FINISHED TRANSCRIPT

WORLD TELECOMMUNICATION STANDARDIZATION ASSEMBLY

DUBAI, UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

NOVEMBER 28, 2012

PLENARY – P.M. SESSION

14:30 CET

CAPTIONING PROVIDED BY:

CAPTION FIRST, INC.  
P.O. BOX 3066  
MONUMENT, CO 80132  
1‑877‑825‑5234

+001‑719‑481‑9835

www.captionfirst.com

\*\*\*\*\*

This 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.

\*\*\*\*

>> CHAIR: Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen. We come back to the Plenary session. Apologies for the late start. We had lots of side discussions. There is an early request for the floor from Italy. Italy, you have the floor.

>> ITALY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon. Italy would like to take this opportunity to make a quick announcement. So in order to help ITU implement your Resolution 72 on EMF, Resolution 73 on ICT environment and climate change, a new resolution on e‑waste, Italy would be happy to co‑organize with ITU‑T the Eighth Select Use Symposium on ICT, the environment and climate change. If my Colleagues and the Director of TSB agrees, the Symposium hosted by Telecom Italia is supposed to take place in Turin on 10th, 11th and 12th April 2013 preceded by a workshop on EMF on 9th April 2013. Director of TSB and Colleagues, we hope that this proposal will be agreeable to you and we look forward to welcoming all of you in Italy in April. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. The Director of the TSB, please.

>> MALCOLM JOHNSON: Thank you, Chairman. Good afternoon. I would like to thank Italy for offering to host this Symposium. The series of Symposiums have been very successful and I am sure this will be in Italy in the beautiful city of Turin. Italy has been very supportive to the work on the environment which ‑‑ and hosted the first green standards week last year and was also very successful. So we look forward very much to working with our Italian friends to make sure that this event will be a great success. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Johnson. I would like to bring the ‑‑ to your attention Document No. 33 Rev 2 which is available now online. It is the modified agenda for today's meeting, remaining of Plenary. A document of ‑‑ the document will be available on the screens now. The document is available online to be downloaded. So we start with Document 112 under agenda Item No. 2, consideration of reports of Committee 3. Will the Chairman of Committee 3 please give ‑‑ walk us through the report. Thank you.

>> STEPHEN TROWBRIDGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I won't take too much of your time as many of the things in this report that we have asked the Plenary to do you have already done in your decisions of this morning. Document 112 is the ‑‑ is what's listed as the final report of Committee 3. We will post a revision to this to fill in a few document numbers that were not known as of the time of posting at about 12:30 last night but this was prepared after the conclusion of our meetings.   
 I would like to recognize and note in the introduction the structure and leadership of our Committee, and in particular I would like to acknowledge the contributions of my Vice Chairmen which included Mr. Abdulla from Bahrain and Mr. Gracie from Canada and Mr. Lee from Korea and Mr. Mukhanov from the Russian Federation. In this case all my Vice Chairmen took on tasks within the Committee and led drafting groups to help us in the completion of our work. That's not always the case. I am quite pleased that the administration sought fit to dominate individuals who came here to do work. In addition I would like to acknowledge the two chairmen of the Working Groups within Committee 3, Working Group 3A was Chaired by Mr. Dubuisson of France and Working Group 3B was Chaired by Mr. Gracie of Canada.   
 Moving on to the results of the work of Committee 3, just to tell you the structure of the document, Clause 2 covers the Resolutions we have put forward from Committee 3 for your consideration. You will see a number of document numbers filled in and underscores to provide a space to write in the numbers when they became available. We have already covered most of this material. So that may not be necessary. And as I indicated we intend to revise this document shortly after all of the documents are available.   
 Clause 3 will tell you the A series recommendations we put forward for revision. And again we have places where we knew the document numbers and that's filled in and other places where we didn't know them as of the time of posting.   
 We will address a few editorial issues of this in the Resolution in the update of it. One thing missing we have a lot of this information in tabular form in the Annex and we had neglected to include Resolution 67 which is one that you have already covered.   
 Of the decisions yet to take you have covered all but four of our texts put forward. So we will be considering later in this Plenary the update to Resolution 1, two new Resolutions labeled as Canada 1 and Brazil 1 and one additional A series revised recommendation which is Recommendation A5. Those are still to come for your decision. In addition to thanking my Vice Chairmen and Working Group Chairman and I would like to give a special thanks to the TSB staff, Ms. Kurakova and Mr. Ratta and Sarah Scott was helping as our assistant and helping us get the documentation moved along behind the scenes and that was very, very helpful to us and, of course, the interpreters who helped us in our work. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Trowbridge. And thank you to your reference to the Committee and Colleagues. I am sure that we will still come back to you with the remaining Resolutions that are yet to be planted out. And we appreciate if you assign it to us throughout the day when will the last contribution be to the Plenary. So excellent work conducted by Committee 3. And we have the report, the final report of Committee 3 in front of us with the set of modifications that Mr. Trowbridge has highlighted and the set of Resolutions and that will be updated accordingly when the documents are ready.

