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>> Ladies and gentlemen, please take your places. Com 4 is about to start.

>> CHAIR: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the fifth Com 4 session. First, as usual, I'd like to check the Channel for interpretation.

Good morning, all interpreters. Channel 1, English.

>> INTERPRETER: Good morning, Chairman.

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

Merci. Channel 3, Spanish? Gracias. Channel 4, Russian?

Channel 5, Chinese?

Channel 6, Arabic?

Okay, it looks okay, so let's start.

Before we start, I have asked you, to improve the efficiency of the meeting, now we have a timer on the stage to limit your intervention to 3 minutes. And please use that timer to keep your timing control, and to contribute to the meeting.

First of all, I would like to express my sincere thanks to the ad hoc Chair, Mr. Phil Rushton and Mr. Arthur Webster, and all the participants to the night session on Committee on structure refinement. I hope we will solve all your concerns in this morning. It is a time to make a decision.

I would like to ask you to focus on our final agreement at Com 4 level on your proposed outcome, having in mind a spirit of cooperation and compromise. I'd like to ask you to take the document Admin 31, today's meeting agenda.

Today is the last day for Com 4 discussion. We will have to complete all the agenda issues in the first quarter in this morning, and third and fourth quarters in this afternoon. It looks simple, but please look at Annex on the second page of Admin 31. We are tasked to review 18 Resolutions from Working Group 4A, and 12 Resolutions from Working Group 4B. And only a few of them have already been done.

So as the agenda, can we go along with the draft meeting agenda in Admin 31? I see no request for the floor, so the agenda is approved. Thank you very much.

And regarding the discussion, I have strong request from the WTSA management to improve the efficient work of the Editorial Committee, and if we will have perfect stable Resolution at this stage. We ask to send those documents to Editorial Committee as soon as possible to meet the current schedule of the WTSA 12. So in this agenda in Admin 31, show the whole agenda for today, and regarding the documentation in item 4, TD74 Rev 1, and TD77 are now available, but at this stage, other documents, TD80 and 81 will be provided later.

So first, to meet the request from the management to contribute to the editing Committee hard work, first I would like to take the input from Working Group 4A, Agenda Item Number 4, and 4A, Working Group 4A provide TD74, Revision 1, and TD77. I would like to take these two documents for our first work in this morning. Any comment?

I see none. And this is just meeting management efficiency, so if we will have any intervention in the request to have further discussion on specific aspects, I try to simply postpone the discussion to the afternoon session.

So I'd like to first ask your approval, and if we will have approval, we will send the document to the Editorial Committee as soon as possible.

So first I'd like to invite Fabio Bigi, Chair of Working Group 4A, to introduce TD74, Rev 1, and TD77. So to clarify the document to be discussed, I'd like the Secretary to show the document.

And room management, please switch to the PC. To show the document. So I'd like to invite Fabio.

>> FABIO BIGI: Thank you, Chairman. These two documents give the results of our Working Group. On the session of Friday, we have approved at our level the revised text of Resolution 75 as presented in TD20, Revision 1. You want to pause after each item? Or you want to introduce everything and you approve en bloc?

>> CHAIR: First I'd like to have your introduction first?

>> FABIO BIGI: On the second Monday we have approved the revised text of Resolution 20 as presented in TD49, the revised text of Resolution 29 as presented in TD50, Revision 1, the revised text of Resolution 52, as presented in TD47, the revised text of Resolution 58 as presented in TD39, and the revised text of Resolution 60 as presented in TD53.

Finally, in our yesterday session, in the afternoon, we have approved the revised text of Resolution 40 as presented in TD38, Revision 1, the revised text of Resolution 50, as presented in TD46, and a new draft opinion on effective implementation of the network externality premium as presented in TD75, Revision 1. That is our work.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Fabio. So now I'd like to ask your approval to the outcome from the Working Group 4A, which contained in TD74, Revision 1, and also TD77. So may I ask your approval one by one? Are you ready now? So first document, revised text of Resolution 75, as presented in TD20, Revision 1.

Are there any opposition? Any comment? Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning to you and to everybody. No opposition at all. I want 20 to propose another course of action. If in the working party or the Working Group 4A there has not been any pending issue we approve all of them in one shot, all together at the same time. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your good proposing, but I would like to ask meeting can agree to the simple approval? Or do you want to check one by one? France, please.

