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>> CHAIR: Ladies and Gentlemen, please take your places. COM 4 is about to start. It looks okay. Let's start. First of all, I would like to express my sincere thanks to the Ad Hoc Chairman and all the participants to the weekend sessions. We have had a long weekend with ITU works and now we have the result. The text may not be perfect in the viewpoint of English grammar and sense of English native speakers, but I would like to ask you to focus on the achievement of our agreement to your proposed outcome from each Ad Hoc with a mind of collaboration and compromised spirit.   
 I would like to ask you to take the Document 28 for today's meeting agenda. Before I ask your approval I would like to ask to make some changes for ‑‑ editorial changes in Item No. 4B, Resolution 76 should be replaced by 73, Resolution 73.   
 And in Item No. 5, we will review the text of TD74. This comes from the Working Group 4A, not 4B. 4A. So those two changes shall be made to the proposed meeting agenda.   
 So as you can see it looks to be a very busy meeting again. But I would like to conclude this session by 15:45. Tomorrow COM 4 will have three sessions but we will have to spend the time for reviewing the result from COM 4 Working Group A and B tomorrow. Working Group 4A and 4B will provide us about 30 Resolutions for approval.   
 So today's main objective is to complete the reviewing of Regional Groups' proposal and of all Committee 4 Ad Hoc Group report. As the agenda shows Item No. 3 and Item No. 4 today's target is to complete these two agenda.   
 So if we will be able to have more time, we may be able to complete Item 5, to review the 4A Working Group activity. So if we will require further discussion additional Ad Hoc may be arranged in this evening or night. But I would like to ‑‑ I wish to have a very smooth discussion in this afternoon.   
 So that's the outline of today's agenda. And can we go along with the draft meeting agenda in admin 28? Any comments? Okay. I see none. So the agenda is approved.   
 Thank you very much. So I would like to move to the approval of the meeting report from the 3rd Committee session which contains TD55.

>> 59.

>> CHAIR: 59. 59. So I would like to ask your comment to the meeting report section by section. It is all ready now. So Section 1, general. Any comments? Section 2? Section 3? So main result is start from Section 4 and I would like to ask your comment to the 4.1., creation of JCA Res. 178. I see none. Next is Section 4.2, approval of draft new and revised Resolutions. Next is Section 5, report from COM 4 Ad Hoc Groups. Next is Section 6, other revised Resolutions under COM 4. Section 7, new Resolutions under Committee 4. And next should be Section 8, not 9. 8, communication of approved Resolution to COM 5.   
 Next is Section 9, not 8, next session. And next is Section 10, on any other business. And last should be the Section 11. Sorry for the error of the section numbering but I would like to ask your comment to the context of the report.   
 I see none. Oh. Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Drafting group created and will hold us here. Chairman have some comment in Paragraph 4.1 of your report. Thank you. Can I make the comment? Paragraph 4.1.

>> CHAIR: Okay. You have the floor.

>> IRAN: Talking of creation of JCA Resolution 178, there is no general agreement of JCA. I wish to put in a square bracket. Whenever you have JCA, put a square bracket. We may agree or may not agree. There is a lot of discussion among colleagues and looking various ways and means and is it possible under the ITU‑T to carry out this work but currently there is no Consensus of the JCA. Put in a square bracket. Say this issue is under discussion, whether it should be JCA or any other mechanism. Any of the two you could put in your report. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Iran is just proposing changes of title of 4.1 and just an issue relating to the Resolution 178. I would like to propose it. Any objection? I see none. So I would like to ask you again that whole over report containing TD59. Any objection? I see none.   
 Approved. Thank you very much. And we would like to move to the main discussion, Item 3 is issue on creation of new regional groups. And I have already reminded you of TD10, Documents 80 and 81 of the message from Committee to Chairman on the request for all indication and information concerning on the financial implication in each recommendation. I have already shared this message information in the former Committee 4 session. And these documents are provided for your information. So I am not going to review it again.   
 And ‑‑ but I would like to ask you taking your consideration on the financial impact, especially in the creation of new Regional Group discussion, was there any big financial implication or not? I hope not. But that information should be shared with us.   
 So first document to be reviewed is Item 3A. I would like to ask CITEL countries to make a brief introduction of Document 38 A6. Any CITEL from the countries? Argentina.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chairman. As you stated in the regional ‑‑ in the framework of the Standing Consultative Committee, one, we have been considering issues regarding numbering and the implementation of new technologies in the countries of the region. And the dis‑ ‑‑ in the light of the most recent report of Study Group 2 we state the need to pursue work relating to numbering and addressing. In CITEL we agreed to prepare this IAP in order to create a Regional Group dealing with these tasks. In our proposal we have defined the goals, the working structure of the group and its working methods which will be electronic. Will have a website. And most of the work as I say will be electronic. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your proposal. So I would like to ask are there any objections to create the new Regional Group in SG2 as in Document 38‑A6? Any comment? Seeing none ‑‑ oh, Iran please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. No objection to creation of a Regional Group for America, but is it not appropriate to talk about all regions? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your clarification. And I would like to discuss SG2, Regional Group for the Americas and other regions according to Resolution 54. You can make a proposal to the Study Group 2 or each Study Group. So are there any comments? Clarification? The proposal is Regional Group for the Americas. So can we support to creation of the SG2 Regional Group for the Americas as contained 38‑A6? I see no objection. This proposal is approved.   
 Next I would like to invite again CITEL countries and to introduce Document 38‑A14.
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>> CHAIR: ‑‑ any region to propose to creation in any Study Groups, so there are no limitations and no impact. So I'd like to ask each region to consider the proposal to the Study Group in the next study period. Is it acceptable for Iran?  
Iran, please.  
 >> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. The Resolution is quite clear, but what I request you to kindly just call the attention of the Plenary that in consideration of this document, other regions may be requested to have any comment with respect to their own region and that is a simple report, and that is all. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So any others? So can we take the comment in the meeting minutes? France Telecom Orange.

