working Group 4B should be added, and last item, any other business, DT10, financial implication from the Committee 2 Chairman should be added.

I hope we can have time for review, but that should be added to our agenda.

So is there any question or comment to my proposed agenda for this morning? Okay, I see none, so agenda is approved. Thank you very much.

TD17, the draft, first our mission is item 2, approval of the report from previous Com 4 session. And TD17 is a draft report of first Com 4 session.

I'd like to have your approval of the report and I will ask you review Section by Section of TD17. Are there any problems?

Okay, so please take the first page, so is there any comment to the first part, Section 1, for general?

Section 2, agenda?

Section 3, work plan and allocation of documents?

Section 4, intercommittee issues, added some notes. On page 2, Section 5, the structuring discussion, basic document, we agreed to establish, reach agreement to keep the 10 Study Group structure.

Section 6, strategic Review Committees. And Section 7, WTSA Resolution and Committee 4.

And Section 8, 9, 10 is additional informational material. So that's all the contents of the meeting minutes. Is there any comment to the report? Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning to you and all distinguished colleagues. Chairman, Section 7, second paragraph, third line after established two Ad Hoc Groups it is mentioned, without presentation of the respective proposal in Com 4 Plenary. Do we need this part? No, we don't need that, Chairman. Just delete that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your suggestion. Is there any objection to the proposal from Iran? Simply delete? I see none. Thank you very much for your suggestion.

Is there any other comment? Okay, it looks fine. The report is approved. Thank you very much.

After the first Com 4 session, we have established three ad hoc on creation of Review Committee, Resolution 72 and Resolution 73. Thank you very much for your hard work.

We have now the report from the ad hoc on Resolution 72, which is contained in TD18. So I would like to take the report which is proposed in the form of a temporary document in this Committee, so I'd like to invite ad hoc Chair Mr. Ahmed Zeddam for your review of the report, TD18. Yes, please. Ahmed, do you have any problem?

Do you have a problem with the mic? Now Ahmed moved to another Chair.

Okay, you have the floor.

>> AHMED ZEDDAM: Hello. Hello, hello.

>> CHAIR: Yes, I can hear.

>> AHMED ZEDDAM: Can you hear me? Yes, Chairman. The Ad Hoc Group did indeed meet to discuss Resolution 72 yesterday afternoon from 4:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. In my Chairmanship of this group, I was assisted by Mr. Guy‑Michel Kouakou, Chairman of ITU‑T Study Group 5. In this session we analyzed the proposals which had been received on Resolution 72. We looked in particular at the proposal from the Arab countries, the European proposal, and the proposal from the African countries. We also received a proposal from the TSB. The European proposal was based on work carried out during the previous study period by Study Group 5. The nature of that proposal was that in light of findings Garnered, we should suppress Resolution 72.

The other contributions held the opposite opinion. They proposed that we should maintain Resolution 72. And amend it with new proposals. On this basis, the ad hoc group decided to review Resolution 72, taking the African and Arab proposals as their basis. This work was indeed carried out in Annex 1 of DT18, you can find the new text which has been approved by this Ad Hoc Group. I'll be very swift in running through this? The considerings we've added a number of amendments in F.

We refer in particular to WHO's fact sheets, and we've also included a new part on mobile terminals, because there are now fact sheets on mobile terminals.

We've also added Resolution 72, says the speaker, adopted by the World Telecommunication Development Conference in 2010, and we also have Resolution 176 in considering H from the last Plenipotentiary Conference.

I'll now move on to resolves. There we've made a minor change in replacing "accelerate" with "continue."

In Study Group 5, we've also reached our cruising speed now. I don't think we they'd to accelerate. We can simply continue at the current pace.

In resolves 2, we've added, on the issue of collaboration, a very important issue on which we need to work. The text reads, in particular with a view to monitoring conformance of telecommunication terminals.

In resolves 3, we've altered the question for ITU‑D. That's now Question 23, not Question 9.

And in resolves 4, we have included strengthening coordination with WHO so that any fact sheet relating to human exposure to electromagnetic fields is circulated to Member States as soon as it is issued.