So with that in mind Document 112 is presented in front of the Assembly for approval. Do we have any comments or views on the document? Thank you. I see none. So the report of the Chair of Committee 3 in Document 112 is approved by the Assembly. Thank you.   
 We move on to agenda Item No. 3, consideration and approval of reports of Committee 4. I would like to ask Mr. Yoichi Maeda to present the documents, 98, 104, 111 and 110. The floor is yours.

>> YOICHI MAEDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Regarding the document, the relevant documents I confirm for the Committee 4, 98, 104, 111, and 110 and to this Plenary I think Document 111 is a final report to this Plenary. I would confirm the documents to be presented.

>> CHAIR: Yes. Please you may go ahead.

>> YOICHI MAEDA: So I would like to ask ‑‑ take Document 111. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The terms of reference of Committee is a work program and realization of ITU‑T and we had six sessions and we have strong support of the Vice Chairmen, Fabio Bigi of Italy, Liu Duo of China, Hassan Talib of Morocco and I would like to express thanks to the support from the TSB. Regarding the output you have already reviewed our output, our Resolution. So I would like to just try to focus on the issues to be discussed in this Plenary.   
 In the report Section 2 summarizes activity related to the Study Group structure and all results are now reflected to the revised Resolution 2. And we have agreed to all the documents and as a result we agreed to keep the ten Study Groups and made a good refinement.   
 So that's all the key essence that belong to the Section 2.   
 Next issue is Resolution at Committee 4 level. 3.1 shows new Resolutions. We have three new Resolutions and one is Resolution on standardization work in ITU‑T for software define networking. And it is contained in Document 90 and meeting agreed. And next one is a new Resolution on information and communication technology applications and standards for improved access to e‑Health service. And we have reviewed this new Resolution. And I will be able to report to you later and I had two informal sessions in the morning and lunchtime. And I am glad to inform you that we have agreed to the revised update of the Resolution and the compromised final result will be introduced later.   
 Third new Resolution under the COM 4 is the law of telecommunication/information and communication technology in combating and controlling e‑waste from telecommunication and information technology equipment and methods of treating it as needed. So this is ‑‑ those are three new Resolutions from Committee 4.   
 And next 3.2 shows agreed revised Resolutions and you have already discussed the list, and I am not going to read all of the rest of the document.   
 Section 3.3 we agreed to suppress four Resolutions, Resolution 26, 17, 56, 63. And in the morning as we received the comment from the Committee 3 Chairman some coordination between the COM 3 and COM 4 should be arranged, and I think TSB will check the deletion of the ‑‑ deletion of those Resolutions.   
 Section 4 we agreed the new opinion on the practical application of new network externality e premium in Document 106. I would like to give us an approval to create new regional groups. We have agreed three regional groups. One is ITU‑T Study Group 2, regional group for the Americas. Second one is ITU‑T Study Group 5, regional groups for the Americas. And third one is ITU‑T Study Group 13, regional group for Africa. Those three new regional groups should be reviewed and those documents are contained in 104 including an Annex. The terms of reference of those three regional groups is described in Document 104.   
 So the next section 6 is most important to the Plenary discussion. Due to the lack of the time and heavy workload I had to report that four open issues are referred to the Plenary discussion. First one is creation of the JCA Resolution 178. So unfortunately Committee 4 of Plenary were not able to resolve the issue and to take decision on the proposal in the document which is TD61 and we have to ‑‑ we decided to defer the matter of the content containing 114 Revision 1 to this Plenary for the action.   
 Section 6.2 is the issue on Resolution 64 and we have reviewed this Resolution and we are now waiting for the result of the coordination discussion to reach agreement. Next point, 6.4 is draft new Resolution on the strategic and structural review of ITU‑T. And we have discussed terms of reference of the new proposed Review Committee. Good progress was achieved in our Committee. Still two open issues remain as the debate concluded. The last draft of new Resolution is included in Document 113.   
 In order to address them in view of the short time available I decided to organize an informal consultation meeting to try to resolve them last night. So Document 113 contains a proposal for a way forward. So debate on draft new Resolution is deferred to the consideration of this Plenary.   
 So that's key result of the Committee 4 or discussion. And as a Chairman I would like to express my thanks to all the contributors of the documents allocated to the COM 4 and its participants and Distinguished Delegates. In particular I have too long lists and it is difficult to read out all the names. But I have listed some key names on the report.   
 That is my report and ‑‑ but to summarize for this Plenary what I would like to ask you to discuss, I would like to clarify that point. First one is to approve the final report of the Committee 4 listed in Clause 1.3, address a pending issue from Committee 4, identify Clause 6.1 on the JCA Resolution 178, Section 6.2 on Resolution 64, and Section 6.3 on Resolution on Review Committee. That's the first point.