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I simply wish to come back to the statement by Mr. Arasteh of Iran and to point out a couple minor things that within Study Group No. 5 one should be aware that the Regional Group for Latin America and the Caribbean already exists. There is already an existing Regional Group for the African countries and the third group for the Arab States. So, in fact, there are already three Regional Groups within Study Group 5. We would, of course, be delighted to welcome any other regions should they express an interest in doing so.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So could I ask France Telecom Orange, do you have any specific proposal for note to the meeting? France Telecom?

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. No, no, I wasn't speaking on behalf of France Telecom but rather as Chairman of Study Group 5. And I do not have any particular proposal to make. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So we'll take note and any proposal will be welcome, and we are not going to close. Can I move to the next one?

Rwanda. Rwanda, please. Tunisia.  
 >> TUNISIA: Thank you, Chairman. The proposed establishment of an African Regional Group in Study Group 13 is a proposal made by the group subsequent to the cloud computing workshop held in Tunis, where about 20 African countries participated. The terms of reference for this new group have been established in order to encourage the active participation of representatives of African administrations on outcomes and deliverables, to establish a Forum of regulators and operators in Africa in order to observe the work underway in Study Group 13, and more particularly, cloud computing. The African Group spoke to the proposal, and did not wish to limit the work of the group to electronic means alone, since the situation in Africa might make it difficult to hold electronic meetings alone and leave this up to the rules established in Resolution 54 regarding Regional Groups.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And before I move to the third proposal, first I'd like to get your approval to creation of the SG5 Regional Group for the Americas containing Document 38‑A14 first. And regarding the comment from Iran, I'd like to add the meeting minutes that all regions are invited to keep in mind the possibility to create a Regional Group according to Resolution 44 ‑‑ 54. So that text should be added to my report.

So I'd like to ask support to the creation of SG5 Regional Group for the Americas. Any comment? I see none. Approved.

So I'd kindly introduce on the next contribution containing 56A13, this proposal is SG13, Regional Group for Africa. Are there any comments to the proposal, creation of Regional Group for Africa in Study Group 13? I see none. This proposal is approved. Thank you very much. So I would like to move to the next agenda Item. It is the report from COM 4 Ad Hoc Groups. So the first one is on structure refinement in Item 4A. So we have a request from ‑‑ oh, no, deleted. Okay.

So relevant in Item 4A, the relevant documents are DT70, 66, 69, and 65. I would like to invite Ad Hoc Chairman, Mr. Arthur Webster of Study Group 9 Chairman. Arthur, please.  
 >> ARTHUR WEBSTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll be speaking as the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group on structure refinement. We had three sessions, and quite a number of participants. We worked very hard, and came up with ‑‑ we almost completed all the tasks assigned to us. The report of this Ad Hoc Group is found in TD70, and I will draw your attention to that. It is a summary of the decisions made during the Ad Hoc meeting. In TD65, we have the text of the revised Resolution 2 which incorporate all the changes that were agreed to in the Ad Hoc Group. Also, the questions were discussed and all the changes to any questions are found in DT66, for those of Study Group 11, and DT69 for those of Study Group 17.

And there's one extra one for Study Group 17, which ‑‑ well, maybe that's the only one.  
Okay, the beginning of our work was taking into account the decision made at COM 4 in its second session. The structure comprises 10 Study Groups, and we started with a baseline of the questions as proposed by the Study Groups, and any proposal for changes in their mandates.

So I will not go through all of these. It would take too long, but one of the items that the group was not able to complete was the allocation of cloud security ‑‑ cloud computing security work in the ITU‑T. We had three proposals that discussed somewhat conflicting changes to be made. However, I do want to report that since this report, this text of TD70 came out, we have met during the coffee break this morning and come up with some text to which the majority of people approved. I have not heard from all the participants of that. So I'm not sure whether we want to address that in this meeting or not. I will leave that to your decision.

