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>> CHAIR: Ladies and Gentlemen, please take your seats. We are about to start Committee 4. Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen. Welcome to the sixth com 4 meeting. First, I would like to check the interpreters a channel for interpreters channel 1.

>> Good afternoon.

>> CHAIR: Channel 2? Channel 3? Russia, channel 4? Channel 5? Channel 6? Thank you very much. We will have another two quarters this afternoon and we have to conclude all of the issues for committee, and as I ask you this morning, we have not resolved the issue under Com 4 and the strategic Review Committee and those JCA Resolution 178 issues, but before we tackle with this issue, I would like to ask you to review the result from Committee 4 Working Group A and B. As I introduce this morning the relevant document for reviewing is TD74, Revision 1 and TD77 and TD80 for Working Group 4A.

Regarding the Working Group 4B, TD81, I have already asked Working Group 4A Chairman, Mr. Fabio Bigi, to make a brief introduction of the document, so I would like to ask you to give approval one by one, but observe the list of the Resolution to be reviewed in TD74, Revision 1, Resolution 75, 20, 29, 29, 52, 58, 60. In TD77, Resolution 40, 50 and those are new opinion 1 should be reviewed.

From the TD80, Resolution 61, 65, 69, and Resolution 64 should be considered. Regarding Resolution 64, this issue has not been resolved yet, so regarding the Resolution 64, I will not take this Resolution for approval at this stage and handle it later this afternoon. Regarding Working Group 4B Resolution, Resolution 7, 43, 44, 45, 76, and Revision of Resolution 26 will be reviewed.

So I think all of your output from the Working Group are quite stable and to save the time, if you will not have any comment, just keep it silent and I would like to ask whether we can give the approval. And if you will have any intervention, comment for the approval, please raise it and I want to just defer the discussion after we review the Resolution.

Any comment to this proposed process for the approval of the Resolution from the Working Group? So I would like to ask take one by one from the TD74, Revision 1, Resolution 75 is contained, TD20, Revision 1. Are there any other comments to 24 approval? Any comments? I see none. Resolution 75 is approved.

Next one, Resolution 20 contains TD49. Is there any comment to this Resolution for the approval? I see none. Resolution 20 is approved. Next one resolution 29 containing TD50, Revision 1. Is there any ‑‑ I see none. Resolution 29 is approved.

Next one is Resolution 52, containing TD47. I have a request for the floor. United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Sorry, just a query on 20 Rev 1, I think there are square brackets around inappropriate hubbing and can we just check that before we move on and decide whether to remove them or not?

>> CHAIR: Fabio, do you have any comment? Okay. I would like to give more time to Fabio, so we will revisit this issue. So Resolution 20, please confirm that.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Sorry, just a query to help the plenary whether the square brackets are still there or not? It's just a query. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Iran, please.

>> IRAN: As considerable discussions in the absence of finding another word for having colleagues agree to put inappropriate hubbing, subsequently square bracket around inappropriate hubbing. Square bracket needs to be removed and text needs to be retained. That is the result of the meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman, Chairing the committee responsible for this set of resolutions and with subject to informal consultation and really the square brackets should be removed as this was the consensus of everyone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> FABIO BIGI: Yes, I confirm so we can remove the square brackets.

>> CHAIR: So Resolution 20, we have approved this Resolution, but square brackets should be removed. Any problem? Any comment? Okay. I see none. I would like to move to the next one.

So I would like to ask Fabio if there are any other square brackets, please remind me?

>> FABIO BIGI: Not so far I am aware. In principle they should be presented to you the agreed text so I was looking for the square brackets and I didn't find, so go ahead.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Next one is Resolution 52 in TD47. Are there any comments to this approval? I see none. Resolution 52 is approved.

Next is Resolution 58 in TD39. Are there any comments to this approval? I see none. Resolution 58 is approved.

Next Resolution 60, 60 in TD53. Are there any comments to this approval? I see none. Oh, Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman, no comment on that. Maybe request kindly, Mr. Bigi, whenever any Resolution you submit for approval you kindly indicate the existence or otherwise of any square bracket. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So the next one is Resolution 60 in TD53. Are there any comments to this approval? I see none. Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Thank you. I just have a short request. May you slow down a little bit? It's a little bit too fast. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I try. Again, Resolution 60 in TD53.

Okay. Are there any comments to this approval? I see none. Resolution 60 is approved. We now move to the TD77 and the target recommendation is 40, 50, and your new opinion effective implementation of the network premium and those three should be reviewed.

So first one in TD77, Resolution 40, in TD38, Revision 1. Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. May I request your indulgence because you have a paper copy? For you it's easy to go from one to the other. We are electronically, we have to close one document and open another document and it takes a little bit of time. I know you have it there, but may you kindly, possibly give us a little bit of time to close one document and open another one. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I will try.

I will synchronize with Fabio. He try to open and then I confirm. So next one is Resolution 50 ‑‑ Resolution 40 in TD38, Revision 1. Are there any comments to this approval? I see none. Resolution 40 is approved. Next one is Resolution 50 in TD46. Okay. Are there any comments to the approval of Resolution 50? Any comments? I see none. Resolution 50 is approved.

Next is new opinion in TD75, Revision 1. France, please.

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, I had indicated that I had a comment relating to understanding on the text for this opinion. I gave the Secretariat a document which could be put up on the screen so that we can see the proposal that I'm submitting to the committee. If it's possible to put it up on the screen, I think that would make it easier for us to be able to look at that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Management, can I ask you to switch screen to the PC? Okay. So, France, you have the floor.

>> FRANCE: Yes, Chairman. I can just give you a brief comment on this document and try and explain the reasons that have led me to submit this modification. It's a little to do with the wording which gives the opinion back to the Member States on, the opinion on their own idea. I think it would be better if we looked at the drafting, and if we could bring out the document, we will be able to see the opinion of Member States.

If we could go down the document, scroll down. There we are. So there I have added in this wording which has been aligned with the French text in order to make sure that we remain along the same lines, and I have also discussed this with Cameroon and they have discussed today with the African Group coordination considering the progress achieved so far within Study Group 3, those Member States concerned may wish to review their respective positions at the 2008 WTSA and possibly withdraw reservations on recommendation ITU‑T D 156. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I would like to have Working Group A Chairman.

>> FABIO BIGI: Thank you. What has been presented to you was the text we approved at Working Group 4A. Now, there is a proposal for France to modify these text and you have to seek agreement of the meeting if they agree on the amended text.

>> CHAIR: Iran, please.

>> IRAN: The proposed modification by France as now indicated on the screen is another way to express the same view. I don't see any difference in substance. There is a difference in how to express. It conveys the same views and has the same objectives, so we don't see any difficulty to replace the current by this one unless our African colleagues have any problem with that. Thank you. Cameroon.

>> CAMEROON: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, indeed, we discussed this text with France and there are some modifications. They are not major modifications or amendments of substance, but we support this as the African Group. They are just some minor amendments in order, and we want to be in agreement with France on this.

>> CHAIR: Last request for the floor is Germany.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Chairman. Germany wants to associate with the proposal from France. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. I think we can accept the proposal, so I would like to ask France to lead again and then I want to ask you for the approval. So, France?

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. I'm going to lead it once more, translating it directly from the English text. So the proposal is to say that it's of the opinion that considering progress achieved so far within Study Group 3, those Member States concerned may wish to review the respective positions expressed at the WTSA 2008 and possibly withdraw their ‑‑ the reservations ITUD156.

>> INTERPRETER: I just saw there was a change in the English text. I must apologize. We have to keep it in the English as it was, says the speaker. I was trying to translate from myself back into French into English as the speaker, so please keep the English. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. With the proposed changes, I would like to ask you are there any comments on this approval with the modification? Any comments? I see none. This new opinion is approved.

Next I would like to move to the TD80 which indicates the Resolution 61, 65, 69 and we will postpone the 64. So first document for your approval is Resolution 61 in TD51 Revision 2. So are there any comments to the approval, Resolution 61? Any comments? I see none. Resolution 61 is approved. Next is Resolution 65 in TD52, Revision 2.

Okay. So are there any comments to the approval of Resolution 65, any comments? I see none. Resolution 65 is approved.