Second point to approve the text of question as given in Clause 2.3.1 to the following arrangement for the cloud computing security work in ITU‑T. So text has been provided from the Committee members and I would like to take this information in the report of this Plenary.   
 Second item is to approve four new draft Resolutions as given in Clause 3.1. Next is for your confirmation to approve revision of 24 resolutions as given in Clause 3.2. In addition to suppressing Resolution 63 approved at the third session of the WTSA Plenary to suppress additional three Resolutions as given in Clause 3.3. Also I would like to request to mandate the TSB to check Resolution 2, Annex C prior to publication to ensure that the detailed recommendation series allocation to Study Group properly reflect all the decisions taken by the Assembly. But it has been already confirmed in the morning session.   
 And next item is approve the new opinion as given in Clause 4. Firstly, I would like to ask to give approval to three regional groups as given in Clause 5. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Maeda, for your report and thank you for the excellent work of you and your Vice Chair Committee 4 and participants. I have a question with clarification with regards to the numbering. On Page No. 5 and Clause 6 you have 6.1 and 6.2 and 6.4. Is this an error in the numbering or is there a particular reason we don't have 6.3? And similarly on the Annex matters you would like us to approve, you have item Nos. 1 and 3. 2 and 4 are missing. It is not a mistake in the print. Probably just the numbering convention. Thank you.

>> YOICHI MAEDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, you are correct and it is a typo error I think.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So with the correction of the numbering on Section 6 and the Annex we have in front of us the approval of the Committee 4 reports, the five reports listed in Clause No. 1.3 of this document. So would the Assembly agree with us to approve all the five reports please? Are there any comments, any objection to the approval of the reports of Committee 4? I see none. Thank you. So this part is approved. All the reports of Committee 4 included in Article of Clause 1.3 are approved.   
 The next item on the approval is the text of questions given as stipulated in Clause No. 2.3.1. If you may refer to the document, please, if you have any comments in approving this specific text. Does anyone have any objection to the approval? Any comments on the text in front of us? I see none. Thank you. The next item would be No. 10 on the list which is approving the three regional groups as being presented in Clause No. 5 of this report. Are there any comments or views? I see none. Thank you. And the remaining items would be discussed and presented as the documents come out. So the remaining Resolutions and draft Resolutions will be addressed whenever the documents are presented or available for presentation. Thank you.   
 So with that can we please approve the report, the fifth report of Committee 4 in Document 111? Thank you. So the report of Committee 4 in Document 111 is approved. Thank you.   
 Mr. Maeda, would you please go through Document 114 Rev 1?