I do have the text available if you want it. The only other item that was not settled was the Lead Study Group designation for Study Group 17. It was provisionally agreed to modify the Study Group 17 lead Study Group role to read, "Lead Study Group on telecommunication/ICT security" but there was a request to put ICT in square brackets.

So I'll pause here to see if there are any questions or comments. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Arthur. Thank you for your great effort and progress on the Study Group structure refinement. I have your report and we have to identify only two unsolved issues in your report. But I think you ‑‑ you are now ready to make a solution on the allocation of the cloud computing security. So I would like to ask you the proposal, after we will review the proposal and confirm the agreement which you have already made in the Document TD70. And also second unresolved issue is describing top line over page 5 of TD70. It indicates title of Lead Study Group on security for SG15, whether we should use the word of telecommunication or slash ICT. Should we include it?   
 Those two points remain unresolved, whether further you had other parts including detailed question structure, refinement, and those text for Resolution 2 having already agreed in Ad Hoc Group.

So first I would like to confirm the agreement first but it is describing on page 2 of TD70 in annex. First part, the section before the allocation of the cloud computing security work in ITU‑T, this document summarizes, maybe not expressly describes, indicate agreement and to no change and it refers to some of the proposals and this stage agreed contents on SG structure refinement as no change. So first I would like to ask your agreement, this stage item for the no change of ‑‑ based on SG proposal. Any comment to the first part of the study structure refinement? Any comment? UK please.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Speaking on behalf of the CPT we did wish to have some text inserted in to your report that we had agreed as part of the TD70 activity that was omitted but feel that it is useful to capture.   
 It is not to do with the structure, but would seek your guidance as to when you would like to take the statement from CPT. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So can I have your specific proposal to the text to be included?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Yes. The text that we had put forward in the Ad Hoc Group that was proposed was that CPT had already presented a number of its proposals to Study Groups regarding question refinement and had had positive results since contributions had been received in those questions which had been identified as inactive. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I think it looks to reflect the discussion. Are there any objections to include the text provided by UK in our document? I see none. So we can confirm the detailed text in the next approval of the meeting report.   
 So thank you very much. So I would like to ask you again and first your approval over the first part of agreement containing page 2 of Annex 1, first part of the no change proposal. Any comment? I see none. First part is approved.   
 And we would like to discuss about location of cloud computing security work later. Next part for your approval is on page 3, collocation/sequencing. I would like to ask that part. It describes the requirement on collocation among the SG2 and 3, SG9 and 16, SG11 and 13 including SG12. Any objection to the proposed refinement? I see none. Approved.   
 Next part, bottom of page 3, allocation of performance and interpretability work. Just two items. Any comment to this requirement? I see none. Approved.   
 Next part is on page 4, and the issue is special arrangement for various questions. Any comment? I see none. Approved. Next part also on page 4, change of question text. The detailed proposal is contained in TD66 and any comment to this agreement? Any comment? I see none. Agreed.   
 Next part is also on page 4, new question proposal, description but this question proposal was not accepted. So it just a clarification of the ‑‑ a meeting agreement. Any comment? I see none. Agreed.   
 Next part is contents of the Resolution 2, described on page 4 and also page 5 but I would like to exclude the first item on page 5 on the title of the Lead Study Group on Security. Without this issue can we approve the contents proposed division in Resolution 2? Any comment? I see none. Approved. Thank you very much.

And we have two remaining issues. And first one is related to the collocation of the cloud computing security. And Mr. Webster mentioned that the correspondence group has been established after the Ad Hoc meeting and we will be able to see the good, compromised solution. So I would like to invite Mr. Webster to introduce your proposed agreement. Arthur, please.

>> ARTHUR WEBSTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The text that the group at coffee break came up with and looked at via e‑mail is as follows: To ask SG17 and SG13 to collaborate, to identify possible areas of cloud computing security studies for SG13 and SG17, and present the suggestions to the TSAG meeting in June 2013. In the meantime H17 and H13 should take advantage of the opportunity afforded by the February meeting of SG13 and the April meeting of SG17 to collaborate. Until TSAG makes a decision in June QH13 and H17 should continue as per the mandates in their current questions. And that's the end of the text. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Arthur. It looks like a reasonable a proposal. Any objection to the proposed solution? I see none. And exact proposed text will appear in the meeting report tomorrow and based on the information I would like to confirm your support to the proposed ‑‑ proposal from the Ad Hoc Chair. Any opposition to take the proposal from the correspondence group? Egypt and Iran.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We just have a concern that this text could delay the work in the opposed Study Groups and we will go to the TSAG and place in the next TSAG until the working period ends without any a concrete conclusion to moving the security of cloud computing from 13 to 17. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: So can I ask you for the proposal on this issue?

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We believe that it should ‑‑ that the subject for security of cloud computing should be moved to its home Study Group which is Study Group 17. And it could collaborate with the Study Group 13 under the JCA for any extra issues that Study Group 13 is concerned with. Thank you. The Chair of this one will be Study Group 13 ‑‑ 17. 17. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Next is Iran and Botswana.