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, we would have a slight hesitation about approving everything cited as a block, because we might like to look again at the wording of the opinion. I can't therefore give my full and unreserved agreement to the idea of en bloc approval of these documents. Unfortunately we really haven't been able to consult with our colleagues from Cameroon on some of the wording issues. I do think it would be useful to see them about that.

So there's still really a matter in abeyance so to speak, and this would apply to my right to return to this document DT75.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So as I ask you before, I'd like to ask your approval one by one.

Okay, to save the time, I'd like to just refer the approval of the first one, revised text of Resolution 75, and I will consult with Chairman Fabio Bigi and we'll take this in this afternoon. So Fabio, please clarify which ‑‑

>> FABIO BIGI: May I propose to approve all the documents presented in Revision 1 to TD74. Is the meeting objecting to this approval en bloc of TD74, Revision 1? Because we're no contest so I think that is the case. So TD74, Revision 1, is approved, if you allow me, okay?

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Let's go back to the ‑‑ yeah, your suggestions. Now, I'd like to ask you again, U.K. and Comoros.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. For DT74, Revision 1, can we just have a minute on each Resolution just for us to check the documents? I can't find DT50, Rev 1, for example, in relation to Resolution 29 in hard copy. Can you just give us a minute on each one just to make sure before you go through approve them all? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Any other ‑‑ Comoros?

United States?

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to all colleagues. Mr. Chairman, I believe we hear in the room some confusion as to how we are to proceed. We have your agenda, and now we have the agenda of Mr. Bigi. As colleagues are asking you to give us some time to review those documents presented by Mr. Bigi, we would ask that you defer that to this afternoon's session, so that we may all consult with each other on those documents. We need to review them. Some of them are present. Some of them are not present.

We have your agenda. Can we proceed with your agenda? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay. And I do not want to duplicate discussion, so if it is more safer than to rush the asking decision, I'd like to take all the review of the Resolutions from the Working Group A and B in the afternoon session, and you should make careful check and to be ready for giving the approval.

So now I'd like to ask you to go back to the agenda on Admin 31. So first I'd like to ask your comment for the proposed meeting report which is contained in TD85.

I'd like to ask your comment Section by Section. So Section 1 for general, any comment? Section 2? Section 3? Section 4? Section 5? Section 6? Section 7?

And lastly, 8 and 9. Any comment to the report? I see none. Report is approved. Thank you very much. So next is Item 3, on the remaining issue from Committee 4, Ad Hoc Groups. The first one is Study Group structure refinement this item 4A. A report from the ad hoc is contained in TD84. I'd like to invite the ad hoc Chairman, Arthur Webster, to introduce the report. Arthur, please.

>> ARTHUR WEBSTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, everyone. The Ad Hoc Group on structure refinement had its last meeting last night to discuss the two remaining items, the allocation of cloud security work was the first item. And we did agree on some text, and would you like me to read that final approved or agreed‑upon text? I guess so.

After the debate, we did agree on this text regarding the allocation of cloud security work:

"To ask SG17 and SG13 to collaborate to identify possible areas of cloud computing security studies for SG13 and SG17 and rent the suggestions to the TSAG meeting in June 2013 that is mandated to take decision in June 2013 meeting. In the meantime, H/17 and H/13 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 by consensus in June 2013, QH/13 and H/17 should continue as per the mandates in their current questions. Such collaboration between SG13 and SG17 shall not be interpreted or pre‑judge the final decision of the June meeting of TSAG."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's the agreed‑upon text.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Arthur, for your great work. Do you have any questions for the qualification of the meeting reported? We'd like to discuss based on this input.

I see none, so first we'd like to take this TD as input. Now I'm very glad to hear we have a compromise text on the allocation of the cloud security work, the proposed text is, as read by Arthur on page 1 of TD84, 8‑line text. The text were agreed by the concerned experts, including SG13 Chairman and SG17 Chairman last night.

Can we agree to approve the compromise text on the allocation of the cloud security work as in TD84? Any comment? United States.

>> ARTHUR WEBSTER: That's not the United States. This is Arthur, the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group. So no comment from me.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So any other comments? Can we agree this proposed compromise text? I see none, agreed. Thank you very much.