Next is Resolution 69 in TD54, Revision 2. Are there any comments to this approval of Resolution 69? Any comment? U.K.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Sorry, Mr. Chairman. Could you slow down a bit? These are documents I am struggling to find. So two have been approved without my seeing changes from this morning. So give me a moment to find the documents. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Are you ready? Any problem? Okay. I would like to ask you are there any comments to the approval of the Resolution 69 in TD54 Revision 2? Any comments? I see none. Resolution 69 is approved.

Thank you very much. Thank you. So please return to the original.

So next we move to the document from the Working Group 4B. It is in TD81. And relevant Resolution 7, 43, 44, 54, 76, and 26.

So first one is Resolution 7 in TD44. First, I would like to ask are there any comments to the approval of Resolution 7 in TD44. Any comment? I see none. Resolution 7 is approved. Next is Resolution 43 in TD43.

Okay. Are there any comments to the approval, Resolution 43 in TD43? Any comments? I see none. Resolution 43 is approved.

Next is Resolution 44 in TD27, Revision 1. Are there any comments Resolution 44 in TD27, Revision 1, any comment? I see none. Resolution 44 is approved. Next is Resolution 54 in TD33. Korea?

>> KOREA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to take your kind attention to the remarks on page 84 in the middle regarding Korea's contribution on bridging standardization issues. We thought that there are some basic points, this contribution was introduced in the Working Group 4B meeting last week, and we thought that there are some basic points that need to be taken into account when we plan and implement related activities. Suggestions included in a proposal part of Korean contribution, Addendum 4, Document 59 reflects those points and were drafted in the hope that the BSU related activities over ITOT become more effective and efficient in the future.

Although these suggestions could be proposed to be included in the draft revised Resolution 44 under advice and direct of the TSB, we have not done so because first we thought that these suggestions could be accommodated by Director of TSB at his discretion at the stage of implementing the decisions to be taken at this assembly regarding the bridging standardization gap. Second, we have not wanted to make the work of revising Resolution 44. It was already too complex by having to merge other related resolutions to it, too much complicated. That is why the Paragraph in Working Group 4B Chairman's report was included in the report, and we hope that this committee knows it for consideration by the Director of the suggestions contained in this contribution. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Malcolm, you have the floor.

>> MALCOLM JOHNSON: Thank you, Chairman. Good afternoon, everybody. I would like to thank Korea for taking this pragmatic approach with their proposal, and can confirm that I will take account of the suggestions made by Korea in taking forward the programme on bridging the standardization gap. I would like to thank Korea for these suggestions.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So we take that note in your record and TSB Director will take care of your request. So I would like to ask your approval of Resolution 54. Any comment? I see none. Resolution 54 is approved.

Next is Ghana, please.

>> GHANA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to bring to your attention that Resolution 44, which was a combination of Resolution 17 ‑‑ I'm sorry, Resolution 27, rather, the TD Document 27 Rev 1 which resulted in the combination of quite a few resolutions. You take note to suppress the various resolutions that have been deleted. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Regarding the Revision of the Resolution, we have request from Iran.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. The issue of suppression of Resolution as a result of merging Resolution in one another would be included in your report for the plenary and you make it subject to the approval of the new resolutions. Once it's approved, the other Resolution will be deleted. We cannot decide it in Committee 4 because still the matter is before plenary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So may I move to the next one? Resolution 76 in TD42, are there any comments to the Resolution of approval 76. Any comment? Egypt and Iran. Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. I think this is just an editorial mistake that instruct the Study Group, bullet 3, it should be aligned with text above in result 5. At the end of sentence we add, or not we add, we modify as such for those technologies at the middle of second line, taking into account user needs and in consideration of the market demand as appropriate for Conformity Assessment Programme. We hope this can capture it. It's just cut and paste from result 5, but in the proper sequence. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Any comment to the intervention from Egypt? Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. First of all, yes, we agree with the proposal suggestion of Egypt. In fact, it was discussed at the meeting and it is so agreed that it is just editorial alignment. Second, Chairman, we wish to take this opportunity and express our sincere thanks to the chairman of ‑‑ which effectively and skillfully and competently resolved this very important issue and brought Resolution to attention of plenary. It should be reported in the minutes of this Committee 4. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So this proposed editorial changes I would like to ask your approval of the Resolution 76. Any comment? I see none. Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to draw your attention to result 2. It's still in brackets although we already have agreed to move the work of CRI to Study Group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your clarification. I don't expect we have still square bracket. Thank you for your correction and I would like to ask you again, any comment for the approval of Resolution 76? Any comment? I see none. Resolution 76 is approved.

Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Chairman, would you kindly mention Revision 76 as amended was approved. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So next one is Resolution for the Revision we have rest of 3 resolutions 26, 17 and 56. I would like to confirm Fabio ‑‑ sorry. Chairman, working through 4B. Is it correct Resolution 26, 17, 56? Ghana, please.

>> GHANA: Yes, it is correct, sir. There is one resolution that I think escapes your list, and it's Resolution 59, which was accepted on the first ‑‑ it's not in the final report, but it's in the first report to you and that was just a minor change, so that was agreed.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Regarding the Resolution 59 Revision was already made in ‑‑ revised ‑‑ okay. So the reading, you should review Resolution 26, 17, 56 and Resolution 59, Revision has been approved. Okay. Thank you. Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I know you have noted, but please kindly consider that the deletion of this Resolution is subject to approval of the new resolutions or merger resolution by the plenary. Please kindly put that in your report. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So we have confirmed Resolution 26, 17, and 56 for your consideration of the Revision. So first I would like to discuss the revision of Resolution 26, any comments? I see none. Resolution 26 is agreed. Next Resolution 17. Resolution 17, telecommunication standardization in relation to the interest of developing countries. I would like to ask your approval of the deletion of Resolution 17. Any comment? I see none. Resolution 17 is deleted.

Last one in this session, Resolution 56. It's on the laws of TSAG and ITU‑T Study Group Vice Chairmen from developing countries, Resolution 56. I would like to ask your approval to delete Resolution 56. Any comment? I see none. Resolution 56 is deleted. Thank you very much. I would like to appreciate your very hard work and only Resolution 64 we will discuss in the later, and now we would like to go back to the remaining issues and the Agenda Item 3.

So I would like to ask management, I would like to ask to switch to the PC.

Okay. In the morning session we started to get your approval to the proposed changes made by adult group on strategic Review Committee, and we have proposal was contained in TD86. Now, secretary made editorial changes to the document, so TD86, level 1 is for your reference and just, I want to clarify the current status, and all the text is included in your document, so just I show the slide just for your assistance. So first we agree in the meeting and I show the context with containing TD73. It is ‑‑ to the plenary from Committee 4. So we agreed to establish a strategic Review Committee and based on that agreement, we have review and draft the text for the Resolution including the term of reference of this committee based on the proposal from Japan which is contained in document 39.

Based on that agreement, we have a lot of activity led by Mr. Alstone of the ad hoc discussion and I have asked him this morning to ask your approval of the proposal from the ad hoc group which is contained in TD86 and proposal result of the consideration on the Resolution noting A and those of Annex A term of reference, section 5, 11, 12, 13, 17 are proposed. So to complete all of the Resolution text and reference, term of reference, I would like to get your approval and also during the morning discussion, I have received several comments and it is listed other issue. So now I want to confirm are there any other issues to be discussed?

And what I identified was one is status of the Review Committee, request by Russia, that is one important issue. And the other is clarification of invitation. It is related to the Annex A term of reference and item Section 11C. So current text invitation will be made by Chairman but Egypt and other country request to include the committee management team.

I have identified those two issues to be clarified, and I would like to ask any other issue to discuss? Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First, the recent editorial issue in Annex A, article 5, regarding the second line which says conflicting standards. I think the intention is conflict standards, conflicting standards because minimize conflicting standards, minimize standards which minimize the conflict. So say minimize conflict in standards.

I repeat in article 5, Annex a.

>> CHAIR: Yes, I have identified that change.

>> EGYPT: Minimize conflict in standards. I will come back to the issue of the management team role.

>> CHAIR: Germany.