And then we have the Section, instructs the Director of the Telecommunication Standardization Bureau, in close collaboration with the Directors of the other two Bureaux. In that Section, we have a number of amendments which you can see in the document.

We're asking the Director to carry out studies to assess developing country needs, and submit the findings and analysis to Study Group 5 with a view to turning that into recommendations where necessary.

Point 2 here talks about holding workshops in developing countries, with presentations and training on the use of equipment employed in assessing human exposure to F energy.

We then have Item 3, support developing countries if they need to establish test centers equipped with test benches for monitoring conformance of telecommunication terminal equipment, and so on, for electromagnetic waves, and we then talk about the modalities of Resolutions 44 and 76, and Resolution 170 of the last Plenipotentiary conference.

There we have it. I think, Chairman, that is my presentation of this new text as approved by the Ad Hoc Group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Ahmed Zeddam and Mr. Guy‑Michel Kouakou, for your wonderful leadership. I'd like to ask your review for approval at the level of Committee 4. So Ahmed explained in detail the changes on Resolution 72. First I'd like to ask, are there any comments to the proposed Resolution 72?

Okay. So if there is any comment I'd like to report this updated Resolution to the WTSA Plenary tomorrow afternoon. Okay? I'd like to confirm. Okay.

I have United States, Algeria, and Iran. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to all colleagues. Thank you for this update on 72. I would like to draw your attention to below resolves on instructs to Director of Telecommunication Standardization Bureau in close cooperation with the Director of the other two Bureaux. 1, where it says to carry out studies on assessing human exposure to EMF, I somehow need clarification on this in regards to the expertise within TSB to carry out such studies. We do not have expertise in the medical field that we can do these type of studies. Could this be clarified? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you for your comment. And my intention for the session ‑‑ today's session, if you have ‑‑ if we will have further comment, I'd like to collect those comments and ask the Ad Hoc Group to review them again, and it will be difficult to continue the editing and the modification discussion at this level. But I want to have the comment from Algeria and Iran.

So now Algeria, you have the floor.

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, Delegates. I have a minor observation about resolves 3. Resolves 3, cooperating on these issues with ITU‑R Study Groups 1 and 6, and with Study Group 2 of ITU‑D in the framework of question 23/1. We have Study Group 1. It should be Study Group 1, not Study Group 2 which I have the honor of Chairing, so we're talking about Study Group 1 of ITU‑D, not Study Group 2. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your correction. And Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I have similar question raised by the U.S. Even if he went one step further talking about the expertise on the medical things, even non‑expertise, how Directors could carry out studies? Directors does not have a particular Study Group himself or in future, a lid Director herself to have that study, Chairman. Director could facilitate but Director cannot be involved in the studies. Director is directing the Bureau. It's not doing the studies at all.

So I would request Mr. Johnson to say how he implement this resolves 1? Even if it is not medical one, so perhaps we should add some word, to facilitate, something like this, and perhaps Mr. Johnson could add something to that to make it quite easy, and let this Resolution be passed immediately from your Committee. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And Ahmed, do you have any proposal Resolution? Or can you take this to your next ad hoc meeting.

>> AHMED ZEDDAM: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, I'd like to espouse the comments made by the U.S. and Iran because I myself yesterday during our discussions said the very same things. I wasn't pleased with this wording but we did discuss for quite some time, I must admit, to reach this wording, and quite clearly, the idea behind this isn't to ask the Director of the ITU‑T to carry out studies.

The word "study" is perhaps not the most appropriate one. What we want is to ask the Director to carry out activities such that they will identify needs where EMF is concerned in developing countries, and then when these needs have been identified, they can be communicated to Study Group 5. That will then allow recommendations to be produced in that regard. That's is the spirit of this text but I can relate to the fact that as it's currently worded, some amendments might be required.

I think we'll go back to the wording of this paragraph in our Ad Hoc Group, Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you very much. And we are lucky to have Malcolm Johnson here, so it's better to ask Directors, so I give the floor to Malcolm.

>> MALCOLM JOHNSON: Good morning, everybody. Let me wish our friends from the United States a happy Thanksgiving Day as far as is possible in the circumstances. Not sure if you can find much Turkey in Dubai but have a nice day.