>> YOICHI MAEDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I introduce the report on ‑‑ of 114 Revision 1 I have reported to the ‑‑ reported the Committee 4 result to this Plenary. And in my report, in our 111 include acknowledgement and if there are any error of the names to express my acknowledgement, please tell me and the secretary for any correction.   
 And I would like to explain the document. This is related to the JCA on technical aspects of Telecommunication Networks to support the Internet. We call JCA Resolution 178. So Committee 4 considered the result from the discussion of Ad Hoc meeting on JCA Resolution 178. And we met. I don't need to read that. And in the Committee meeting I proposed to add task force for the group, possible compromise solution and there was no discussion on this proposal due to the lack of the time. So currently agreed update terms of reference for such group is found in this document with the addition of the ‑‑ my proposal in square bracket and further discussions were deferred to this Plenary due to the lack of the time. And this document Annex just show the revised terms of reference and in terms of reference we agreed to modify the Items 2 and 3 of the terms of reference.   
 And I would like to propose to keep the name of the JCA as we agreed in TSAG, but through the long discussion made in Committee 4 my suggestion is to use the name of the JCA but to add post terms of reference which says as appropriate to propose creation of joint working party or other groups.   
 So we had two groups on this naming. The one group requests to use a name of joint working party or other groups of the PP Resolution 178. But we have a lot of support and support including the TSAG agreement, JCA would be appropriate at this stage, but additional terms of reference in the first item I hope this will solve the other concern. This is my proposal. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Maeda. Just for clarification to what extent the Committee 4 has addressed this and which part was specifically not presented and which part that had the debates and you would like to bring it forward to the consideration of the Plenary? Are all the changes here? All the highlighted changes? Thank you.

>> YOICHI MAEDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Annex of this document shows the terms of reference and modification made in Items 2 and 3. Those two are agreed in Committee 4. But after that whether we call this group other name of JCA, JCA on Resolution 178 or working or joint Working Groups on Resolution 178, that naming is pending.   
 So additional proposal to the terms of reference is to solve that concern of the naming, whether we use JCA or not. I hope this clarifies your question. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Maeda. So we have the Document 114 Revision 1 in front of us with the proposed terms of reference for the JCA and the proposal from the Chairman of Committee 4 is to have the fourth item in the terms of reference which is this text under the ‑‑ between the square brackets to solve the issues of the naming of this group. And the document is presented for you for approval. Do we have any objection to the proposal made by the Chairman of Committee 4? Russia, you have the floor, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, we consider that there is a very clear indication given to us by the Plenipotentiary in Resolution 178. The instructions are very clear. We are supposed to work on the technical aspects and as appropriate we are supposed to create Study Groups or other groups. It is very clear in 178. We have attentively considered Resolution A1 and we have looked at 221 and there reference is made to JCA. It is very clear. It clearly indicates that the establishment of a JCA is mainly intended to improve coordination and planning; that it is not something that deals with technical studies or that develops recommendations. So that being so it cannot fulfill the tasks that it is instructed to fill in the way that has been determined by the Plenipotentiary. And it seems to us that the Assembly has to put in to practice the decisions that have been handed down to it by a higher body and I am not sure that we should interpret this Resolution in the way that it would now appear. It seems to us that the Plenipotentiary gave a very clear and understandable view and why don't we do what the Plenipotentiary requires us to do. We fully understand that establishing a new Study Group is something that involves enormous financial expense. Yes, we understand that, but dropping the level of implementation to coordination activity as we see it is not correct and it is not in line with the spirit of the Resolution.   
 So we are proposing not a joint coordination activity but a joint working party. And we can then decide which would be the lead Study Group and so on so that we can be in compliance with Resolution 178 and implement it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. United Kingdom, please.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Under the last point that was just raised, we believe under Resolution 178 it does give the ITU the ability to adapt and work in a coordinated manner to meet the needs. We also have a question with regards to the additional point 4. It appears to be very broad. And we believe that groups have to be agreed by WTSA anyway. And we would like some clarification as to what is the output and methods and focus of those additional groups that are mentioned here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UK. I believe that the intent was to reach a compromise on the namings. And I am sure that the Chairman of Committee 4 did discuss this in terms of what would be the terms and the outcome of the type of coordination authorities of the Study Groups. So I would ask the Committee 4 Chairman again to answer the question raised by the UK, what are the other types of joint working party groups that we have proposed in the text and what are the methods of working within those groups, if you have discussed in Committee 4 now, please.