>> GERMANY: Thank you for clarification on the status of this group as requested from Russia. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. France Telecom?

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, I too would like to take advantage of the fact that we are having this discussion to clarify three points that are important in terms of the elaboration of this Resolution and in terms of the terms of reference of the review commitment or Review Committee. Firstly, the reference to 68, we have to make it clear that that has to be modified. Secondly, we have to clarify the vocabulary with reference to the CTO group. This is something that does not exist as such. We have rather a CTO meeting, and thirdly, I would like to propose discussion on the issue of the duration of meetings that is envisioned. We have already started talking about this morning but we are talking about the possibility of having meetings for a period of up to five days and I think it would be better to have a maximum of two to three days prior to TSAG. If you give me the floor later I will elaborate further on these points of our discussion.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you, France and regarding the duration, we will discuss in part of term of reference in item 16 and for the faster question, can I have your exact proposed text to reflect your concern in relation with Resolution 68 and those vocabulary aspects? Can I have any specific proposal? Iran and France? Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you Mr. Chairman. It's a matter of language. If we say to minimize conflicting standard means that it is a continuous work and means that perhaps it could be interpreted that we go to all standards that exist and try to minimize the conflict it is not the purpose. The purpose is from the establishment of the group or committee, every effort will be made to minimize the conflict in standards, so on, so forth. But not conflicting, because conflicting may be that the people said that there are several standards currently that might have conflict with other standards. Try to resolve them. It is very tedious work. So in summary, this action is not attractive. This action is from the time that the committee proposed something to WTSA and it is approved. We should have a clear understanding of that. Subsequently, we suggest or we share the views ever Egypt. We should replace the word conflicting with conflicting or conflict between the standards and it is to be mentioned in your report that that is not retroactive actions. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. I will take it in part of the proposal from the ad hoc. So regarding the Resolution 68, France, please. France Telecom, do you have exact request proposal for our consideration, France?

>> FRANCE: Yes, thank you, Chairman. Yes, this is more of an editorial comment. Currently in the text there is a reference to Resolution 68 under considering E, we think it would be more appropriate to move this reference to noting under G so that it goes under the same section of all of the references to resolutions and also that the text that refers to Resolution 68 I'm going to change into English for this. Resolution 68 of WTSA12 Dubai which requests TSB Director to arrange meetings for high level executive, technology of such meetings in order to assist in identifying and coordinating standardization priorities and subjects to minimize the numbers of form ‑‑ so this is the text that was drafted by Committee 3 of this assembly.

>> CHAIR: Okay. I think there is no great problem, so I would like to have your proposal sent to the TSB. So regarding the issue, we have ‑‑ please take the document 86, level 1 from ad hoc group Chairman and on page 1 and 2 we have 6 proposal related to the Resolution noting A and through section 5, 11, 12, 13, 17. Any addition to this issue? I would like to review the section 16 on the duration of the meeting. And also we will discuss about the status of the Review Committee and lastly as Egypt proposed, invitation related to the section 11C will be reviewed later.

So first of all, Resolution noting A and proposed by ad hoc Committee we try to reflect involvement of associated members, but we have found it difficult to include this other part of noting A, but associated members will be invited and that is now describing section 11C by including the other expert including associate. So first agreement I want to have is as proposed by ad hoc group no change will be made to the noting A. I would like to have your comment. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: I am in ‑‑ item 11, if you are in item 11?

>> CHAIR: No. Just now asking noting A at the beginning of the Resolution.

>> EGYPT: We will come to item 11 later.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: No change will be made. Any comment? So can I ask you to switch projector to the podium PC again? So regarding the changes in noting A of the Resolution will not change and existing text will be used. Any comment? I see none. United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, very much, Mr. Chairman and good afternoon to all colleagues. We are dealing with the, as you had projected on the screen it appeared we were at the section the Review Committee which included a discussion of associates, but Mr. Chairman, if you are not there yet, I could wait on my comment. Clarification, please, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Do you have a proposal? Yes. So as I said before, so the associate issue is we have added text in term of reference item 11C. I think that gives you a solution. Are there any other comments? United States?

>> UNITED STATES: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Does offer a solution, we had earlier been the Member State that had placed a reservation on that point. We would wish to have it noted in the record that we would encourage the Chairman of this future Committee to invite associates in the expert category as ‑‑ since many very prominent players in our industry are associates to the ITU. So Mr. Chairman, we would underscore that we would expect the Chairman to make that invitation in order to enrich the dialogue in the Committee on the subjects that it will address. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United States, thank you for your suggestion, and we take 8 and 11C, we will discuss later including the adding the Committee management team for the invitation. Okay. So next confirmation is Annex A, section 5. The wording is current proposal is a conflict standards. So proposal is we have lengthy discussion, and the text is with a view to minimize conflict standards, but I have proposal from ‑‑ can you show item number 5? So the proposed text is minimize conflicting standards. So first, I would like to confirm this proposed text, conflicting standards. Can you agree to this proposal? Iran.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman, perhaps I was not clear. Conflicting standards is not a proper application. Conflict either in standards or between standards, but not conflicting. That's what I suggested, Chairman. I hope that my suggestion has been duly taken into account and even conflict standards has ambiguous meeting you say conflict between standards or conflict in standards. Thank you very much. It's showing on the screen.

>> CHAIR: So now proposal is conflict in standards. Any objection? The proposal is to change to conflict between standards. Conflict between standards. So Bulgaria.

>> Bulgaria colon thank you, Mr. Chairman. We agree to your proposal.

>> CHAIR: So any objection to my proposal. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Our proposal was conflict in standards. I think it is more focused. However, I have no sticking much to that. Conflict in standards.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. Sweden can accept conflict between standards.

>> CHAIR: Thanks, so I just ask any opposition to use conflict between standards? Any objection? U.A.?

>> UA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We support the word in standards rather than between. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Italy.

>> ITALY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My proposal is to replace the word minimize with avoid. To avoid conflict between standards.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your comment so I would like to minimize discussion so now we have to decide part of the conflict in standards. So I want to ask you whether conflict in standards or conflict between standards. Unfortunately I'm a non‑native speaker, I couldn't find great differences. So I would like to ask you again my proposal is to use conflict between standards. Iran.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. When we suggest that we said either conflict in or between, preferably in is more correct, more appropriate, preferably. So conflict in standards. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. If we are insisting on this proposal, it's because it is to do with the translation into Arabic and there could be problems with the translation into Arabic and that's why we think conflict in standards because that will be more easy to translate and would avoid any problems in the Arabic version. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. And the last, China.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Chair. According to our understanding, we feel that conflict in standards is better for us to understand. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So the considering the comment on translation or avoiding the misunderstanding, I would like to propose to you conflict in standards as my last proposal. So can we leave it with my proposed changes, conflict in standards? Any objection? Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. I need to consult with native speaking English persons on my issue. In my reading there was a difference between the two issues and I want to clarify that what we see with number 5 is that we are talking about conflicts between standards developed in different standards bodies, not conflict in one standard, but I want to consult with native speaking English persons before I say yes or no to this text.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Malcolm Johnson, I think he is a native speaker. I would like to follow his suggestion in English. Can you agree to accept his proposal? In or between, just advise us.

>> MALCOLM JOHNSON: Thank you, Chairman. Very nice of you to offer me the floor. As I read this, number 5, it seems to be talking about cooperation with other standards bodies. So I would have thought that this was intended to mean that we should avoid having standard produced by different standards bodies which are conflicting and if that's the intention, certainly in the English, maybe it doesn't translate well into other languages, but if it's to avoid having on the market standards from different bodies which are conflicting, it would be better to say minimize conflict between standards.

If it's to minimize conflict in standards, then it's within the standard itself. So I think we are talking about conflict of standards produced by different bodies, in which case in the English it would be better to say between. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Germany. Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chair. We welcome the clarification by the TSB Director right now and it was also our understanding that it's better to take between instead of in. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. And Egypt?