Second important issue regarding the title of the lead study role for ITU‑T Study Group 17. I'd like to confirm that we have the proposal of SG17 Lead Study Group for bracket, telecommunication/ICT bracket closed, security. So I'd like to make a decision at Com 4 level for the title of this Lead Study Group for SG17. The square bracket means, I understand that we have two options for the title of SG17 Lead Study Group on security. One option is "telecommunication/ICT security," and the other option is just "security." So I'd like to ask this option. May I ask your decision, which option should be taken?

Also, considering that the title of the lead role just coordination role, it is not a detailed mandate. I ask your understanding and flexibility so we can move on in our heavy agenda.

Is there any comment? So do you support the first option of telecommunication/ICT security? Any objection to take the first option? United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Yes, consistent with the interventions that we have made yesterday in your Committee, as well as at the drafting groups, the United States feels that the first option could very easily create confusion at this stage. We do not have a definition of "ICT." It would create difficulties to know how to ‑‑ what are the range of contributions that should be made to that Study Group. It could cause considerable confusion during the proceedings of the Study Group as to the jurisdiction of the Study Group.

We also believe that whenever there is confusion of Study Group's jurisdiction as we have seen in other Study Groups, there will be a proliferation of traditional approval procedures imposed upon all contributions coming into Study Group 17 because of the confusion over definition.

So, Mr. Chairman, in order to avoid that, in order to also support Study Group 17, and to avoid the confusion that is inherent in that title, and to await the decision of Dr. Minkin's group on the definition of ICT, until that is clarified, we would propose to stay with the second option, which is "security." Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I have request for the floor, U.K. and China.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chairman. Just to keep it brief, we prefer the second option, which is just "security." Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any other different opinion? China?

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We respect the opinions from the United States, but at the same time, we need to know that the terminology and the definition should not hinder the work of the Study Group 17, and we also notice that SG17 has already carried out many studies on ICT, and will continue to do this.

For example, cybersecurity and other topics. Meanwhile, we have noticed that telecommunication/ICT has been used in almost all Resolutions or is most frequently used in other Resolutions, so I don't think that such wording will lead to confusion.

Considering that ‑‑ in consideration of the future development of SG17 and in consideration of the accurate description of SG17, we prefer the first option. We need to have telecom/ICT, and I hope that ITU can complete the definition work as soon as possible, and we prefer the first option, Telecom/ICT, which is more accurate about the work of the SG17. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: And last I'd like to request for floor, Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. Canada would like to express support for the position that has been put forward by the United States and the United Kingdom. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So may I close the list? And we have now Brazil, Saudi Arabia, Algeria, United States. And now we have proposal from the ad hoc whether we take telecommunication/ICT security, or "security." So I'd like to ask you to consider which option is more happier for everyone.

If option 2 will not cause any further big problem and satisfy some United States or other intervention, I'd like to ask you to consider what the most appropriate compromise, and we have floor and we close the list. And Brazil, Saudi Arabia, Algeria, United States, and I will ask for your final decision.

Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chairman. Study Group 17 works on many activities which are very close to ICT computing, such as those that have already been mentioned such as cybersecurity or recommendation CX.500, so it seems to us that it would be better to go with the first option of telecommunication/ICT, and to just say "security" doesn't seem precise enough. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Argentina? No, Algeria.

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Chairman. With regards to this concern on the ‑‑ about the definitions, we would join the position of the Honorable Delegate from the United States as in the level of the development Sector, the advice from Board and Resolution 114 of the PP10, and also with regards to the work from Study Group 1 in the development Sector, which is led by the Honorable Delegate from Russia, Dr. Minkin, we haven't yet finished the work in terms of definitions of the term "ICT."

So in order not to move on to things that are going to be carried out next week to the conference next week, we will be proposing definitions for the joint term "Telecommunication/ICT," so I think that today, to use telecommunication/ICT without yet being aware of the definitions is not appropriate at this time. And it would be better to use the term "security."