>> YOICHI MAEDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have had a long discussion and this original proposal came from the TSB electives and based on the input from the TSAG. So we tried to review the proposed terms of reference and at Committee 4 we tried to resolve the concern, but I would like to offer this proposal to the Plenary and it should be discussed at the Plenary. This is my proposal to you. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Iran, you can take the floor, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, the administration of Brazil kindly submitted a very important document to the Plenipotentiary conference for establishment of the Study Group dealing with the technical issues of the Internet. After lengthy debate the Plenipotentiary reflected the request in an appropriate manner in Resolution 178 and tasked the director and the TSB and ITU‑T to take necessary action in order to identify appropriate mechanisms to do that. Chairman, the importance is not the mechanism. The importance is the work. Many countries including and in particular developing countries they are in need of this technical work on the Internet.   
 Consequently the mechanism to do this work should be as such to be in a position to carry out the work. We fully appreciate the efforts of the TSAG and we are grateful to them and also appreciate the kind efforts of the director of the TSB. However we are in the Assembly of the TSB, of the ITU‑T that wider representations of Distinguished Colleagues from various countries, in particular those who were interested in the matter. Chairman, the issue that we have to discuss is what is the most appropriate mechanisms, JCA or I would put it in the other form, Working Group but not joint working parties. If you refer to joint working parties, joint working party, Chairman, refer in Paragraph 215 under Study Group management. It may be difficult to have joint working parties for this ‑‑ it is for Study Groups. In fact, the Study Group 13 they have joint working parties for NGN and so on and so forth. That is possible. But for this action which involved more than a Study Group I have some doubt that whether joint working parties could fit within the objectives and purposes and content of the Resolutions, various Resolutions of the WTSA. Chairman, one possible option for the colleagues to consider is to establish a TSAG working party.   
 And then TSAG working party because TSAG is not overseeing but coordinating the activities of all Study Groups may make necessary arrangements in order that this very important issue be properly studied. Now it is up to the Assembly to see whether JCA which is just coordinating activities is a best approach or working party is the most appropriate approach. JCA could coordinate but who will do the job? JCA? And what mechanism of JCA will do the job. JCA could not have joint working parties. Joint working party for the Study Group unless ou modify Recommendation A1 that we have currently approved. I think in the morning you have approved that. So we could not come back to that unless you want to take the document back and amend it but having a Working Group of TSAG may not cause any difficulty. In general, Chairman, this administration is in favor to do the work in the most appropriate manner, either JCA if there is a Consensus or working party of TSAG if there is a Consensus. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. And I think you meant Working Group to the TSAG and not working party. I have a number of requests for the floor. I think I will give this item five minutes of discussion. If we could not resolve this, then we probably have to defer discussions and not take more time from the Plenary.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is our belief that under the working of the JCA the lead Study Group would undertake the work and perform those tasks. We would also like to understand better that if the alternative proposal was to be considered what would be the output of such a group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom. United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And good afternoon to all colleagues. Mr. Chairman, we would wish to support the conclusions of the Chair of Committee 4 and in particular as those conclusions reflect the long discussion that we have had in Committee 4, but also we support the creation of a joint coordination activity, a JCA to address the resolves of Resolution 178 because we have the benefit of the work undertaken by Mr. Rushton and his group and the advice of TSAG as to what would be the best approach to comply with Resolution 178.   
 And the report that they have prepared in TD424 Rev 1 before TSAG is a complete report and we thank them for the analysis. And we think the analysis leads us then appropriately to the conclusion of the creation of a joint coordination activity.   
 Mr. Chairman, we would note that the resolves of Resolution 178 is that the ITU shall continue to adapt working in a coordinated and transparent manner development of technical aspects of Telecommunications Networks for supporting the Internet. And then there is a range of areas that that should be taking consideration, network evolution, capacity, continuity, interoperability, security through contribution based work. Mr. Chairman, that is a description of multiple Study Groups already existing within ITU‑T and we have made that very clear as to the organization of that work at the WTSA.   
 A joint coordination activity can see all of the work of the Study Groups. It itself does not do the work already assigned by the Study Groups. But it oversees them. It coordinates, and lastly, Mr. Chairman, it makes suggestions, underscore suggestions as to what adaptations are necessary to fulfill Resolution 178 as well as the efficient work undertaken in the area of the Internet activities at the ITU.