>> EGYPT: We still insist in standards because it reflects the idea what we want exactly regarding the translation in Arabic and the meaning itself. We have a very big problem with the explanation just expressed by the other delegates. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: So for the moment put the square bracket, and we will check in the plenary, and ask expert of translation. Anyhow, we need to have careful attention for the translation. And for the moment, I would like to put square bracket. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. First of all, we appreciate the English of Mr. Johnson, very good, appreciate it very much. Second, Chairman, perhaps we need to listen to the French translation of that because the language prevailed is French so we would like to know what our distinguished colleague from France or French language is translated that may give guidance for other language as well. Because finally the Committee is Chaired by the French language and perhaps either now or after we have engaged a little bit of discussions outside of the meeting or off line to see what are the words or terms you used in French which is revealing language.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you so for the moment I would like to postpone the final decision and we are going to have more suggestions from the trans expert. So can I move to the next item.

>> TANZANIA: Thank you, Chair. I think we have agreed with what you have put in square bracket but you have just forgotten the word minimize which was proposed to be avoid. Because if we go from minimization, we are allowing conflicting standards but our object is just to minimize. We want it to be to avoid.

>> CHAIR: Okay. But we have already discussed, and I would like to ask you to come back to the plenary if you have any further thought. Anyhow, I want to limit this target for the discussion. I would like to ask your indulgence. So next section is section 11. And we ad hoc group propose to use 11A, B, C, and we agree not to change the last proposal from the ad hoc. So I would like to propose to add after item C after the Chairman invited by the Chairman and the Committee management team. It should be added. So is there any comment to the proposed text for the item 11? Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Perhaps, the better language would be invited by Chairman in consultation with the management Committee and the Director of the TSB or as it was proposed invited by the Management Committee in consultation with the Director, but the first one is more appropriate, invited by the chairman in consultation with Management Committee and the Director. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any objection to the proposal from Iran? Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman, and this was just the text that I wanted to speak in the very beginning of this meeting and, however, I would like to also translate, to transfer this text to article B because here we are talking about representative of other organizations which organizations, health or industry or personal or private is very wide. So this must be done in consultation with the management team as well as with TSB Director. So the same text proposed by our delegate from Iran should be proposed to the end of the sentence article 11 article B as well. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: So to add the same text invited by the Chairman in consultation with Committee management and TSB Director. Germany.

>> GERMANY: Could I ask for clarification what Committee management is supposed to be because I think that's related to status and I don't recall that there is anything like a Committee management team. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: No. This is Review Committee, management, itself. So the Chairman and vice Chairman. So text said Chairman and six Vice Chairmen. I say this is Committee management team.

>> GERMANY: Why don't we put Chairman advice or something like that? There is not anything like the commented management team.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So I would like to propose invited by the Chairman and vice Chairman in consultation with the TSB Director. And same text should be added at the end of the B. Any objection? Iran.

>> IRAN: It's not objection as such, but not all vice Chairman put invitation and Chairman invitation, so 6 Vice Chairmen. It is the Chairman who invites, but in consultation with the management team and management team Chairman is known by everybody in all of the Study Groups of ITU‑T. It is the Chairman and vice Chairman. If there are working parties, also Chairman of working parties, but here we don't have working party. We have Chairman and vice Chairman, there it is clear to say invited by Chairman. The Chairman invites, however, before the invitation is made, the Chairman consult the Vice Chairman and the Director of the TSB and that is a fact known in ITU‑T, and in other ITU organizations, ITU‑R and ITU‑D. So Management Committee is a known and agreed text and application in the entire ITU. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for my English lesson and I fully agree with Mr. Roste, so I think now invited by the Chairman in consultation with Vice Chairman and TSB Director. Any objection? Sweden?

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. When I'm reading the text now, I get the impression that you have the first classification is the Member States, second members of academia, the second one is other members and associates and the third one with their limited participation, only the subject matters of these other organizations, that's the standards organizations, so on, because the participation from the, on the screen here, the second part is more limited than the third part.

That's one problem I have with the text. The second one is that I think if we are serious with this idea of discussing with other organizations about avoiding overlapping standards and avoiding conflicts between standards and so on, we think ‑‑ I think we should give them the right to participate. We don't need to add in those cases the invitation by the Chairman. So I would have difficulties with text that you have added in the text Addendum. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: We have already agreed these three categories, A, B, C, including the associate. And I think ad hoc group had the same discussion and final agreement is this proposal. So I would like to take this proposal for your approval. Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your wisdom and Egypt supports and Arab Group supports your groups exactly. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chairman. I'm confused here. Are we suggesting that the text we see on the screen is what you are proposing this meeting to accept? Is that my understanding?

>> CHAIR: Yes.

>> AUSTRALIA: It is. There is some difficulty associated with the new text in Item B. My understanding was that we had what was effectively an open invitation to regional telecommunications organizations. They should not be required to be invited to be part of the Review Committee. But over and above that, as you would be well aware, we have had six drafting groups on this whole issue. This is starting to feel to me like drafting group number 7. I think the text is extremely delicate and we really shouldn't be making too many changes to this. We have gone to great lengths to clarify exactly who is to be invited and under what circumstances. So my suggestion is that we very much revert back to the text that was originally proposed to this meeting with the one exception that under item C, yes, do include reference to Vice Chairman. Otherwise we will be redrafting and redrafting and I'm bit uncomfortable with the way it's heading at the moment. That's my proposal, Chair. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. I did want to get into that, but this is the time for that. Really the inclusion of this invitation was proposed in very first meeting of the ad hoc group. This was concluded, this was included in the final text at that time. Unfortunately next day this part was deleted and I have concern, I talked to the Chairman, and TSB Director, but ‑‑ and I observed after my right to come back to the issue again and since it has not been raised so I am raising it now. It's not new text. It's text that has been proposed and unfortunately was deleted without, was no reflecting what has been discussed in very first meeting so I'm sorry for that, but this text I is very appropriate to be placed right now.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So I would like to have a coffee break and to finalize, but before I have ‑‑ we will have a coffee break, I want to ask your approval for other items in section 12. So ad hoc group discussed impact of reference of ITU regional offices, but meeting agreed to keep the existing text. So no modifications have been made to section 12. Any objection? I see none. Next issue is section 13.

Regarding the language, we add or the language as so requested report to the TSAG shall be trance slated in the official language of the union. This discussion will be, will have impact on the relation of status discussion, but at this stage, we consider the languages, so I would like to first to accept support this proposal. Any comment? I see none. The revised text is approved. Next is item 17. And by the suggestion of TSB, we add the text taking it into account of the equitability geographical distribution, this expression will be appropriate. So any comment to this proposal? I see none. Germany.

>> GERMANY: Thank you. May I ask for clarification how this Committee will be conformed and appointed? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So the discussion was we are going to have six Vice Chairmen and from the six regions, but how to describe the six regions. So I would like to ‑‑ we have asked TSB and taking into account the equitable geographic distribution is appropriate. So any further comment? Iran and Germany. Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't think there is any problem to designate or elect or whatever the six Vice Chairmen. It's usual practice in ITU, the Secretary General or Director of ISB are six regional organizations either here or later on informed that these are our representatives. I don't think we have should engage in that business. We do it in TSAG, in CPM and everywhere, so I don't think we should discuss it at level of Committee 4 or plenary. Very traditional way and we already used to do that several times so I don't think that is at issue. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any additional comment? Okay. United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. As we continue to reflect upon the intervention of Germany, we do believe that there may be one step that has been ‑‑ that needs to be explicit. There is a resolve to establish a Review Committee. Mr. Chairman, usually there is resolves for someone or something to take the action. So Mr. Chairman, it may be a very minor editing task, but we do believe that one step needs to be made explicit as to who or what would establish the Review Committee. So I would ask Mr. Chairman that that be made explicit by a minor editing of the text and we believe that that may assist others to understand the good question proposed by our German colleague. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Iran.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. It is not the first time that the Committee or this group is established by higher body. We have council establishing group, we have plenipotentiary establishing group and so on so forth so the ‑‑ is established group the Chairman will be designated in another way. So we have to discuss how designated. Maybe WTSA stating having approved this Resolution. WTSA come to the conclusion that Mr. or Mrs. X, Y, will be the Chairman, and the Vice Chairman by regional organization. So I don't think that in Resolution ‑‑ there is no problem you also include in the Resolution this Review Committee will be Chaired by, put a blank and then go to the plenary, so that is another option. There are two options either add an item at the end, this Review Committee will be Chaired, blank, or the assembly when will approve this Resolution at the same time the Chairman of the Assembly ask after consultation, so on, so forth, he receive the result of the consultation that X or Y will be Chairman of the group. There are two possibilities and both of them agree. So either at the end or leave it to the assembly at the time of approval to designate and that will be recorded in the minute. Post possibility exist. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: My understanding WTSA assembly nominates, and I would like to take Iran's comment in my meeting note and my proposal is to keep the text as proposed. United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and, again, we appreciate Mr. Ariste's views on this subject and we believe he has offered a way forward. It's a simple editing task Mr. Chairman for future references so there is no ambiguity that Resolution simply indicates that it resolved a WTSA establish a Review Committee and then we can take it upon the assembly's Chair and consultation with TSB Director to do that, but we would ask that that be made explicit so there is no question as to the origin of this Review Committee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Malcolm, you have the floor.