Yes, I think the clarification from Study Group 5 Chairman would make it easier for Director of TSB to carry out this instruction, so some slight rewording I think can be sorted out hopefully fairly quickly so that this Resolution could be adopted by the Plenary tomorrow. That would be very helpful so that Committee 5 could have some work to do as early as possible.

I don't think it's a difficult thing to do picking up the wording from the Chairman of Study Group 5. And of course, we can call on experts. We may not have the expertise in the Bureau to do this instructs. We could always call on an expert and give a short contract to an expert possibly in consultation with WHO, other relevant bodies. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Malcolm. So we have for the three requests for the floor, but may I ask you to close this discussion in this meeting? And I'd like to ask you to join the next session of Ad Hoc Group discussion, and report back to the next Committee 4 meeting.

Any other further comment on this aspect? Iran, please?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. There is a quick solution for that and I can propose that and perhaps we don't need Mr. Ahmed hold the meeting again. It is quite easy to say, Chairman, instruct a Director to "assist," the start of the sentence, "to assist developing countries assessing the impact of human exposures to EMF in order to enable them to submit," the rest of the sentence after "submit." So Director assist developing countries.

I repeat again, "to assist developing countries assessing the impact of human exposures to EMF in order to enable them to submit," and then take the rest of the sentence, "finding an analysis as soon as possible to the Study Group 5," or take out "as soon as possible," make it quite easy, assist the countries. Whether he is a consultant or not, that's up to the Director and that's all. With WHO, without WHO, that is something quite easy, quick, and we don't need to bother Mr. Ahmed again. He is very kind. Because we are very limited in number, we can assist his meeting, so let's do this, and I think quite easy to do that now. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Is there any specific comment to the proposal from Iran? So I'd like to ask Iran to repeat in dictation speed, please.

>> IRAN: With pleasure. Resolves 1 reads as follows: To assist developing countries to assess the impact of human exposure to EMF in order to enable them to submit their findings and contribution to ITU‑T Study Group 5. Then you read the rest of the sentence, "for its consideration," line 3.

Ask your Secretary whether he has the whole sentence. If that is okay, I think that easily resolve the matter, and Mr. Johnson agree with that, with the telepathy from here to there. Okay, that's okay, we don't need to go to the Ad Hoc Group anymore, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Canada and Côte d'Ivoire, Algeria. Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We do have further comments on the text and we do require that there would be another ad hoc so that we'd have a chance to discuss them. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So I think we have another ‑‑ yeah, intervention will be made so it's better to get together in a second session of ad hoc to be led by Ahmed, and continue the discussion and report back to the Committee 4 session.

It's okay, and I have further request from Côte d'Ivoire. You have the floor.

>> CÔTE D'IVOIRE: Thank you, Chairman. Microphone, please.

Thank you, Chairman. The African group shares Iran's comments about the possibility of sparing ourselves the second ad hoc meeting. However, the proposal which has been made to reword the proposal on the "instructs the Director," et cetera, is not entirely to our liking. In the ad hoc meeting, we held a discussion about this proposal, and we reached a compromise, namely, to speak of case studies and not just studies. That would avoid confusion between Study Group work and TSB work.

So rather than talking about simply studies, we decided to say "to carry out case studies," and Iran's proposal just now doesn't respect the spirit of the African group's proposal. We're not talking about carrying out measures. We're talking about carrying out case studies to identify our needs where standards and recommendations and perhaps even assistance are concerned.

We don't need support in implementing certain measures, so that's the distinction to be made. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, and if you only have concern in that Section, item 1 in resolves, but I'm afraid we have further comment, so I'd like to suggest to discuss again in Ad Hoc Group, and please come back to the Committee 4 with final best solution. Okay? So this issue will be discussed in Ad Hoc Group.

So, Ahmed, please continue the discussion. Thank you.

So I'd like to move to the main issue for today. It is Study Group structure refinement. The way of the discussion is as follows: First I would like to have your concise and short presentation of your contribution showing Item 3B without debate. I will not ask the presentation which were presented yesterday, and input from the Study Group Chairman to save you time.