>> CHAIR: Thank you. United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we would note that the title of Study Group 17 is currently "Security," and under that title, a number of contributions have been made, and progress has been made within that Study Group. So as you have suggested that there are two options and one being "security," which we would take to mean that we would maintain the status quo as to the title of this Study Group until, until there is a clarification on the definition of "ICT" as a result of Dr. Minkin's efforts, therefore we would retain the status quo. However, Mr. Chairman, should there need to be a compromise, and we would offer this as the only compromise we would be prepared to join, we could say "telecommunication security," but the current title is, as you have rightly indicated is security but as a compromise we would offer "telecommunication security." Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you for your comment. And list has been already closed. So I'd like to apply the principle that many times help us move forward, less is more someone say is Australian, but I don't know and based on input from the Ad Hoc Group, we ask to take telecommunication/ICT security or security, but as far as I observe the comments, kind of minimum agreement both of us, it looks like more simpler solution.

So I'd like to ask, can we in spirit of compromise agree to just "security," as the name of Lead Study Group name. It not describe any mandate. It just coordination role of the name of the Lead Study Group.

So I'd like to ask your comment to my proposal of the title just "security." Are there any objections to my proposal? Saudi Arabia, Iran, and Uganda.

Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, everyone. I fully agree with you, Chairman, that if we just use "security" as you've said or just "telecommunication security," security/telecommunication, so if everyone could agree we could just say security. We'd agree with that, as well.

>> CHAIR: Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Distinguished Delegate of China in his intervention referred that currently Study Group 17 carrying out works in relation with issues of telecommunication, ICT, so on, so forth. Perhaps while you retain the title of the Study Group as being security or similar to that without ICT, but the Assembly confirm that the Study Group 17 continues its activity in the area of telecommunication/ICT as it has been before so there would not be any restriction to study of that. We retain the title but the study will be allowed and will be confirmed that aspect. So taking on Board some of the valid proposals made by China in the minutes of Committee 4 which be reflected to the Plenary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran, for your suggestion. But I'd like to clarify in Resolution 2, Annex A, part 1 describes the detail of the mandate of each Study Group, including the title, and we have already agreed, and now we are just discussing the part B, the naming of the Lead Study Group role and just its name.

So our decision will not give any impact to the real work in each Study Group. We have already described and clearly understood. So you can continue, of course.

So I'd like to ask you again whether we can give approval to take the name of title just "security."

May I ask your approval? Still we have some requests for the floor. Uganda?

>> UGANDA: Thank you, Chair. Chair, we also think "security" alone is broader, and we have used the terminology "telecommunication/ICT" in various documents of the ITU, so would prefer, Mr. Chairman, as we wait for the definition, we retain the term "telecommunication/ICT security" as the mandate for Study Group 17. I thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your proposal but at this stage we only have two options for your decision, and also we can continue the discussion requesting the definition of ICT, including telecommunication, but I want to continue the discussion. And France?

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. I join you in your proposal. I think that a short title was remaining aware that the Study Group 17 mandate is written in detail elsewhere. A short title is enough, so I would be happy to go with "security." Thank you.

>> CHAIR: And Japan?

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At this stage, in light of compromise, I think the best way is to take the Australian method so I fully support your proposal. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Russia?

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, I would like to begin by clarifying one point: We are now discussing not the name of the Study Group, Study Group 17, that is, so there's no disagreement on that. In fact, we all agree that Study Group 17 should retain its name, the brief title referring to "security." We all know that and we all agree on that. What we're discussing now is something different, Lead Study Group 17. We're not talking about the name of the Study Group. We're talking about the leading role to be played by that Study Group. The fact that it should be the Lead Study Group for telecommunication/ICT security or just for security. That's what we're now discussing.

Right now I would remind you of the fact that Study Group 17 is the Lead Study Group for telecommunication, and that requires clarification. For that reason, there is, so to speak, these two proposals that have been put forward. We can talk about it being the Lead Study Group for telecommunication/ICT, or we can talk about it being the Lead Study Group for security. We have these two options.

And as a compromise, we are willing to go along with the second of those, that is to say, Lead Study Group for security. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Thank you for your clarification and support.

Next, Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you very much, Chairman. I fully agree with you and I also agree with Saudi Arabia who spoke a while ago. I think we should use the title "security" for this Study Group, and we will await the Assembly documents to say that it is related to ICT security as will appear in the Assembly document. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

>> EGYPT: The final record of the document ‑‑ of the Assembly, sorry.