>> MALCOLM JOHNSON: Thank you, Chairman. Well, of course, tomorrow we have head of delegation meeting to look at Chairmanships, and this is a WTSA Resolution. So it starts off by saying World Telecommunication Standardization Assembly, Dubai 2012 resolves to establish, and I think we have inserted TSAG, I understood, TSAG Review Committee. So it's WTSA resolving to establish this Review Committee. And I would hope that between now and the end of this assembly, we can have agreement on the Chairman, and possibly Vice Chairman from each region. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Chairman okay. Last comment, I hope, Iran.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We agree with Dr.‑‑ that this should be excluded but Mr. Johnson raises another issue is the status of that we have not yet discussed that so let us not mix up the situations ‑‑ that we should clearly mention who is Chairman and how should Chairman be elected. Let us put it somewhere in the Resolution or request assembly to designate that. This is another status you come after the coffee break, if any. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I would like to take this including section 11 and this I hope we can solve the problem. So I would like to postpone that to the next session and the next party, the section 16, duration now we have shall be no longer spend five working days but it says just a maximum, but following your discussion, I would like to propose the number five by three. No longer than three working days. But exact day of ‑‑ dates for the meeting had you be arranged by the Chairman with the consultation of the TSB Director.

So France, do you have any other proposal to this number of the day in section 16?

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, I'm taking the floor, but in fact I really am just running with the bat given to me by France Telecom who raised the point initially. The concern was not to have a group that was going to meet for a long time because time is money as we all know. So we thought that it would be a good idea to encourage the people who are going to be managing this Committee, this Review Committee or whatever it's going to be called to be careful in their use of time. I wonder if we couldn't sigh she usually be of two days duration, and at the very most three days. This is very important because we are after all here about money. So it should be normally two days and no longer than three days would be my suggestion for an amendment to 16 in the terms of reference. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, but sometimes I think only one day will be enough. So maximum three will be sufficient, and one or two or one half day, so I would like to ask Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. It may be a quick solution for that. Usually we could say up to three days. Maybe one day, maybe two days, but not more than three days. Up to. And we have used it many times in the ITU. Maybe not in ITU‑T panel, but we use that several times, up to three days that means maximum three days it could be two days, one day, and we leave it to the Management Committee and Director and consultation. Up to three days. I hope first Telecom and French administration agree with that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your proposal and your objection to the Iran proposal up to three working days? France?

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. We, we are E we are trying to feigned a compromise expression here but I know what human nature is and what you say up to three days then what tends to happen is that the meeting lasts for three days. People always go for the longest option when it comes to meeting time. So if we are saying that the maximum is three days, yes, that's all very well and good, but perhaps we should say that the duration of meetings should not exceed three days in order to make it clear that you might have one day or two day, but certainly never exceeding three days.

>> CHAIR: Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, it seems to me that there might be a problem with this for developing countries. I mean, if you are talking about people who are going to come to a meeting that's only going to last for one or two days, then that's going to be a big difficulty for people from developing countries to come for a short meeting so I think we have to find flexible wording here and something that will make it possible for countries with financial difficulties to attend meetings of this Committee. We also have to take die account of the hard ‑‑ due account of the hardship of some countries in sending people to a meeting for a very short period.

>> CHAIR: Iran.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I draw the attention of my distinguished colleague that this meeting is going to be back to back immediately before the TSAG, so it is only not two days' meeting generally speaking because the report will be submitted to TSAG and TSAG will discuss that in one way or another, so I don't think there will be any difficulty. Subsequently, we have no problem to accept French proposal that maximum should not exceed three days, but knowing it will be back to back. If it is not back to back, which is already agreed by you, we have difficulty even to come to a meeting for five days and after two weeks we come to another meeting of TSAG for another five days. It must be back to back whether it is agreed two days or three days for us. That's okay, but I think the French proposal may cover the situation. We have no difficulty to that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We do have to think about the financial implications, and also about the yearly calendar of TSAG meetings. In 2013 we will have a four-day TSAG meeting so ideally this Committee should have a one-day meeting because for developing countries it's less cost. We travel during the weekend and come back during the weekend. If it's more than five days counting TSAG, then the Strategic Review Committee will have to spend more to travel before the weekend. So ideally in 2 thousand 3 it should be one day, maybe in 2014 it should be two days but ideally completing the week with TSAG.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Of course, management Chairman with consultation of TSB the proper allocation of days should be considered. So now I would like to come back to the text in Section 16. So based on your several good ideas, I would like to propose, shall not exceed three working days. Any objection? I see none. The change is agreed. So before our coffee break, I would like to ask you to consider last one, proposal from the duration status of this Committee, and Resolution and ToR has already clarified creation will be made by WTSA and duration between the TSAG. And this review has been clarified, but the status I would like to ask you to be the part of the result of Resolution 1. It says, now to establish Review Committee to fulfill the term of reference and my proposal is to add TSAG in front of the Review Committee. So just add TSAG and no changes will not be made in other changes for the Resolution and terms of reference. So the proposal is to establish TSAG Review Committee. I would like to have your comment. Bulgaria, Australia.

>> BULGARIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We support your proposal.

>> AUSTRALIA: Unfortunately, I find it difficult to support the proposal. That change is not what we had agreed during the course of our discussion over the six drafting groups of this meeting. In fact, much of the text that exists in the results describes the working relationship between the Review Committee and TSAG itself. There is copious detail in about the working relationship, how it reacts to TSAG and reports to TSAG. If we make this a TSAG Committee perhaps that has to be reviewed so that makes it very difficult as it stands the Resolution states the World Telecommunication Standardization Assembly 2012 Dubai resolves, now, making a change to TSAG there opens a plethora of problems as I see it. I suggest we do not do it.

>> CHAIR: So I don't propose changes to the mandate and reporting, or the report from the Committee through the TSAG that with no change so those relevant text have not been changed so just adding the TSAG, but I would like to have a coffee break and now we have an issue, first one is section 11, and next one is section 17. Conflict in is okay. So Tanzania.

>> TANZANIA: Apologies, Mr. Chair, but we wanted just to get clarification on saying TSAG Committee. Is it TSAG, TSAG's Committee or Committee for TSAG. That is what we wanted. Apologies.