Are there any requests to add any other contributions in this suggest refinement? Item A and B.

Okay, United Kingdom? Cuba.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I've got two separate points. One is in relation to the Ad Hoc Group you set up yesterday under Resolution 73. There is a document in preparation at the moment, and we do need another meeting, so I'd like time just before you close at the end just to briefly introduce the document and to talk about the further work.

But my colleague here wishes to raise a point about the documents.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair, good morning. With regards to your proposal under 3B, we note that there is EUR/45A1/1 that you indicate was presented in session 1 yesterday. It was presented yesterday but only with regards to the Study Groups, not with regards to the question proposals within it and we would like to present that according to your rules this morning. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, and I can include the contribution from Europe. Is there any problem of the interpretation of Spanish Channel?

Okay? Thank you very much. So still we have a request and if there are no other problems, Spain, do you have still problem? Okay, thank you very much.

So are there any requests to add the contribution for the Section on refinement? Okay.

And okay, we have confirmed the contribution to be presented, and I'd like to continue the process of our discussion. After your presentation, I'm going to show my summary for the discussion point on the refinement based on the general agenda for Committee 4, as I show in TD9 yesterday.

If you can agree on the discussion point, but if we will not be able to conclude the discussion, I will have to set up an Ad Hoc Group to prepare our draft proposal on the Study Group structure refinement. I need your kind help, especially the support of all Study Group Chairmen and Vice‑Chairmen, including the next study period, Study Group candidates.

So first I'd like to ask, are there any comments and questions on my proposed procedure for discussion? I see none, so thank you for your kind cooperation. Now we have about 40 or 45 minutes for this session. As we agree yesterday, I'd like to ask you to make your presentation as concise and short as possible. The maximum of the speech time is I said yesterday 5 minutes, but please consider the current situation.

And much shorter minutes will be welcome. So first I'd like to have a contribution from APT. Japan, please.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to briefly introduce APT Common Proposal document 35, Addendum 7. This APT Common Proposal have two points. One is addition of Leading Role of Study Groups. In the past four years, every Study Group are very active and continue to explore new work items and some of the issues in this Study Group are missed in there. So Resolution 2 is a Study Group. Firstly so APT would like to propose to include this new area as a leading role of Study Groups. This is first point.

And second point is so minor in sense of the area but as a substantial studies of co‑location between Study Groups. Currently Study Group 9 and 16 and Study Group 11 and 13 are requested to have a co‑located meeting but observing a discussion about previous meetings so Study Group Chairmen expressed their desire to have more flexible meetings.

So APT would like to include a short‑term in the part of Resolution 2 so that state can have an independent meeting as appropriate but basically co‑location is very useful and promote cooperation between Study Groups, and we'd like to continue co‑location between Study Groups basically but give Study Groups to have independent meetings as appropriate. This is the second point. This is all about APT Common Proposal. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan. Next I'd like to invite ‑‑ it is A7/R1,/1. Can I move to the next one from Brazil? Brazil, please.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would like to present document 57A1. This is a proposal to be considered by Committee 4 and WTSA regarding an additional point, in addition is 30.2D Study Group 2. It's regarding network neutrality. Network neutrality discussion has emerged strongly in many countries, and Brazil has the view that ITU is the main organisation where a clear view of the main aspects associated to network neutrality can be provided. Such as technical matters, traffic management, and quality of services. There are also many economic aspects but mainly regulatory issues related to the theme to be discussed.

After a study period, ITU can offer Member States better information to decide afterwards. We think, Mr. Chairman, that network neutrality is an important aspect that can be dealt with in this Study Group 2 and Brazil would like to further enhance the discussion in this Committee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: You can continue another presentation. You have three contributions.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So continuing contribution 57, Addendum 10, propose to address practical aspects of procedures, methodologies, and best practices regarding leader laboratory specifications to be located in what we believe could be the most suitable question of SG11, aiming together the Specialists. So Brazil submits to WTSA that that's in Annex which raises the following questions: What are the general tests and procedures for conformance testing including laboratory specifications? What are included all ITU Study Groups, the recommendation which consider laboratory procedures.