>> CHAIR: So regarding the definition, I'd like to take that message in my meeting minutes, and I hope higher level meeting will clarify the definition of telecommunication/ICT.

So I just want to ask you whether you support the simple option "security" or not. I just want to have your comment on that point.

Benin.

>> BENIN: Thank you, Chairman. I think you have made an excellent proposal as a compromise, and Benin supports this proposal to have a title that is simply "security" and that overcomes the difficulties. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Korea?

>> KOREA: Thank you, Chairman. Korea simply supports "security." Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I'd like to close the list now. We have Switzerland, United States, China, Iran. And Uganda. Gambia. I'd like to close the list. Uganda changed to Sweden? So that's the end of the list. Switzerland.

>> SWITZERLAND: Switzerland supports simply security. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: China? United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and we will consistent with the interventions of other colleagues make a statement in the Plenary of the Assembly indicating that in supporting security, we also support the existing mandate of Study Group 17, and that we will wait any further definitions of terms as they are then presented to the Plenipotentiary. We will enter that statement in the record. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. China?

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. China can support "security" now. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. The term "security" sufficiently broad, general, and we retain that term for the time being, and would not add anything to that term. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Lastly, is Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. Sweden also would support the use of the word "security." Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So I'd like to ask your final decision. I'd like to propose "security" as the title of the SG17 Lead Study Group, and are there any objections to my proposal?

Russia, do you ask the floor for opposition?

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, we support the term "security," but I just wanted to clarify further the point, what we are now talking about is not just the name of the Study Group. The Study Group is the Study Group for security, that's the name and that's the title that's agreed. What we're talking about now is something different. We are now saying that SG17 is identified as the Lead Study Group for security.

I noted what was referred to by the U.S. and I was a bit confused when he talked about keeping the current status. Now, the current status is that Study Group 17 is the Lead Study Group for telecommunication. That's the current status. I just wanted to clarify yet again that as we understand it, we have general agreement to the effect that the name of the Study Group will refer to security, and that when we're also talking about it as the Lead Study Group, it will be the Lead Study Group for security, and not Lead Study Group for telecommunication as it is at present. I just wanted to clarify my understanding that that is correct.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And I think we have almost reached agreement, but I'd like to clarify, we are now discussing in Part 2 of Annex A of Resolution 2. It is just lead Study Groups in specific area of study. Many Study Groups has name of the Lead Study Group for something.

Now, only we discuss SG15, Lead Study Group ‑‑ SG17, Lead Study Group on security. This is my proposal, just to the part of the part 2 of Annex A of Resolution 2.

So I'd like to ask my final clarification: Is there any ‑‑ United States? Do you request the floor?

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And as our distinguished Chair of Study Group 17, Mr. Kremer, has intervened, with respect to a point made by the United States, I'd wish to make it very clear that as we see Study Group 17 as the Lead Study Group on security, two things have not changed. First, the title of the current Study Group 17, and secondly, its mandate. And we will enter that in the record during the Assembly. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We take that your comment as a note. Okay, final question: Are there any opposition to my proposed title, "Lead Study Group on security" for SG17? Any objection?

I see none. Meeting agreed. Thank you very much.

Okay, thank you very much. Regarding the Study Group structure refinement, we have clarified the 10 Study Group structure, and we refine the question, including some questions merging the location and including Resolution 2. Secretary will make all editorial consultation to produce the final proposed revised of Resolution 2, but I think we have completed all of our tasks to discuss about Study Group structure.

Are there any other issues to be discussed on this Study Group refinement? I see none. United States?

>> ARTHUR WEBSTER: This is the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group again. I just want to thank all the participants of the Ad Hoc Group for all the hard work and the compromises that had to be made. And I want to thank Mr. Campos Neto for all his hard work and the TSB staff for background. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Arthur. Thank you for your appreciation. Also I'd like to express my sincere thanks to a great, great effort to reach agreement.

Okay, so we have agreed all the relevant documents on SG structure refinement, so we will, after this meeting, will send all the documents, Resolution 2, should be sent to Committee 5, Editorial Committee, to prepare our final Plenary.

Any other comment? Iran.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We fully agree with you. However, we would wish to request you that the compromise reached and submitted to you by the Ad Hoc Group to be reflected in your report to the Plenary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I will do it. So the discussion on the structure refinement is closed. Thank you very much.