>> IRAN: Thank you. Should the decision be made by the TSAG we wish to include in the report of your Committee that reflected the Plenary that the decision on matter should be reached by Consensus. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And Botswana and Korea.

>> BOTSWANA: Sorry, sir. We didn't ask for the floor. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. You have the floor, Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. I shall like to support what the Delegate of Egypt has just said. All questions on cloud computing security should be examined within Study Group 17. We know that Resolution No. 2 of the Johannesburg conference stipulated that Study Group 17 would be the lead Study Group for telecommunication and ICT security. We also have Resolution 130 of the Plenipotentiary conference and Resolution 181. All of these text reaffirm the responsibility given to Study Group 17, lead Study Group on telecommunication and ICT security. Consequently we would like to reaffirm that all questions on security, telecommunication security whether it be cloud computing or other security of telecommunication issues should be covered in Study Group 17. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Korea, please.

>> KOREA: Please. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will comment as Chairman of Study Group 13 rather than the Delegation of Korea. Regarding the concerns raised by Egyptian colleagues, since we identified this cloud computing subject at the beginning of the TSAG ‑‑ this year from the TSAG, Study Group 13 as a lead Study Group we do our best to collaborate with Study Group 17. One conclusion was we had a collocation meeting. Whenever Study Group 13 have long meetings where Study Group 17 have their meetings we expect our experts to join together. So actually those two questions now is identical as opposed to group ‑‑ those experts also collocated together. So to read this result rather delay the work we identify that the architectural, functional aspect to support this cloud security also cloud security experts also help us to make progress any requirements under consideration while we develop the cloud requirement and the functional architecture. I think it is a good way to ask TSAG while we continue these activities until next Study Group 13 and 17 meetings, that we convey ideas of how to handle the subject at the next TSAG meeting. So this is my experience. So I don't believe it ‑‑ this approach, delay the work. So this is a comment from Chairman of Study Group 13. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So I would like to ask we can draft SG13 and 17 based on guidelines proposed by Ad Hoc Chair. And I have a request from France.

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. My statement is coming after your proposed conclusion but I'd just like to encourage the Assembly to approve the terms read out just now, the compromised terms read out by Mr. Webster because I think they respect the roles of the different Study Groups and enable the two Study Groups to continue their work straight away without any suspension in their work. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. United States and United Kingdom. UK.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we would wish to associate with the intervention of the Chair of Study Group 13. And we do so for two principal reasons. First, he has emphasized the importance of Study Group 13 in developing the technical architecture for cloud computing consistent with its mandate to deal with future Networks. Mr. Chairman, we believe that it is integral and inherent to the architectural work of the cloud as found in Study Group 13 to deal with whatever security issues are inherent to the architecture.   
 Now the second point, Mr. Chairman, is that the Chair of Study Group 13 has indicated that they are making every effort to collocate with Study Group 17, to monitor each Study Group's work and to liaise as appropriate. We believe that is sufficient to ensure that the specific work done by Study Group 17 on security can be taken in to account and also integrated in to the work of the architecture that is being done in Study Group 13.   
 Mr. Chairman, that is sufficient for us to be reassured that there will be no delay in the work of the cloud and the security of the cloud. We believe that is ‑‑ that a delay is not in the interest of the ITU and certainly it is not in the interest of this Delegation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Now I would like to close the list and now the UK, Egypt, Russia. So the list is closed. So I would like to invite UK and Egypt and Russia. UK, please.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The remarks the UK were going to make have all just been made by the U.S. and we would endorse their remarks and support their position on this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. I should like to clarify one point. We referred to deferring the decision until the next TSAG meeting. You said that until then each Study Group would work according to its terms of reference. But we are afraid that the decision will be deferred until a further session of the TSAG. And then each of the Study Groups will have done its work, but without clear and explicit coordination between the two activities this would be judgmental to the preparation of the relevant recommendations up to maturity in ITU‑T.   
 Chairman, what we are asking is to have greater clarity in terms of coordination or the postponement of certain subjects or moving subjects from Study Group 17 to Study Group 13. We know that experts are instructed to coordinate efforts so that everything is clear in the division of work. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Our task as the Assembly is to create conditions for effective work for each Study Group in its area of responsibility. It should be noted that the proposal which we are discussing at this moment in essence defers a decision on what exactly in cloud computing security and that is the issue under consideration. It is not cloud computing's evolving infrastructure but cloud computing security that is the issue under study, and now we are deferring a decision about what exactly should be studied in this area by Study Group 17 and by Study Group 13. We must understand that that is what we are doing.