And propose the following task, specify general methodologies for conformance testing of equipment to recommendations of the ITU Telecommunication Standardization Sector.

Can I move on to the next contribution? 57/A9. This contribution is in line with the previous one. It presents background with extended list of events during the last study period, and considering it was based on the report of the Plenary of Study Group 17 that considered the possibility to create a new draft question S17 on formal language for telecommunication software and testing. And considering that the ITU‑T SG11 intends to be the Lead Study Group on test specifications, conformance and interoperability testing, the contribution concludes with the support of moving the JCA‑CIT and associated questions from SG17 to SG11.

Moving to SG11 the JCA‑CIT and the relevant parts of the proposed draft Question S/17, would allow the work on these specific technical topics to be concentrated in a work package dealing with testing in ITU‑T. The rationale of this concentration is to ensure more efficient use of experts' time and to reduce travel costs.

Additionally, this would lead to a better distribution of the workload among the ITU‑T Study Groups during the next study period. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. No more? So next is U.K., Europe. Yes, U.K., you have the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. The proposals contained in EUR/45A1, specifically in Annex 2, identifies a number of proposals to better align the work within the Study Groups. This proposal covering all the Study Groups and in detail the questions is based upon the principles that I presented when I talked to this document yesterday. In applying the principles within this document to the questions, we seek to get better efficiency, better leverage of the experts within the ITU‑T, and to align the work in order to achieve greater efficiencies and ease of working for members and Sector Members. The rationale that we develop and have assessed as part of the ongoing activity in developing this proposal is contained within Annex 2. It is not an activity that has been undertaken lightly and has been taken over considerable months in order to arrive at the proposal you see before you.

Indeed, as we developed the Annex and developed the rationale and the proposals within it, we took cognizance of the activities of the Study Groups, and in a number of cases we support the proposals of the Study Groups. There are some issues that we have felt necessary to identify separately with regards to some Study Groups that we feel are worthy of further debate in order to achieve the principles that we have identified within our document.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Rushton. And next is Iran, document 70 and 71. Please make presentation relevant for the refinement issue. Iran, please.

>> IRAN: I think the proposal in this document is natural and does not require further presentation. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Next is Russia, document 50.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. Since it's very important to study security, the World Telecommunication Standardization Assembly is an excellent forum to analyze what is already working well and should be maintained, and what has not worked so well where there are opportunities for improvement.

Currently, Study Group 17 is the Lead Study Group on security, and as Lead Study Group on security, it's responsible for the study of core questions on security. In addition in consultation with other relevant Study Groups and in collaboration, where appropriate, with other standards bodies, Study Group 17 has the responsibility to define and maintain the overall framework and to coordinate, assign the work, and to determine mandates of other Study Groups, and prioritize the studies to be carried out by the Study Groups, and to ensure the preparation of consistent, complete and timely Recommendations. Study Group 17 has an outstanding record of achievements on core security, and in cooperating and collaborating with other Study Groups and a large number of external bodies.

A review of the proposed questions for the next study period submitted to our Assembly shows that 9 out of the 10 Study Groups have proposed work on various aspects of security. This division of the work on security among the Study Groups reinforces the need to have a Lead Study Group on security for the next study period. Study Group 17 with its mandate for security should continue to be assigned this role.

In the current study period, the division of work on security among the various Study Groups has worked well, with just one area where there were concerns.

Despite concerted efforts of many experts over the past years, there continues to be overlap between Question 16 of Study Group 13 and various questions in Study Group 17. Also, some of the Study Group 13 work on security and identity management could have benefited by increased leveraging of the work of Study Group 17. Finding a good division of the work involved considerable effort, but was proved to be difficult to achieve, despite the excellent spirit of cooperation.

Given this situation and the likelihood that difficulties will continue, perhaps it is worth considering a different approach. As everybody knows, Study Group 13 plans to restructure its work into several main areas, each within its own working party, and it plans also to create a horizontal working party supporting all the areas of its work. Thus, cloud computing would be one of the vertical areas within working party 6, and security would be studied within Question 16, which would be in a special horizontal working party, which would be designed to support the work of all the vertical areas.