>> CHAIR: Russia

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, we don't have a big problem with TSAG Review Committee. You could say a Committee that's authorized by TSAG or with the consent of TSAG, or you could leave it as it is. The important thing, the main thing that we wanted to say that we are not talking here about two parallel structures. We are talking about one structure that comes under the auspices of TSAG at a determined level and that is given predetermined tasks by the assembly. And it reports through the assembly, there TSAG to the assembly. So it does that on the basis of the conditions determined in this document. We are not changing them. The only point I wanted to make at this stage and it's just a request is this, before we give final approval to this document, we would really like to see a clean version of the text. It's a new recommendation. It's in fact a new Resolution. And we would really lick to see a clean ‑‑ like to see a clean text so we don't miss anything. After all, there have been many, many changes and we don't want to miss any of them, so could we please ask that there be a clean text before final approval. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Of course, final approval should be made in the plenary. So I would the consent on the identified issues, and let's finalize in the plenary. So I would like to have a coffee break and the last floor to give to Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We also have no difficulty if we clearly mention TSAG Review Committee, that means it's not outside the box. It's inside the box, however, in order to be effective, some authority has been given to this Committee by the assembly and assembly is the superior of the TSAG could assign this to the Committee. The only thing we would like, Chairman, in the minutes of the plenary it is mentioned that the establishment of this group in no way is to diminish the key role of TSAG, nor reduce its authority and mandate. We would like to mention that TSAG remains and the key elements for the telecommunication standardization body ITU‑T, and we would like to mention that in the minutes of the plenary, but by the way of being more effective this TSAG Review Committee will be established and I think assembly is authorized to provide the mechanism how the reporting will be done. It has already been done. I don't have same difficulty with our distinguished Australian friend see. There is no difficulty because everything is mentioned here. The only thing we don't want to say it is outside the box, it is inside the box but we have a different mechanism in reports and how to work and how to function.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So I would like to have a coffee break, and also for some people I would like to discuss for our final solution, so I have requests from Kenya, United States, but I would like to discuss after the coffee break. So I would like to ask you to resume at 4:45 so sorry for short break, but about 20 minutes. Thank you.

(Break 4:24 to 4:45 pm)

>> CHAIR: Ladies and gentlemen, please take your seats. We will continue our session. Good afternoon, everyone. I would like to open our last session and still we have some important issue. First, I'd like to report to the coffee break discussion to find a compromise solution for the three remaining issues on the Review Committee Resolution and term of reference. And first, I would like to take that issue, then another important remaining issue under the Com 4 is Resolution related to 178JCA Resolution 178 then I would like to go back to the issue from the working, Com 4 Working Groups. We have to discuss Resolution 64.

This will be discussed after our discussion on strategic Review Committee and Resolution 178. So the compromise proposal on creation of strategic Review Committee, first one relates to part of the result 1 in Resolution current text now to establish Review Committee to fulfill, that should be TSAG should be added in front of the Review Committee. So now the resolve so establish TSAG Review Committee. So TSAG as you can see.

Are there any objections to this insertion of word TSAG in front of Review Committee? Germany.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Chair. I am not in native speaker of English, but to me the TSAG Review Committee implies a lot of ambiguity to me. Maybe it's supposed to review TSAG, I'm not sure. That's certainly not the objection of this. So I would prefer something else and we also would like to propose that the Review Committee might become a working party of the TSAG. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. As I mentioned prior to the coffee break, we have difficulty in accepting the addition of TSAG before Review Committee. I stress again that what we are reading in this Resolution is the WTSA has established this Review Committee. If it were to be a TSAG Review Committee, I don't see what the point of what we have been through over the last week and a half has been about because that TSAG Review Committee could have been established separately outside of the WTSA under TSAG itself. So that remains a fruitless exercise in itself. Additionally if you change to a TSAG Review Committee, it has further implications for much of the text that follows that deals with how the Committee works with reports to and is accountable to a certain extent the TSAG as well. So once again I stress that I don't think the addition of TSAG in resolves 1 is a good idea and I request that that be removed from Res 1, thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we would associate with the interventions of Germany and Australia. We understand that English is an exceedingly flexible language so it offers many possibilities but there is confusion to at least an English speaker to say TSAG Review Committee. So, Mr. Chairman, we believe there is an easy fix and it can be found, but that would create some confusion of understanding. The last point, Mr. Chairman is as you were reviewing this Resolution, we understood as well that the issue of whether or not to say conflict between standards or conflict in standards is still an open issue, and we wish you to return to that point.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: I will take it conflict in wording we will take later. Rwanda.

>> RWANDA:  I speak on behalf of the African group. Our preference is to be direct, Mr. Chairman, to remove confusion around the reporting of the Review Committee, and I want to propose that we consider to include to establish a Review Committee that reports to TSAG and then you can add other words.

>> CHAIR: And Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, once again, I would like to underscore a point. We consider that this Committee if there is a question of it, we could call it a TSAG Working Group, but this body will be a body that will exist within the structures of TSAG. It's not a body that should exist in parallel to TSAG and it's not a body that shall do tasks that are supposed to be done by TSAG. It's also very well to say that some of the tasks of TSAG might be given over to this Committee or to this Working Group if that's a more acceptable term for colleagues maybe we should call it TSAG Working Group. That's one option or we can say that it's a Review Committee, a Review Committee that works under the auspices of TSAG. For instance, we could say establish under the authority of TSAG a Review Committee. At any rate, we understand that we are talking about a formation within TSAG and that's very important.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Egypt, Japan, France, Australia. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. We would like to keep the proposal as it was submitted appears in the text. The report should be sent to, submitted to the TSAG as they have been, as it has been the document in order to maintain a balance between the two groups.

>> CHAIR: Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would like to propose to keep the name of this group, the Committee. The original reason Japan made this group is to establish this group under WTSA because we believe this activity is quite important for the ITU‑T and I think it is fully recognized by the discussion in the CTO meeting on TSS. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: France.

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, we have listened closely to the explanations and proposals from Russia, which propose clearly that this Committee be directed by TSAG. And that throughout the whole period between now and the next world assembly, it will be steered by Member States who are represented and sector members who are represented within TSAG, and it would not be logical to allow an autonomous group to develop along parallel lines, so we support this idea that this group be attached to TSAG. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Australia and Tunisia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you once again, Chair. In relation to the new text that's been proposed in resolve 1 that says report to TSAG, if you look at resolves instructs the Review Committee to it does say to report to TSAG on a regular basis, so that text is obviously not required.

It's already covered. In relation to this being a TSAG Review Committee or review group, again, I point out quite strongly that much of the following text would be redundant or would be nonsensical in some ways in the relationship to a TSAG Working Group. I think we fought long and hard for the past six drafting group meetings to insure that this group does have responsibilities and works closely with TSAG and in effect meets before TSAG immediately before to maintain that strong relationship, and I believe that those relationships have been agreed by our ad hoc drafting group through the course of six very long and difficult meetings.

The change to include TSAG before Review Committee is not going to help the situation, and we would rather not see that happen at all. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: And last Tunisia.

>> TUNISIA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, Tunisia has asked for the floor because it wishes to express support for the Arab group proposal that is the proposal put forward by the representative of Egypt. In other words, we believe that the Review Committee should be under the authority of TSAG ‑‑ sorry, of WTSA.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your comment. We have had a lot of discussion and repeated several times, but thing I want to clarify is relation between this Review Committee and TSAG has been clearly defined and regarding the part of instruct of Review Committee, first one said consider the result of CTU group, next is report to TSAG on regular basis, third, to conduct its initial review in timely manner so as to provide input to TSAG for the preparation of the ITU‑T strategic plan, and to submit its report to the next WTSA through TSAG, and also instruct TSAG to consider the Review Committee report in conformity with article 14A implementing the appropriate recommendation pending consideration at next WTSA.

Second, instruct TSAG to submit the report of the Review Committee without change to WTSA together within its comment. So I think your concern, I think those text could be served the relation and dependency has been clearly defined. So do not project suggested wording but for the moment if I add the word TSAG in front of the Review Committee, to prepare the proposal to the plenary I would like to propose to keep the existing text without TSAG so just to establish a Review Committee and no change, and I would like to have an informal consultation and final conclusion will be made in plenary. So regarding this part, I would like to take that decision.

And to clarify that what we discussed during the coffee break, we have two additional issues, and may the screen show the item section 11 of terms of reference after the or at the end of the 11B discuss and we add invited by the Chairman in consultation with the Vice Chairman and TSB Director. That text should be attached to the, after the discussion in 11B, and also same text should reappear at the end of the 11C. So last point is section item number 5, minimize conflict and that part proposal is conflict of the standards with ITU‑T standards.

That is my proposal so regarding the text, I would like to ask your support to accept those changes. Lastly, regarding the nomination of the Chairman, Vice Chairman, I think it should be made in this WTSA assembly and that information should be included in my meeting minutes. So based on that proposal can I ask your support to prepare the proposal to the plenary, and with agreed text we would like to discuss the final in plenary. Hopefully you can come with a compromise text. So I would like to have the comment Russia?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, we would request that at any rate, looking at resolves 1, if there is no agreement, then within square brackets, we should state under the authority of TSAG. And then if we are not able to reach an agreement, then it is an issue that will be resolved at plenary. We have the right to request that that be done. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So I would like to close the list, we have Kenya, Tanzania, France Telecom Orange, Egypt, Uganda, Egypt, Germany, Sweden, Uzbekistan and Japan, and United States. So Kenya.