Secondly, before the TSAG which will be held at the middle of the next year, before that both Study Group 17 and Study Group 13 will be dealing in essence with one in the same issue, the issue of ensuring cloud computing security. And it must be understood that when we have more than one Study Group dealing with one in the same issue then as a rule we have to decide who will coordinate this work, who will be the leader. From the viewpoint of the Russian Federation security issues ‑‑ for security issues the lead Study Group should be Study Group 17 for many reasons, including that there are far more experts on security in Study Group 17. Also Study Group 17 was the pioneer and leader in the study of cloud computing security and already has a number of recommendations in this area, et cetera.   
 The second issue I would like to address is objections about clarifying the status of Study Group 17 as the Study Group on security, not only in telecommunications but also in ICT. As has already been noted in preceding statements we have a whole number of Resolutions which directly show that Study Group 17 develops security standards both in telecommunications and in ICT. Therefore if we now do not record in writing that Study Group 17 is the lead Study Group in security not only in telecommunications but also in ICT, this could be interpreted either as meaning that ITU doesn't develop security standards on ICT at all or it could be interpreted as meaning that the lead Study Group on this issue is some other Study Group. So there would be confusion. There would be a lack of compliance with high level Resolutions in Guadalajara and deleting of ICT from the terms of reference of the lead Study Group on security would do no good and give no value. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Due to the lack of time and also as we agreed in the former Committee, please consider your speaking time. And regarding the agreement I think Egypt requests further clarification and I would like to ‑‑ I do not want to continue this discussion in Committee for discussion.   
 So I would like to ask ‑‑ make a small group, just focus on this aspect. I think that the proposed text made by Ad Hoc Group Chair looks like, yeah, good proposal to ‑‑ and general support could be achieved. But I would like to ask you to clarify the efficiency and the promptness related to the TSAG suggestion. I would like to ask meet again, just set up limited objectives. I would like to review your proposal in the next Committee 4 meeting. And regarding the ‑‑ so establishing the small Ad Hoc Group on this subject, just allocation of cloud computing work, is it agreeable? I see none. Agreed.   
 So regarding the next unresolved part, it is described on top of page 5, provisionally agreed to modify SG17 lead Study Group role to read "Lead Study Group on telecommunication square bracket/ICT security."   
 So but I think it looks a little difficult to solve the compromised solution. But in my experience I would like to ask you to clarify how we can be the ‑‑ this square bracket. So is it telecommunication security or telecommunication/ICT security? So I would like to propose ‑‑ I think we can find the word of telecommunication/ICT in many texts in ITU. So I would like to ask taking out the bracket and read telecommunication/ICT could we support it? I would like to have your comment. So my proposal on top of page 5, take out the square bracket and read "Lead Study Group role to read lead Study Group on telecommunication/ICT security."   
 I would like to propose this for your compromise. Is there any objection? Saudi Arabia and United States.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. I already requested the floor for a comment about cloud computing. Nevertheless since we have now moved on to the title of Study Group 17 we agree to your proposal. That is to say telecommunication/ICT security, this is in conformity with many resolutions already adopted on this subject. As to examination of issues related to security, we also agree that the Study Group is the lead Study Group. However we think that WTSA is the right Forum to take this decision and we see no reason therefore why the decision should be deferred on telecommunication security. So I think that the decision should be taken in this Assembly and should not be deferred. It is a decision of principle. It should not be deferred to the next TSAG. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you regarding the telecommunication/ICT. Thank you for your support to my proposal. And second point raised and as I ‑‑ as we agreed I would like to ask drafting Ad Hoc Group to solve your consent and please bring back to the next Committee 4 meeting.   
 So next is United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we wish to express a concern about including ICT in the title of the Working Group ‑‑ excuse me, of the Study Group. We have supported at previous conferences of the ITU the notion that there may be a definite ‑‑ working definition of ICT that could be used. But that it would be specific to the circumstances in which ICT would be found or in which it would be used in the work of the ITU. The concern we have, Mr. Chairman, is now we elevate the ICT to this title of a technical Study Group as though we know the definition of ICT. Telecommunication we know the definition. It is in the Constitution and in administrative treaties. We would also note that consistent with request 4, request Council 4 of Resolution 140 of Guadalajara which stated that the Council should develop a definition of ICT and that that definition, proposed definition and options for that definition should be submitted to Council for the next session. We are delighted that Dr. Minkin is chairing that group and we are participating as a Vice‑Chair of that work through Roxanne McElvane. We are fully committed to providing a definition to ICT and fully committed to the work of Dr. Minkin. And because of that, that there is no definition of ICT and that work is continuing now under Dr. Minkin that we believe it is inappropriate to use the term in a technical Study Group in its title. We would prefer to wait consistent with Resolution 140 until the work of Dr. Minkin is completed and we have a better understanding of what exactly is ICT. We have no problem with telecommunication since it is a definition including the Constitution. Mr. Chairman, for those reasons we cannot support at this time the use of a term ICT in the title of a technical Study Group. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So I think we cannot solve at this Committee 4 meeting. So in addition to the first study item on allocation of cloud computing security, I would like to give you one more chance to discuss this title in Ad Hoc Group. And if we will not be able to solve the issue in the next Committee 4 I will have to defer the decision on to the WTSA Plenary. So I would like to ask you to review these two items, only two items limited to have another attempt to reach compromised solution with clear text. So can we ‑‑ I would like to have your approval to continue the Ad Hoc Group with only two specific study topics. Any comment? I see none.   
 So we would like to move to the next item. So we have spent a lot of time and we have to ask further collaboration and I would like to move to the next document to be reviewed on the part of the structure refinement. So relevant documents are TD66, TD69. Those two documents describe the detailed modify question text. And TD65 describes all modification based on agreement for the Resolution 2. So I do not need to take the page by page for those detailed information. And I just want to ask if you have any concerns, please raise it. So I would like to ask you to give approval to the Document TD66. Any objection? I see none. TD66 is approved.   
 Next is TD69, also describe the question. Any objection to give the approval? I see none. TD69 is approved. Next document is TD65, revised Resolution 2. So the Resolution 2 includes lead Study Group item. So we have not solved the lead item on the security for SG17. So excluding this ‑‑ this Study Group title for SG17, I would like to ask your approval. Any objection to give the approval TD65? 65 is approved. Thank you very much. And thank you, Arthur, but I would like to ask you to have another session and like to have your next good proposal.   
 Next item is 4B. It relates to the revised Resolution 73 and also the new Resolution on e‑waste. We have initial report in the former Committee 4 meeting and we have some discussion between Resolution 73 and e‑waste Resolution. And Mr. Affleck, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group, kindly he will discuss those two recommendations and provide his meeting report and clear proposal which is contained in TD55. So I would like to invite Mr. Affleck, UK to introduce your proposal.