As we see it, this would appear to be the creation of a mini Study Group 17 within Study Group 13. We think it would be more efficient if the horizontal work should be done within Study Group 17. This is for cloud computing security, since cloud computing security is not a specific but a generic security question.

Since organisation of work within a Study Group is a matter for the Study Groups to decide themselves, Study Group 17 could, for example, establish a special working party where Question QH/13, which is a continuation of Q16 of Study Group 13, would be located along with the closely coupled work of QH/17, the continuation of Q8 of Study Group 17 on cloud computing security, QJ/17, the continuation of Q10 of Study Group 17, on identity management, and QR/17, the continuation of Q11 of Study Group 17 and others with responsibilities for PKI, OIDs, etc.

This would focus all the critical work on cloud computing security into a single working party, and this would improve focus and effectiveness of the studies. Thus, to summarize the contribution from the Russian Federation, I would like to say what our three proposals are.

One, Study Group 17 should continue it role as Lead Study Group on security.

Two, concentrate all cloud computing security work in Study Group 17, since this is a generic security issue, by assigning proposed Question H13 to Study Group 17.

Three, propose a separate working party in Study Group 17 on cloud computing security including all security issues related to this area. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Next is the United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This contribution from the U.S. provides members the U.S. position on the division of cloud computing security work between Study Group 13 and 17, mainly that cloud computing security work that is specific to cloud computing should be undertaken in Study Group 13, while security work that is generic, without unique cloud aspects, should be undertaken in Study Group 17. So it's slightly different than the Russian contribution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your presentation, and is there any other missing to be presented here?

Okay, as I said before, and just could my slide show up. Please show the slide, please.

Okay, thank you very much. So first I'd like to give you an overview of my prepared summary.

So before I start, I had a request, Côte d'Ivoire?

>> CÔTE D'IVOIRE: Thank you, Chairman. I apologize for interrupting. The African group has a contribution on the structure ‑‑ restructuring of Study Groups, but it is not mentioned on the agenda, but I would like to present it, if you agree. It's 56A, Addendum 1.

>> CHAIR: ‑‑ your light, so please.

>> CÔTE D'IVOIRE: On the restructuring of the Study Groups, the African group would like the current terms of reference of a number of Study Groups to be maintained, and at the same time, that Study Group 11 should be the Lead Study Group on conformance and interoperability, and that the same Study Group 11 should have modeling specification language description techniques assigned to it.

For Study Group 13, the African group would like this to be the Lead Study Group on all cloud computing related issues. We would also like Study Group 16 to take up the activities of JCA, IPTV in Study Group 16, and that Study Group 17 be the Lead Study Group on all issues relating to telecommunication security. That is the content of our proposal on the restructuring of the Study Groups. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. And sorry for my missing. But I have already identified your contribution. Thank you.

So, please, back to the slide. So first of all, I'd like to confirm our basis for our refinement discussion, and we have agreed to keep the 10 Study Group structure yesterday, and each Study Group has reported and proposed to the WTSA a set of questions, and those documents are contained in each number as I show in Agenda Item 3A. So those first we'd like to keep this input as our basis and proposal from each Study Group, considering for future studies.

And through your contribution regarding the question level, we receive the comment and document set of the questions as I've shown in the first part.

Also, each Study Group proposed changes to Resolution 2, and the contents of the proposed changes to Resolution 2 is consolidated in document 51. First I would like to remind you that all of those documents are a basis and we can discuss how to update the question text and how to modify the relevant contents to be included in Resolution 2.

This is the first confirmation. And next slide, so I'd like to identify the study points.

So after we agree the number of the Study Group, before we get into the question and the mandate level, I'd like to ask you to consider the issue on collaboration. We have ‑‑ co‑location. So we have received several ideas from Europe and APT, so I'd like to ask which co‑location will be appropriate for everyone.

And then the second part is I'd like to clarify which question should be studied, but as part I receive the comment from Europe, question proposed by Study Groups 2, 3, 5, 12, 13, except for the cloud computing security, and 15, 16 is partially, and 17 partially, but we received the endorsements to those proposed question texts, so I hope those endorsed proposals will not make us further detailed studies.