>> KENYA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, before we adjourned for the coffee break, you had our flag up and you promised that you would give us the floor. Continuously we have raised our flag. You have tended to ignore us. We would like to respectively request you to recognize our right to be heard and not to continue to ignore us. Having said that, I only have one thing to say. We will object vigorously on the word TSAG in your first proposal. We will come back later with other points. It has to report to TSAG. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: And that report should be clearly in the instruct. Iran.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. May we take it one by one, with respect to item 5 you have amended we agree with your proposals which may be also supported by other people. Now, it is more clear to minimize the conflict of data standards with ITS standards. It's quite clear. It's much better than between and much better than in. So we fully support that it has resolved many ambiguities so that is accepted. Let's take it one by one to make point more clear so that is agreed so may you kindly request the reason you of your objection on the proposal on this item and then I have another proposal to make. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your suggestion. And as Mr. Roste suggested, my proposal is in section 5, conflict of the standards with ITU‑T standards. Are there any objections to my proposal in section 5? United States?

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We will not object to that formulation, but we wish to underscore that the emphasis here is on enhanced cooperation and in saying that, we would note that there are three Resolution from Guadalajara that speaks to other institutions that should on a reciprocal basis be in a cooperative relationship with the ITU. Mr. Chairman, we may ask at the time of the plenary to reference again those three footnotes to very important resolutions of Guadalajara and to underscore the importance of enhanced cooperation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay. We will take it and any other objection to my proposal. I would like to take the note and we would like to finish all of the list. So Tunisia.

>> TUNISIA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, Tunisia supports your last proposal for 5. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: France Telecom Orange.

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, I know that you are coming to the end of our consideration of this text and so I would just remind you that I had another point to flag. It's not actually on an issue that you have looked at thus far. It was rather an additional editorial improvement to the instructs the review in the section. Just take me a minute or so to introduce this. Looking at the current text of instructions the Review Committee here it refers in the first bullet point to the Review Committee being instructed to consider the results of the CTO group. Now, the word results in English is an ambiguous because the CTO meeting does not produce any result as such apart from a commune okay which is in the public domain and there may be a report sent by the Director to TSAG but the word results a little ambiguous.

Also the formulation CTO group is not appropriate. And I say that because the CTO group does not officially exist. It's not an official body of the ITU. In our current text we refer only to the CTO meeting. For that reason, my suggestion is instructs the Review Committee and then this is my proposed wording, to consider the outcomes of the CTO meetings, in particular, it's report. To consider the outcome meetings of the CTO comma in particular its report. Kyrgyzstan.

>> KYRGYZSTAN: Thank you for giving me the floor. We do not seem to have the possibility of taking the floor so if we had been able to get your attention earlier would like to do so know. We would like to support the proposal from Russian Federation with the inclusion of TSAG and we agree with point 5. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: It's not a point of order. Next Uganda.

>> UGANDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, on behalf of African group, I would like to state that we do not agree with the proposed way, the way you had summarized, especially as far as holding an informal meeting is concerned. Mr. Chairman, you proposed to take this to plenary. If that is your decision, then we stick with plenary because just before break you told us you were going to hold informal meeting. We didn't see it, so we think if it's your decision, we advance this to the plenary so we are able to pro pair input there's. Second, Mr. Chairman, I want to restrict myself to resolves. I would like to leave the proposal that I made idea that the Review Committee should report to TSAG so that when that point is discussed, we also have consideration of that. For us, this reviews ambiguity.

We know that they almost mean the same thing, but we want to be as clear as possible at this time and for this kind of discussion.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We check the current proposal to instruct ‑‑ no, no., instruct the review property in number two and to report to the TSAG on a regular basis. I think I have repeated it. So please understand that our result of discussion made in ad hoc. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. And coming back to Article 5, Item 5, though it is like a compromise solution and we can support that hoping that the ITU Arab will reflect this meeting so we reserve the right to see the Arab translation and see that it is aligned with this text, however, we have noted that there are some Member States that requested reference to some text referring to plenipotentiary Resolution. We want to amend that with the text which looks like while taking note of the preeminent role of the ITU, as standard setting integremental source F as stipulated in plan of the union and we can refer the council the exact document reflecting this sentence. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Germany.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Chair. Germany wants to reserve its position concerning resolves 1. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. Regarding 5, that's on the screen now, we have still some difficulties with the understanding of 5 since it seems to us that it's only the add organizations that should minimize the conflict with ITU‑T standards. In our understanding, it's a question of cooperation between organizations to avoid that the standards of conflicting which means that in some cases ITU‑T has to take steps. In other cases, the other organization has to take steps to achieve this goal.

And regarding the ‑‑ so we have difficulties with this text as it stands now, but we are prepared to consider it further and may come back in the plenary. Regarding the amendment proposed by Egypt, we also have difficulties. We do not see the relevance to refer to the strategic plan. If there should be any reference in any document, it has to be to the basic text of the union, but we would prefer not to see any text along the lines proposed by Egypt. We have a number of standardization organizations and the goal is to achieve a situation where they are not conflicting with each other. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Regarding the text on number 5 ‑‑ there is text on number 9, this is the result of the very lengthy discussion and compromised solution. So we strongly insist to keep this text. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, on 5, Paragraph 5 within the Review Committee terms of reference, we would like to say that we are in favor of the text as shown on the screen. On the other hand, on the idea of adding a footnote referring to plenipotentiary Resolution and references made to three plenipotentiary resolutions if that is to be linked to the Paragraph relating to enhancing cooperation with other organizations we were talking about creating Internet Protocol networks and new internet networks. Internet, with a small i. So this note, this footnote should include sections that are relevant and it would seem that at present it is including some parts that do not relate directly to things that have to do with standards and standard setting, so we don't think it's appropriate to add this footnote. Because we think that this footnote is linked to Paragraphs included in the plenipotentiary resolutions and we don't think it's appropriate to include it here, so summing up that's my position.

>> CHAIR: Iran.

>> IRAN: Thank you Chairman, while we fully recognize the right of every Member State or membership to make any statement, perhaps we suggest that you take the issue one we bun. First clear number 5 and then go too other, otherwise, we may not finish this meeting at all. As Dr. Beaird mentioned, in Item 5 the emphasis is on enhanced cooperation. That's all. So colleagues need to take that into account and I don't agree with those distinguished colleagues that say ITU you need to adjust data standards according to standard of regional organization or other organization that is not the issue on the table. The issue is enhanced cooperation. So minimize that let us be fine with each other. So I think kindly please take number five to see perhaps you could clear it here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And I would like to complete the list. So Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, on 5, section 5, we don't have any objection to the text that you proposed. On the proposal made by France Telecom Orange, again, we are willing to support that on one we have already spoken so I will not repeat what we already said. The only point I would like to draw to your attention is this. When colleagues said that the Committee should report to TSAG, then if I understand directly, what they had in mind was not some kind of interim report alone, but a final report. If I'm correct in that understanding, then I understand that there is a wish for TSAG to have the possibility of considering what had been done by the Committee, and then making changes, if I understood colleagues correctly. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United States and finally Egypt.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We wish to reiterate.

As we indicated we can accept your formulation in number 5. We had indicated when we said that that we wish to emphasize enhanced cooperation, and in so doing, we will make a statement in plenary on final approval of this document, that will also reference the footnote in 3 resolutions of Guadalajara to underscore the importance of enhanced cooperation with the internet technical community. We did not propose, Mr. Chairman, and we seek to apologize for any misunderstanding, we did not propose that that footnote be added to number 5. As a result, Mr. Chairman, we would invite Egypt and others who have a view on that subject to join with us and make their statement in plenary and allow it to go into the record.