>> VINCENT AFFLECK: Thank you, Chairman. I think you have covered the main points. We held a meeting on the 25th of November. We resolved the issue in relation to 73. It was quite a small editing issue but took half an hour. It was then agreed to have separate Resolutions on e‑waste and environments and climate change. And then we proposed to review the proposal, new Resolution on e‑waste. And that document is now in DT55. And it doesn't have any square brackets.   
 So it is the new document. The new Resolution is from page 8 onwards on DT55. The only issue in relation to DT Resolution 73, DT35 is covered on the first page of DT55 and I believe that should get approval from everyone. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I have a request for the floor. United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Regarding Resolution 73 or the revisions thereof under the text instructors, the director of the Telecommunication Standards Bureau in collaboration with other directors of other bureaus best practices and guidelines in the area of environment and climate change are very helpful, such as the ones, for example, the report on potential of ICTs towards adaptation and mitigation through the concrete case of Ghana. The U.S. understands that the TSB publishes these types of reports in response to requests from developing countries as these countries cannot always attend Study Group 5 meetings.   
 Accordingly the U.S. believes that before TSB contracts with outside experts and recognizing TSB's limited resources the most economic way to respond to such request is for TSB to consult with Study Group 5 to see if the expert in Study Group 5 can do the work.   
 However in the spirit of compromise the U.S. agrees to keep the text as is and is optimistic that there will be no duplication of effort between the work of Study Group 5 and the reports published by the TSB. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. So the proposed text will be reasonable, but I would like first any comment to these proposed report including the report and then I would like to ask your approval for the text of the revised Resolution 73 and new Resolution on e‑waste separately. First, any other comment to the report? I see none. Then I would like to ask your approval to the proposed revised Resolution 73, containing page ‑‑ from page 2 to page 8 in TD55. Any objection? I see none. TD55 is approved for the Resolution 73. Next I would like to ask the part of the draft Resolution on e‑waste, the text ‑‑ the new text is containing from page 8 to 10 in TD55. Any objection to the approval? I see none. New Resolution on e‑waste is approved. Thank you very much. I would like to move to the next item on software define networking, SDN which is containing TD58. I would like to invite Ad Hoc Chair, Dan Li from China.

>> DAN LI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The COM 4 SDN Ad Hoc Group held a meeting Saturday from 2 to 4 o'clock based on ACP/35A10/1 proposal. We discussed whether or not to form a new Resolution and if necessary we need to develop appropriate text. Other discussion we come to the view that just as pointed out in the meeting document SDN work is very crucial. The Ad Hoc Group realized that ITU‑T SG13 has already embarked on some study on this topic, namely, SDN and other Study Groups will also conduct on their SDN related work in due course. And other organizations are also conducting related work on the topic of SDN. Therefore through our discussion we come to the view that we did need to develop a new Resolution on SDN.   
 The substance of SDN will be based on ACP/35A10. Subsequently we discussed in depth the content of a proposed new Resolution. We also reached agreement on the substance or content of the proposed new Resolution on SDN. The ‑‑ in the ACP/35A10 the ‑‑ we conducted some early or preliminary editorial work on the basis of our ACP/35A10 and developed a new document, WP and then we agreed to on the basis of ACP/35A10 to combine it with the new proposed Resolution, with the WD10 to form a new proposed Resolution, the content of which is contained in document DT58. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And are there any comments to the report? Okay. So I would like to ask your approval for the new Resolution on SDN, for software define networking. Any objection? I see none. So Resolution on ‑‑ new Resolution on SDN is approved. Thank you very much.   
 I would like to move to the next one, Strategic Review Committee issue. The proposal is contained in TD68. I would like to invite Ad Hoc Chair, Mr. Rushton, UK. I would like to ask your brief introduction. Thank you.