I'd like to move to the Agenda Item on Strategic Review Committee. I'd like to invite Phil Rushton to introduce TD86. Phil, please.

>> PHILIP RUSHTON: Thank you, Chair. Good morning to everyone. Temporary document 86 is the output of the sixth meeting of this group. The sixth meeting was charged with 6 issues which I will give the results of. Whilst attendees also wish to raise other issues, these were not taken as that was not part of our mandate. Quickly going through, you asked through Com 4 to look at asserting associate members into noting A in the Resolution. It was agreed to keep the text as is. That was not accepted, Chair.

You asked us to look at Annex A, Section 5, following deletion of text in your Committee. The new proposed changes that were agreed is indicated in item 5, and it now reads, "to identify ways and means to enhance cooperation with standard bodies with a view to minimize conflicting standards."

We were also tasked with looking at how we could include associates or address the associates issue in clause 11. There was much debate on this. There was input from the legal adviser. At the end of the fairly lengthy debate, it was agreed to keep the text as is, although one Member State did reserve its position.

We looked at Section 12, to insert a reference to Regional Groups. We endeavored to do this, and again a long discussion took place, but there was no support for this proposal in the Ad Hoc Group, and it was agreed to keep the text as is within the Ad Hoc Group.

In Section 13, we were asked to consider additional languages in addition to the text that appeared saying "only English." This we did, and the change was made as appears in the new Section 13, which reads, "the Review Committee shall operate in English or the six official languages if so requested. Reports to TSAG shall be translated in the six official languages of the Union."

Finally Chair, you asked us to look at Section 17 and add a reference to National and regional representations. This we did, and the text now reads, "the management team of this Review Committee shall consist of a Chairman and up to six Vice‑Chairmen taking into account of equitable geographical distribution."

Thank you, Chair. That concludes the report from the ad hoc.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Phil, and floor management, please switch the display to PC. So thank you for your endurance and strong support. I'd like to appreciate your very hard work, so I see you had extensive and detailed discussion, so I hope the agreement reached yesterday can be reconfirmed by this Plenary. I would like to have your approval to the proposed result in TD86.

First I'd like to ask your approval to have a discussion based on proposed text in TD86. And then I'd like to ask your approval item by item.

First of all, is there any comment to the report itself? Tanzania and Iran.

>> TANZANIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think this is a fair representation of what we discussed. Only that we should also have to resolve on item 17, on the Chair and Vice‑Chair as to when this will be appointed or nominated because we need to finalize the matter before we conclude the Assembly. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your comment. And if we agree to establish this review group, I think the high‑level Delegation could arrange this matter, Head of Delegation, and I have further request for the floor. Iran, Russia, Bahrain. Iran please.

>> IRAN: First of all we wish to express our appreciation to Mr. Phil Rushton for the very hard work he has done. Very, very competent person and fair and firm. We appreciate that.

Chairman, we have a small comment with respect to Annex A, Section 11, report of the Ad Hoc Group. In the area mentioned that the legal adviser says, that inclusion or invitation ‑‑ inclusion of associate membership in the text is against Convention. I don't think that such a strong word has been used. Perhaps it may not be in line with the expression of Convention but not saying that against the Convention so I need clarification whether this text coming from the legal adviser or whether this understanding of Mr. Rushton from the explanation he has given.

In that case, Chairman, we suggest that we delete this portion, because I don't think that it is appropriate that we mention the legal view in such a strong word in the document of Assembly. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Now this text is approved by Committee 4 so I'd like to take your suggestion to my meeting report, and try to consider your suggestion. Thank you for your comment.

Next is Russia.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, I, too, would like to begin as others have done by thanking the convenor of this group, Philip Rushton. He did an enormous amount of work. It was very tense work, and we thank him for it. Nonetheless, we would like to raise a question about the status of this Committee.

We asked Mr. Rushton to reflect our view in the reported. Now, we didn't see this when we looked at this document 86 and we would like once again to put forward a proposal which was supported by a number of other countries, that is to say that we're not against the terms of reference, but in the form in which they stand at present, we have to say that in practice, we are repeating what, in fact, is supposed to be done by the Advisory Group within the standardization Sector, and we think it is appropriate for this Committee to be a Working Group of TSAG, with all of the instructions and tasks given to it. We think that would be logical.