Mr. Chairman, then with respect to the instructs Review Committee, we would support the intervention of France and the suggestions that France has made, and we would hope if we simply reorder the instructs to begin with the report to TSAG on a regular basis, and to conclude with, to consider the results of the CTO group as remanded by France that by emphasizing that in the first instructs, the Review Committee should report to TSAG, we hope that by that mean, we ease some of the concern of our colleagues from the Russian Federation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And with that explanation from our dear colleague Mr. Beaird from the United States we reserve our rights to come back to the plenary which is related to plenipotentiary Resolution regarding strategic plan of the union. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: I would like to ask interpreter to give us another additional ten minutes interpretation if possible.

>> Yes, an additional ten minutes, Chairman.

>> That's fine, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: For your indulgence, I appreciate. Regarding the final proposal, I think we are now almost able to reach agreement, but still we need more time, but I would like to limit the issue to be discussed, section 5, section 11, and those resolve part in Resolution. And I would like to ask to join the informal consultation this evening, and I would like to prepare the final proposal and the final discussion will be made in plenary.

Can I ask you to accept this proposal? Thank you very much. So within a very limited time, and I would like to ask you to take the agenda 4C on JCA Resolution 178 and relevant document is TD61. . This is a report of ad hoc group on JCA‑Res 178. This is a report and the group that is tasked to resolve the concern expressed during the session and examine the ToR of the JCA‑Res 178 and report back to the Committee 4, and it considered a Director proposal for revised ToR of the revised Resolution 178 and agreed by TOR with amendment as the Annex but during the discussion it was identified that there were two proposals on the name of the group as JCA and appropriate group. For example, a joint Working Group or joint working party. The definition of the group should be clarified, and this could be further discussed. And first, I would like to ask your approval to the proposed revised text which in Annex of TD61. The modifications were made to the second Item of term of reference and addition of the third one. This was agreed by the ad hoc group. Before we discuss the naming of the group, first, I would like to have your approval of this proposed terms of reference. Any objection? Any objection? I see none. Proposal is accepted. And next, regarding the name of the JCA or other naming, I think first I want to clarify that regarding the name of the JCA, JCA definition is defined in clause 2.3 of ITU recommendation 8.1. And regarding the working party or joint working parties defined in clause 2.1.4 and 2.1.5. My observation to the proposal to use a joint working party, the working party have to define the specific questions. It is the definition of working party. So with this in mind, it seems to me it is premature to use a joint working party and JCA would be a more appropriate arrangement as we discussed in the last TSAG.

So my proposal is that we use the name of JCA as agreed by TSAG, but I would like to propose to add a text in the term of reference as post Item as appropriate to propose creation of joint working parties or other groups. So my proposal is to use the James of JCA as we agreed in TSAG, and adding the text either post ToR. I would like to repeat, at the post term of reference as appropriate ‑‑ term of reference as appropriate to propose creation of joint working parties or other groups. And your position so my compromised proposal. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, in that case, as we see it, we need to raise the status of the group that we want to establish. Afterall, Resolution 178 is very clear. It refers to the establishment of a Study Group or other group. In our supreme body, there is nothing about an activity. As for the questions you refer to, well, in this case in the text, the question is written with a small letter. It's not written with a capital letter, and that means that we are talking about any question that comes before the group. We are not talking about a question with a capital letter, a question for study that's has to be agreed upon and that we have an established practice for agreeing upon. Therefore, we can establish the joint working party if we consider that that's necessary.

And we are certainly entirely able to do that and we think that such an important issue should be dealt with at the level of a joint working party, and we think that that would be the response to Resolution 178. And in line with it, after all, in that Resolution, there is nothing at all about a JCA. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Due to the lack of time, I would like the last comment, Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, the ‑‑ of Brazil propose will documentation of report 178 has been established and in that is referred to the Study Group or group. The importance is that we address the issue raised in 175. The naming is to have a consensus. If there is a consensus for JCA, so far, so good, if not, people will be more comfortable to have Working Group. Working Group under the TSAG. And I think ‑‑ I don't think that makes a big difference. The importance is that somebody should do the job. Perhaps it would be more appropriate to create a Working Group, which is referred to in Resolution 178 and under the parentcy of the TSAG so that would be simple so we have need to have consensus on JCA, but not joint Working Group. There is so many options, it is difficult, Chairman, could we limit the option on two, JCA or Working Group of TSAG. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I have to close this meeting within five minutes. So through the ad hoc discussion, I see that there is broad support, and given that the proposal has been widely discussed by the two camps in the issue, I would like to close debate by declaring that while there is good support for the creation of a JCA Resolution 178, given some concern from several administrations, and very loaded agenda, the best way for this is that we defer this idea to plenary. Can we go along with that? U.K.?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We were going to ask to comment, but as the issue has been deferred to plenary, we will bring up our concern there. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So if you can support to defer the discussion to plenary, I would like to move the next final issue. Any request? Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you. Chairman, if we would like to apply Resolution 178 in the best possible way, we should adopt the proposals from Russia and Iran. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So, so I would like to close the list and United States and France and please consider the time. Thank you.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and we can support your decision to send this issue to plenary. We would, of course, express now as we will in plenary the support for the term JCA. Mr. Chairman, we would only ask that the summary that you have provided to Com 4 also be included in your report to the plenary. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Finally, France.

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. Now, in principle we support the idea of a JCA which will continue with the work of TSAG, but as you have said, it should go to plenary and we agree with these conclusions from your meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I have closed the list, so please accept my apology, and this discussion will be discussed in the plenary. Thank you very much.

So lastly, I would like to move to the final Resolution, 69 ‑‑ 64 from the Working Group. I would like to invite Working Group OA Mr. Bigi.

>> FABIO BIGI: Thank you Mr. Chairman. We go speedily because we have submitted to your plenary resolution 64 in TD48 because there were still text in square brackets there was in considering F and I encourage after my meeting informal discussion because there were in the meeting far reaching proposal that we cannot have in front of us, so we were obliged to defer discussion. My understanding is, if someone will correct me, that some solution has been found because finally there has been agreed to delete the square brackets, and eventually the text could be added at the end of the Resolution and I think the informal convener for the activity he has performed. So may I request if there are any observation, or any proposal on this, if you allow me, Chairman. United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And Mr. Chairman, we wish to express our appreciation to you and to the convener of the informal group that met during the lunch period. Mr. Chairman, we benefited a great deal from that discussion and we wish to express our appreciation in that regard to colleagues. Mr. Chairman, it is our view that if we could understand a statement of a fact, there may be and I'm certain that many would express an interest in the ITU‑T to become additional registry of IP addresses. And colleagues may wish to express themselves as they have, and we will take that as a fact that many developing countries believe that that should be done.

But Mr. Chairman, that is only an incomplete picture. We cannot go from the expression of an opinion, however, factual that opinion may be, to a reality. Fortunately within the ITU we have procedures that deal expressly with expanded jurisdiction of the ITU, and in the allocation of budgetary resources for that purpose. And the meeting that as that issue is the plenipotentiary. Grant me one moment to give you an example.

It has come before the attention of the council that the ITU may be interested in serving as supervisory authority for unidroit in the implementation of its treaty decisions formulated in the meeting of March of this year. We have expressed in council a willingness for the Secretary General to participate in meetings for the planning of the supervisory authority. However, it was explicitly the decision of council that no decision can be made with the expansion of the jurisdiction of the ITU or with the allocation of budget for that purpose until the plenipotentiary in 2014.

In the same spirit, Mr. Chairman, we can accept F as a fact, but more is needed and that more that is needed is in recognition of the important and vital role that the plenipotentiary plays in matters such as this. So, Mr. Chairman, we would commend to your attention and to the Committee for the necessary to include the plenipotentiary in any discussion concerning F. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So I have to close, and I would like to ‑‑ no, as we, as I ask you, so we have to defer this Item to the plenary, so can we go along with this? Thank you for your understanding. So sorry for the interpreters, and I would like to say thank you for your support and we will arrange informal meeting on the Review Committee and please check the screen and tentatively from after 19 hours, the meeting will be arranged. Thank you, and meeting is adjourned.

(Applause).

(Meeting adjourned at 17:45)

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

This text is being provided in a rough draft format.

Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided

in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may

not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

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