>> PHILIP RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. DT68 contains the report of the Ad Hoc Group on the Strategic Review Committee. We had five meetings. The mandate of the group is presented in this document as is the output to the annex. In presenting this document and the annex for agreement I have to bring to your attention four issues that were raised during the various meetings of the Ad Hoc. There are financial implications of the work that are proposed and that should be raised with Committee 2. There is also a liaison issue related to Committee 3 involving the collaboration activity that should also be raised with Committee 3. It was also clarified as part of the meeting that should be captured in your report, Chairman, that the decisions of the Strategic Review Committee would be taken in accordance with the rules of procedure found in the Constitution and Convention. Finally, Chair, there is one issue raised which ‑‑ whether or not this should be a working party of TSAG. That was raised as an issue last evening to be brought back to your Committee. With that said, Chairman, the annex are a Resolution and terms of reference after long discussion were agreed by the Ad Hoc. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Rushton. Thank you for your very strong leadership. First I would like to ask any comment to the report. I see none. So I would like to ask your approval of the new Resolution on now title is Strategic and Structured Review of ITU‑T. I see Saudi Arabia and Iran.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We should like to thank Mr. Rushton for his very hard work in leading the Ad Hoc Group. We did make some observations regarding 5, "overlap", the word "overlap". We did submit that observation, but in light of the large number of meetings we weren't able to participate in the last meeting of the Ad Hoc Group which dealt with the new draft Resolution. Consequently, Mr. Chairman, we would ask you to delete the word "overlap".

>> CHAIR: And Iran.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Exactly this is our point. Here we dealing with a very, very important issue. ITU is the leading organization for standards. Having overlap standards may put ITU under the subordination of other standard making bodies. Strong support to delete the word "overlap" standards. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So I would like to confirm the proposal from Saudi Arabia and delete Item No. 5 of the term of reference on page 5 and ‑‑ yeah. Just deleting the word "overlap" in Item 5 of the Review Committee terms of reference. Is it to your proposal?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. That is exactly right. To delete the word "overlap" in Subparagraph 5 of the terms of reference. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: The proposal is deletion of word "overlap" in Item 5 of the ITU‑R, is that acceptable? I see none. Any other comments? Guinea?

>> GUINEA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I should like to thank you, Philip, for his hard work. We wish to speak to Paragraph 13 on page 6 of the English version. Review Committee shall operate in English only. If this Committee is to represent Member States before other organizations it should ‑‑ and the fact that the meetings can only last a maximum of five days, I do think we need to review these rules.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your comment. First I would like to confirm the deletion of the word "overlap" from the text, No. 5 of the terms of reference. The meeting agreed to the changes? Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. In fact, there are two words, "and overlap". Both should be deleted.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your clarification. Proposed deletion is "and overlap". Any objection? Same issue, objection? I have a list from the Egypt, United States, Sweden, Germany, Cuba.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Indeed the word conflict was raised from the Arab Delegation, Arab Group and was originally conflicting standards. So I support the deleting "and overlap" and minimize conflicting standards. Another remark, if you allow me, in the last ‑‑ in item 17 were ‑‑ it was said consists of up to six Vice‑Chairman. Would it be appropriate to refer to regions, similar as TSAG since the function is very close to TSAG functionality?

>> CHAIR: First item No. 5 of ITU‑R. Any other comments to this point? United States?

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, as we have now heard the intervention of our colleague from Egypt we would like to confirm that the language now in 5 would read "to enhance cooperation with standards bodies with a view to minimize conflicting standards and the standards activities." Mr. Chairman, through you we would seek confirmation that is now the proposal before this Committee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your question for clarification. I think your proposal is reasonable. And Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. Indeed the last part I think have been added later and the original proposal was "conflicting standards" full stop. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Shorter is better. So I would like to confirm the proposal is minimize conflicting standards. Egypt's proposal is acceptable? Any objection? Sweden, Germany. Sweden, please.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. I am not exactly sure what is the proposal now. I understood that there was one proposal to delete "and overlap". And I understood that the United States wanted a clarification regarding the last part of the sentence. We heard a new comment from Egypt and I have to say that in my view there should be no overlap between standards and should be no overlap between standards activities. That should be the goal. But since I haven't really understood exactly what is now under consideration of the meeting I have to say that it is difficult to take a standpoint on the exact text, but the goal from our side is to minimize conflicts and overlap of standards and standards activities.   
 Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. And I'm afraid we can't conclude this issue in this meeting. And I would like to ask you to continue further discussion in small Ad Hoc, and I would like to clarify which item you have concerns. So I have identified in No. 5 of the Committee, terms of reference in Annex A and also we have received the comment No. 17. And yeah, No. 13. Is there any part to be discussed further to reach agreement? Germany.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Chair. We would like to associate with the comments made by Sweden and I think these two issues should be discussed further. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. And Cuba.

>> CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. Mr. Chairman, it is Annex A, page 5 is the issue we wish to deal with. Paragraph 2 we agree by and large with the document, but we did wish to speak to this paragraph and request the addition. In reference of in order to propose improvements and we work with regional groups of the ITU, we would propose that the regional offices of the ITU be included, regional groups and the regional bureaus of the ITU which will cover all countries within the regions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Which parts? Item 2 on page 5?

>> CUBA: Page 12 ‑‑ on page 6. Paragraph 12 on page 6 where it refers to the Review Committee will work with existing regional groups. And I would like to see the regional offices, bureaus added to that paragraph 12 on page 6.

>> CHAIR: Now item 5, 12, 13, 17. I would like to give the floor to Algeria.

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to come back to Paragraph 5, the issue has arisen again and that we will continue to reflect on this. I would agree that we should remove the reference to overlap and keep conflicting between standards and standards activities. I don't think one can speak of conflict between standards and standards activities. A standard is an output. It is a final result as it were. And activities are continuing. So I do not feel that we can establish a conflict between the definitions of standards and standards activities.   
 My concern would be that there is ‑‑ my concern really is who is going to determine that a conflict exists.

>> CHAIR: So I would like to close the list with Bahrain and Kenya.

>> BAHRAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to also add my support to the position expressed by Egypt and Saudi Arabia regarding the word "overlap". Our concern is that overlap is not well defined. And in fact, when you have multiple standards bodies working on standards it is not the activities we have a concern with. The concern is they come out with conflicting standards and the market or operators or the relevant entities are divided on which standard to adopt. There is no real issue with having them work on the same path they are on. Having multiple topics on the same body could help expedite the work if they are working with close collaboration. So therefore we strongly support Egypt's position in removing the word "overlap" and instead talking about conflicting standards full stop. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thanks. Kenya.

>> KENYA: We'd also like to support and congratulate Mr. Rushton for this report. I want to address myself to three issues, Mr. Chairman. One would like to support the deletion of the words "and overlap" for the reasons that have been given. Two, Mr. Chairman, one of the biggest misgivings some of us had over the creation of this group was with respect to budgetary constraints. And I note that one of the reasons to proposing that this group conduct its business using one language only is to avoid exactly that. And I want to echo the sentiments of my colleague from Guinea for this group to be presented and effective business has to be conducted in more than one language because otherwise it then loses the relevance and representative force that initially ended. And thirdly, Mr. Chairman, there was a proposal here that would be more specific with respect to the nomination of Vice‑Chairs from six regions. I would want to propose that we be more specific and say six Vice‑Chairs each representing each of the six regions of the ITU‑T. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So now we have several comments and we have several comments to the Item No. 5. First I would like to clarify the ‑‑ whether you can support just delete "and overlap" from the text No. 5. It is a proposal. Could it be acceptable or not? Yeah. And overlap, yes. So Iran.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. If you remove "and overlap", consequently we have to remove standard activities. Otherwise if you minimize standard activities, let us be quite frank we will be subordinate of other organizations. As soon as we start to do something, they say no, this activity has already started. We are conflicting with your ‑‑ you are applicating with us and don't do this job. Let us come under our work and our subordination. The standard activities need to be deleted. We support Egypt, Bahrain and Kenya.

>> CHAIR: Due to the lack of time I would like to conclude the discussion point on the proposed text containing TD68 and ‑‑ but I would like to strongly ask you to consider what we have agreed in the Ad Hoc and also the financial impact. And the issue to be discussed is Item No. 5 in the terms of reference. No. 5, No. 12, 13, and 17. So I would like to ask Ad Hoc to just concentrate on those items to finalize, to give approval in the next Committee meeting. Any objection? I see none. Thank you. So we have to close today's session. And the issue on the JCA item related to the Resolution 178 and also reviewing the report from the Committee Working Group will postpone to the next Committee meeting.   
 Are there any issues for this session? United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And we don't mean to delay your progress and we appreciate very much your efficiency. However we did have our request to speak when you had asked if there were any objections. Mr. Chairman, we would suggest that there was another issue with respect to this Resolution that is not ‑‑ has not been mentioned and we were intending to mention it, which is the Review Committee should also extend its participation to associates of the ITU. And we had wished to add that issue to the Ad Hoc's consideration that you have formed. We make this recommendation because, Mr. Chairman, without associates in this group we would be losing involvement of significant commercial entities and players on a global scale that would be of great benefit to the ITU. So, Mr. Chairman, we ask that you add the issue of associates to noting A in the Resolution that is before us and will be before the Ad Hoc Group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So can we note A for the additional discussion point related to the associate? Okay. I see none. So Mr. Rushton, I have to ask you again but I hope you can conclude the reasonable solution and I would like to see the next Committee meeting tomorrow morning. So meeting is adjourned.   
 (Session concluded at 16:11 CET)   
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