So, Mr. Chairman, for those reasons we support the conclusion of the Chairman. We support the creation of a joint coordination activity and we would make only one modification and that is in 4 as it reads now. It says "As appropriate to propose creation." We would say "As appropriate to suggest creation of joint working parties or other groups." A JCA may suggest; it may not propose. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. France please.

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Under the considerings where it has been worked on very hard, and they made the original proposal for the establishment of a joint activity, we would support the Chairman's proposal which is in the spirit of the original proposal and I think responds to the issues, the complex issues which we are trying to deal with. And I think that as a compromise one could introduce Paragraph 4 which proposes the establishment of a structure, we could deal with proposals. So I would support your proposal, Mr. Chairman, and would support the notion of joint activity in order to deal with these matters.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, France. Egypt.

>> SPAIN: Mr. Chairman, it is actually Spain. Mr. Chairman?

>> CHAIR: Okay.

>> SPAIN: Mr. Chairman, thank you. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to agree with the point made by the Delegation of France a few moments ago. We must respect the work that has been undertaken in the past on this matter both by TSAG and by this Assembly. Therefore not only did the TSAG propose the creation of a joint activity but in the report of the COM 4 it was indicated there was agreement of the terms of reference. And in light of those terms of reference I believe that it is a joint coordination activity since the work required is to consider issues of interest and of study. So I think in order to show solidarity with the work that has been accomplished we would support the proposal of the Chairman of COM 4. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Yes, we would like to add our voice to our colleagues from the U.S. as well as Spain and the UK. We believe that the JCA is the right tool. We believe that it maintains the spirit of openness and collaboration both with the group that's ‑‑ the work that's already taking place within the ITU and also work that's taking place in other SDOs. Thanks very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. I see the list is lining up. Two more interventions from the floor. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. We, too, would like to lend our support to the intervention by the representative of the Russian Federation and indeed we consider that the intervention by the representative of Iran and their proposal would be an appropriate manner of implementing Resolution 178, a Resolution which specifically establishes a creation of a working ‑‑ of a Study Group and not a group dealing with another activity. Not a joint activity.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. I have got on the list Brazil, China, Greece and Portugal. So we start with Brazil, please.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As we all know the original idea from Brazil during the Plenipot, the last Plenipot was to create a Working Group to deal with technical issues regarding the Internet. But that was not agreed in the last TSAG. And so Brazil brought to this Assembly the results of the TSAG which now in our opinion can reflect the spirit of Resolution 178 and also bring the Consensus. And we would wish to echo Iran's statement that the results of this group and every other group in the ITU‑T and the participation of the administrations are the most important to accomplish its objectives.   
 To conclude, Mr. Chairman, we are in favor of the proposed text. And we would also like to re‑enforce the idea and ‑‑ for Member States to participate in this JCA. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. China, please.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Chairman. China thanks the TSAG and the JCA as well as all the other administrations for their ideas which is best to implement Resolution 178. So we thank the Chair of COM 4 for his proposal considering that the Internet and the ICT and the Telecom Sector play a more and more important role. We think that the means to implement the 178 Resolution is very important. So is it the JCA or some other groups or joint working party? So I think this question is one that needs a special study. So we think, we hope to adopt a more proactive and effective manner to implement the task from the Resolution 178. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China. Next is Greece, please.

>> GREECE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would like to support the idea that the joint coordination activity is the best, most efficient way to implement Resolution 178. And we would like to support the statement from Canada, United States and others. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And finally Portugal, please.