And at the next level, some contributions proposed closing the questions. I think for the existing Study Group, this proposal to close the question will give you a very big impact. So request to close the questions mainly come from Europe, and I listed the proposals.

So you may have to judge whether each proposal can be accepted or not.

Next level is we have to consider moving the block of the work. Personally, I'm afraid to study the question detail modification without enough expert, but as far as we discuss about the block transferring among the Study Groups, we do not need to have a detailed drafting editing discussion for the question description. But we have to consider the following block transferring based on the contribution.

One is the relation between SG 9 and 12, the other is SG 13 and 16. Under the proposal moving the block of the work, first one is security related aspect, so I have listed relevant contributions and the point which is addressing the contribution.

Next moving block proposal related to the conformance and interoperability testing aspect. We have to discuss whether SG 17 or 11 which are relevant to handle this aspect.

Under the next consideration is proposal on merging, merging the questions, and one of the big discussions is related to SG 9. So three kinds of merging proposed in European contribution.

And another merging issue is related to SG 11, also come from Europe, and lastly, merging is related to SG 2 and SG 16.

So those are kind of mid level of the Study Group structure. So next slide is request proposal on the changes of the question texts. So I listed relevant contributions and relevant Study Group questions.

And maybe finally we have proposal on the new questions from Europe and Iran.

And after we reach agreement of the Study Group structure refinement and question level location and the responsibility mandate, our last role of the work is completion of the Resolution 2.

So Resolution 2, describe the mandate of the Study Group, so your proposed refinement may give impact to the texts relevant for the mandate in Resolution 2. And also Lead Study Group roles are proposed from the several countries, so Lead Study Group roles also should be included in part of Resolution 2.

So I have all the proposals from your contributions as I show in this document. So that's all I expect to have the clear proposal to the Committee 4, and those final study and decision for refinement will be discussed in new Ad Hoc Group.

This is my proposed summary for the study on the refinement, and I'd like to ask you: Are there any missing points to be discussed in the Ad Hoc Groups or any misunderstanding and any different way of study?

So I have some comments, so first is the United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe we agree with that summary. We didn't find any issues with it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We, too, appreciate very much the effort you have made, the homework you have made in spite of all other workload that you have. Chairman, there are some issues that before going to ad hoc we need to have some discussion and debate at the level of Committee 4, and that is the security questions, that means security aspects of Study Group 17 and discussions on the cloud which was separated to be a Study Group 13. Then Study Group 16 may also say please separate my security issue, give it to 16. Study Group 15 may say please separate my issue. So it means that we have to abandon Study Group 17 totally. That means abandoning the security aspects and abandoning the coordination with all these securities which is the most important topics.

Chairman, I don't know whether you will be here or not in the WCIT, that is the top important issues. Some people, they don't want to discuss it. Some others they are very, very cautious about this issue, and are interested, so we need to have some discussion at the level of Committee 4 with respect to the two divergent situations between the cloud and others, and diminishing the activities of Study Group 17, Chairman.

We need to discuss it at level of Committee 4. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And U.K., please.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, we agree with your approach to refer these matters to the Ad Hoc Group or Committee to further discuss, and would welcome the opportunity to discuss with colleagues in that ad hoc the proposals that we have submitted in our contribution.

You asked if there were any issues with the presentation that you had made. In principle, no, but as they say, the devil is always in the detail, so it was a rather a fast run‑through that you did in the timing that you had, and therefore, if there are issues from our contribution that have not been entirely captured or we have missed, we will raise them in the ad hoc.

But as far as I could see, at the speed of light that you were working, they seemed appropriate. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. And if you accept, I'd like to provide my summary as a working document.

Is there any problem? If so, TSB will upload my PowerPoint summary as a working document.

Okay, and further requests from Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also appreciate, as the other speakers, your careful preparation of this meeting. I would only like to draw your attention to the fact that this afternoon in Committee 4B, we have a discussion on conformance and interoperability. We also the issue of the shift of the responsibility for conformance and interoperability to Study Group 11 is discussed so I consider this an open issue, and as far as I understood, you'll consider this here as an agreement to shift it to Study Group 11, so I would ask you to consider this an open issue, and wait for the outcome of this discussion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So as I address in the past session, I think it is an intercommittee issue so if you have any important message, I'm happy to share between the Committees.