Now, we see a number of our own Resolutions, Resolution 45, for instance, among others, we see a number of Resolutions that instruct the TSAG to do certain things which are in fact exactly the same things that we're asking this Committee to do. Therefore, Chairman, we suggest that we consider the status of this body, and we think we need to look at it and to review it in order to ensure that we have a better definition of its status.

There's a proposal that it meet a week prior to TSAG. Now, that's a format within which Working Groups of TSAG already operate, and that would allow us to make the right decisions and to resolve this issue in the right way. This is a matter that was put forward for the consideration of the Committee, and I now put it forward here.

Let me say once again, we're not against the terms of reference. Indeed, we fully agree with the terms of reference. Our only proposal is that this be a Working Group of TSAG. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Regarding the status we haven't concluded but for your comment, do you suggest to include your message in my report? So I'd like to do so. And Bahrain.

>> BAHRAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to begin by echoing my colleagues in appreciation of the role Mr. Rushton has done in the Working Group. As to the document itself, the first point I'd like to raise is in Article 11, under Article 11A, we would like to keep the text as is, without the inclusion of associates under A.

With respect to C, there was one amendment that was proposed during the Working Group which is to change "invited by the Chairman" to "invited by the management team" or invited by the review management team in consultation with the TSB Director so we would like to have that change inserted.

Moving on, there is one question for clarification I'd like to raise regarding Article 17. The discussion was to have one Vice‑Chairman from each of the ITU regions. The text was left to the Secretariat and now reads, "taking into account equitable geographical distribution." I just want to raise a question whether this is clear that we are referring to the ITU regions or whether this needs to be amended somewhat. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Regarding your comment related to the Section 11, I will discuss later for your comment, and 17 is a proposal from the TSB, and it reflects the current situation.

So next is Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, I'd like to begin by wishing you good morning, and I hope we all have a very pleasant day here. Having said that, I would also like to thank Mr. Rushton for the way in which he conducted meetings. He was very skillful indeed in the manner in which he convened the meetings and organised our work, and I'd like to thank him for that, and also thank everyone who was involved in the work.

On the terms of reference, I'm looking here at the Arabic version, and it seems to me that what we have in the fifth paragraph is not in line with the English version. So I would just like to flag that point. There is a discrepancy between paragraph 5 in the terms of reference in Arabic and English. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I'd like to ask Mr. Rushton, I think there are two versions. In Section 5, to minimize the conflict standards, and the other in the text itself, revised terms of reference, it is conflicting, so maybe we should just clarify which is appropriate, conflict or conflicting. Mr. Rushton?

>> PHILIP RUSHTON: It is the text in the terms of reference. That is what we were looking at last evening. It should be a view to minimize conflicting standards. And if I may, just to recall that when I made my presentation yesterday, the issue raised by the distinguished Delegate from Russia was part of my verbal report that that was an outstanding issue. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So regarding the Section 5, minimize conflicting, and I think it clarifies Saudi Arabia's question. Okay, next is Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We do support the idea of the creation of this group and the work done by the Ad Hoc Group reflected on document 86. However, we have a question for clarification.

In item 16 of the terms of reference, it says that the duration should be no longer than five working days. We were wondering if this group will meet in 2013 and who will decide the duration of the meeting in 2013? Will it be TSAG? Will it be Council? Council will meet after TSAG next year, so would not be Council. If the meeting ‑‑ maybe in 2013 it's too early for this Committee to be meeting to discuss Study Group structure, so we'd like some clarification on if there will be a meeting in 2013 and what will be the duration. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Regarding your question, normally that meeting dates including venue should be arranged by management team and Chairman have to arrange in consultation with TSB Directors. And to provide the information by the formal announcement from the Directors. So that should be discussed in management team.

Any further? And France, please.

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. I have listened to the various statements that have been made here, and I would now like to make a number of comments myself. We participated in the drafting group that worked on this text, and we certainly agree with the report as submitted by Mr. Rushton. Mr. Rushton certainly conducted our work very well, and I would say he was really tireless throughout all of the work that we did, and I thank him very much for that.