>> PORTUGAL: Thank you. Portugal is in agreement with a number of countries that they have previously expressed support for the model of joint coordination activity to implement Resolution 178. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Portugal. I see on the list of interventions and discussions that there is extensive support for the joint coordination activity. We have heard the comment from Iran that they are in support of JCA, and if the JCA does not go through and probably the best way is the Working Group and the support was given from the Arab States with the same comment. There is a Consensus there is a support towards the JCA, and I would like to proceed in this manner that we accept the proposal of the Chairman of Committee 4 that is in front of us. And is there opposition to that? Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, of course, we have to seek compromise. As a compromise we would like to make a proposal. We would agree to a JCA but we would like this JCA not to operate for the whole four years. We would like to limit the working period for this JCA; for instance, between now and the next TSAG and then have to report on its work and make some kind of proposals. So in that way we would be keeping the whole spirit of 178. And, of course, we would ultimately have this activity, this JCA and then have it reporting to TSAG. So in 4 we would say and to draft a report on its work to TSAG in 2013 and then we would follow the text and to propose the creation of joint working parties or other groups, that would remain unchanged. That's our proposal to Amendment 4 under the terms of reference.

>> CHAIR: Before I read out the proposal made by the Russian Federation, Iran, you had asked for the floor before that. Please go ahead.

>> IRAN: We support the Consensus as emerging which is emerging now and support the Chair, perhaps because we have been told that the joint working party could be established under the parent group or parent Study Group. If we agree to the JCA, we have to identify the parent group for that JCA. Would it then be possible to designate TSAG for that? If that is the case, if that is the case, then the Paragraph 4 should be slightly modified and we leave it to the TSAG to create joint working parties if necessary or under this discretion of TSAG. We suggest that perhaps if other colleagues do not have difficulty we designate or the Assembly designates TSAG as the parent group for this JCA. JCA has many activities among many Study Groups and TSAG would be the most appropriate entity. That is a suggestion. And we support the Chair and Consensus is emerging. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. United Kingdom, you have the floor, please.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to point out that the issue of the parent group for the JCA is already taken care of under the section methods of working within this document. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom. That is the point I would like to highlight to Delegates from Russia. Would this text be satisfactory ‑‑ you make the same proposal under the Item 4 of the terms of reference because the method of working does highlight the JCA will report to TSAG. So do you still want the same text that you wanted to add in Item No. 4? Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. We always work in the spirit of Consensus and agree with your proposal.

>> CHAIR: My proposal was that the text presented in method working, the JCA shall report to TSAG and would be satisfactory and no need to add any more text to Item 4 in the terms of reference. Is that your understanding? Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you everyone for your contribution and cooperation and support. So in this case we would remove the square brackets in Item 4 under the terms of reference and we approve the document. This is the Consensus reached in the Assembly. Can we move ahead with approval of the document with the square brackets removed? Thank you very much for your cooperation. The document is approved.   
 Document ‑‑ Revision 1 to Document 114, proposed joint coordination activity on technical aspects of Telecommunication Networks to support the Internet, creation of JCA under Resolution 178. Thank you very much.   
 I think we have passed our coffee break. So let's have 15 minutes coffee break please. 20 minutes. We come back at 15 minutes passed 4 p.m. Thank you very much.   
 (Coffee break)

>> CHAIR: Good evening, Ladies and Gentlemen. Thank you. We will come back to the Plenary session. The next agenda item in front of us is the set of Resolutions.

>> Ladies and Gentlemen. We are starting now. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: We come back to the Plenary, Ladies and Gentlemen. The next document in front of us for discussion is Document No. 106. I just would like to highlight that this document has not gone through the Editorial Committee and has been sent directly to the Plenary. The Editorial Committee is under extreme pressure with the amount of work and documents that have been sent to them. And they will be working around the clock overnight and the load was extensive. And they have done a great job so far and there were some documents not yet out. We hope it can be out from the Editorial Committee from end of sessions today or at least tomorrow morning.

Document 106 in front of us outlines a number of Resolutions and draft new opinion. However this is out directly from Committee 4. And they haven't gone through the Editorial Committee yet. We would ask the Committee 4 Chair to present the document. Before you do that, Mr. Maeda, I would like to highlight to the Plenary we are leaving the option for the evening session but the progress of the work will determine if we go for the evening session or not, and the amount of available documents for presentation would determine that as well. So let's hope we have enough documents in hand to go ahead with the evening session, otherwise we shift all pending items to tomorrow morning's session.   
 Iran, you asked for the floor.