I'd like to close the list and final is Egypt. Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and for your very excellent summary. However, if there is some questions or some remarks on the input from Study Groups, we have some concerns. If it will be the right time to raise it now? Or will there be another opportunity? Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Yes, the study issue, please raise it now. Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. We have heard the contribution from Brazil, 57, Addendum 1, and the proposal adding of network neutrality to the mandate of Study Group 2. This issue is a very high level political policy issue and I don't see any relation or direct relation to specifying service description and Egypt would prefer that these terms would not be included here. It is a issue of WCIT to have a very heavy debate, and not proper to put it in standardization work in Study Group 2. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And can I show the slide? Maybe it was so quick. But in my summary item on neutrality is included. Secretary, can I ask you to switch to the slide?

Okay, anyhow, I add the item net neutrality to SG 2, it is the issue on the mandate. First I'd like to ask that issue as a mandate for SG 2.

Okay? And I'd like to ask you to join the ad hoc discussion, and I'd like to set up the ad hoc, but still we have three requests for the floor. It's a new issue.

First is Chad, please.

Chad, you have the floor. No? Okay. Please, I'll move ‑‑ would like to move to Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Related with intervention by Egypt, Japan also have some concerns about this network neutrality. Since it is just one line, there's no definition at all, and it seems that it should be a political issue, so we have also concerns, but we don't disagree with a discussion in Ad Hoc Group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. United Kingdom? You are the last floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair, Mr. Chairman. We would just like as the U.K. to associate ourselves with the interventions by Japan and Egypt. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So regarding the ad hoc, I can have your voluntary contributions but as I asked you before, first I'd like to if possible nominate Mr. Arthur Webster from the United States and his Study Group 9 Chairman, and of course, I'd like to ask all the Study Group Chairmen and Vice‑Chairmen including the candidates to create good Study Group structure, and I'd like to have good refinement. So is there any other proposals to the ad hoc Chairmen?

Is there any objection to ask this important role to Arthur Webster? I see none. Thank you very much. So Arthur, do you have any comment?

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, but could you please give it to Arthur Webster?

>> CHAIR: Yes, Arthur, you have floor.

>> ARTHUR WEBSTER: The mic is not on. It is on? Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd be very happy to Chair this Ad Hoc Group, this very important topic, and will work with you during the break to determine when we can have our first meeting. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your support, and Iran and U.K. Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, unfortunately our expert dealing with the two questions for the security arrive on Saturday and I wish that these be taken into account. I don't want that in the absence of that expert any decision will be made and I reiterate our main concerns about the proposals to diminish the activity of Study Group 17, and to create many Study Group 17 and all the Study Groups and we support the proposal of Russia and we would like that to be taken into account. Currently we are two persons and cannot attend all meetings but security questions proposed by Iran need to be delayed until our expert arrives, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I hope ‑‑ we try to meet your requirement. Just at this stage, best efforts.

And United Kingdom?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to take the opportunity before you closed the meeting so that there's going to be a further meeting of the Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 73, which will be at half past 2:00 this afternoon for 2 hours.

The document that we were working on last night at the meeting is now available as working document 3 to Committee 4. So prior to the meeting if people want to do some preparation, the working document 3 is available on the ITU website. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. And due to the lack of the time and our reviewing of the report from the Working Group will be made in tomorrow's session.

And before I close, lastly, I'd like to remind you that Committee 2 Chairman Kyu‑Jin Wee requests the Chairman of all Committees and Working Groups to provide all indication and information concerning the decisions on Resolutions that may have financial implications on both income and expenditures, especially we will have a discussion on the new creation of regional groups in each Study Group. We will collect those information.

We ask to communicate with Committee 2 in this WTSA. I would like to share this information, and Committee Chair will handle this issue. But please remind that financial issues also will be studied in WTSA.

So now it's already past our ending time, so I'd like to see you tomorrow morning, and meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much.

Next session starts 11:15. Thank you.

[ End of session ]
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