We would also say that we support the request from Russia that we clarify the status of this group of this Review Committee and that we believe it should be attached to TSAG.

Another comment, we also share the concern expressed by Brazil about the duration of meetings. We think that the duration of meetings should be regulated more strictly, because there are financial implications when you consider the duration of meetings.

I have another comment to make but this is something I would prefer be put forward by France Telecom and this refers to another issue, that is to say the CTO Group, and I think this could perhaps be referenced rather differently in the draft Resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. And we have a long list, but we have to consider the whole agenda, and so still you have some questions. So...

So now we only have 10 minutes, and first I'd like to close the list, and Russia, Egypt, Iran, United States, France Telecom Orange, Sweden and Hungary and Algeria. And concerning the time, I'd like to have your positive comments for this discussion so Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, we don't why given our proposal and what we said you suddenly leapt to the conclusion that we just wanted our concern to be reflected in your report. We raised an issue, we raised a question and we asked for discussion of that question. And I would ask you to discuss the issue that we raised and then take a decision. It may be that you will only do this in your report. It may be that you'll do something else but we have support for what we said also and we consider that from the financial point of view, and first and foremost from the point of view of management and governance, this group should be a Working Group of TSAG. Otherwise you end up saying that you don't have confidence in TSAG and in fact, you intend to create a parallel structure, body of some kind that is going to do the same job. So that's why I would ask you to raise this issue and to resolve it first at Committee level. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Regarding the comment, as far as I observed your hard work at the ad hoc meeting this was already discussed in the Ad Hoc Group, and there was agreement to have it under the WTSA. So I do not want to go back to the basic agreement, but I think we they'd to have further discussion on some implementation, but if you wish to have another group to clarify, we have to establish another ad hoc, but based on this proposed text in TD86, only additional clarification should be ‑‑ discussion point should be limited to your additional message based on Page 3 of the TD86, Pages 3 to 8 ‑‑ page 5, and regarding the term of reference, page 6 and 7.

I think as we agreed, current text should be the base, and if you want to add more clarification to help us, just discussion should be limited to that point.

So I'd like to have such a meeting.

So now we have a long list but I'd like to ask your indulgence and to bring your further comment to the additional Ad Hoc Group. And bring your final proposal to the afternoon session.

Can I ask you to continue the Ad Hoc Group to have additional clarification? And other Committee 4 session, due to the lack of time, I have to stop the meeting now.

So I'd like to ask you to support establishing additional Ad Hoc Group on this issue. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We seek your indulgence. We are dealing with very, very important and vital point. This is a matter to be debated and discussed at the level of the Committee. Ad hoc, there were so many ad hoc at the same time that the distinguished colleagues did not have the opportunity to be present at these ad hoc. Chairman, this is a matter of principle. Our administration fully supports the views expressed by Russia and by other colleagues, that we need to talk about the status of that. It is not a matter to be discussed at ad hoc. Ad hoc could discuss terms of reference. So far so good and we've already expressed our appreciations but the status is an issue to be discussed here, Chairman.

That is very important. I request you to put that in the agenda of the afternoon to have a discussion, full discussion and debate, on the status in either of the way, whether we have ad hoc ‑‑ sorry, the Review Committee or we have Working Group of the TSAG but please put it in the agenda of the afternoon.

Chairman, among the decisions of WTSA, this is the most important decisions. It relates the future of ITU‑T and we should treat it with quite important views on that, and take it serious. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your comment, and regarding the meeting, if there is no support to establish additional ad hoc, we have to come back to this issue in the afternoon Committee 4 session, or we have to bring this issue to the Plenary discussion.

And I'd like to ask your indulgence to save the Editorial Committee work to prepare the last time agreement. I would like to send this to...

Okay, and I clarify, regarding the agenda, we are going to take this issue in this afternoon, but as of the beginning of the afternoon session, to contribute to the Editorial Committee's hard work, I'd like to take the input from the Com 4 Working Group input first, and then I'd like to take issue on Resolution 178 of the Agenda Item 3C, and then I hope we will have further discussion on this review, Strategic Review Committee. Is it clarified for your schedule? Thank you.

So this first morning session is closed, and I'd like to have your meeting in this after than. Meeting is adjourned.

[ End of meeting ]
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