>> IRAN: Yes, Chairman. Thank you very much. Just to remind ourselves that with respect to the pressure to the Editorial Committee this issue was discussed at the last Assembly of WTSA and in fact, Resolution 1 was amended to take in to account what yourself has said just now. All Committees of the WTSA will be finished except the Editorial Committee. It mentioned Editorial Committee may hold meetings after the closing Assembly to complete tasks as assigned by the Assembly. We don't need to put more pressure on the Committee if the alignment of language is not finished. The Assembly could assign that work to the Editorial Committee unless you want Madame Alajouanine under pressure 24 hours a day.

>> CHAIR: Thank you and the points were clear. We have seen the Editorial Committee do an excellent job. However, the amount of documents presented at the last minute were too extensive. With that we move to Document 106. And would the Chairman of Committee 4 present the document for us?

>> YOICHI MAEDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Document 106 contains the series of texts submitted by Committee 4 to the Editorial Committee and revised text for the Resolution 7, 76, 43, 44, 45, and also draft new opinion are included. And I would like to ask the approval for those Resolutions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Maeda. The document in front of us the first Resolution to consider is Resolution 7, collaboration with the international organization for standardization and the International Electrotechnical Commission. Any comments on Resolution 7 please? I see none. Thank you. Resolution 7 is approved.   
 Next is Resolution 76, studies related to conformance and interoperability testing, assistance to developing countries and a possible future ITU mark programme. Any comments on the Resolution 76? I see none. Thank you. Resolution 76 is then approved by the Assembly.   
 Our next Resolution is No. 43, regional preparations for WTSAs. The Resolution is presented for any comments. Thank you. Resolution 43 is approved by the Plenary.   
 Next is Resolution 44, bridging the standardization gap between developing and developed countries and an Annex to Resolution 44. It is presented for approval. Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We propose some editorial changes in Resolution 44. Under the invites regions and its Member States it is mentioned to pursue the creation of regional groups of parent ITU‑T groups in their respective regions in accordance to Resolves 6. This should be Resolves 5 of this Resolution. And under instructs Director of TSB section ‑‑

>> CHAIR: Egypt, you have further comments as well?

>> EGYPT: Yes, under instructs Director of TSB Items 13, 14, 15, and 16 they are in Italics on the website. So I don't think that they should be in Italics. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Your comments have been noted. The changes will be made. Thank you. If there are no further comments for Resolution 44, then we are to approve Resolution 44 and the Annex. So no comments. Thank you very much. Resolution 44 is approved.   
 Our next item is Resolution 54, the creation and assistance to regional groups is presented for your approval, please. Any comments on Resolution 54? I see no comments. Resolution 54 is approved by the Plenary. Thank you.   
 Our last item of Document 106 is a draft new opinion, practical application of network externality premium. Any comments on the draft new opinion? I see no comments. So the draft new opinion is approved. Thank you.   
 This concludes all the documents, all the Resolutions under Document 106 and the draft new opinion.   
 We would like now to move to Document No. 113, 113. And I would like to ask Mr. Maeda to present the document as Chairman of Committee 4, please.

>> YOICHI MAEDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On Document 113 contain draft new Resolution on strategic and structural review of ITU‑T. The creation of this proposed Strategic Review Committee was proposed to your former Committee ‑‑ Plenary meeting from the Committee 4 and the creation was approved at the WTSA Plenary level. And the proposal contained a Resolution on this issue and also the terms of reference of the proposed Review Committees.   
 The text of the draft Resolution was a baseline accepted at our final session of Committee 4. Although good progress was achieved two open issues remain which indicate in square brackets and yellow highlight in the Resolution text. So the text, you can see the pages from the second page, the text shown on those pages are the agreement made by the Committee meeting with some remaining two issues.   
 In order to effectively address them I decided to organize an informal consultation meeting to try to solve them. And we had a late night discussion yesterday for about two hours to resolve the two open issues.   
 Taking in to account the opinion and proposal expressed at the informal consultation meeting held yesterday, I would like to present the following three, Chairman, proposals with hope to achieve Consensus at this Plenary meeting. So to clarify the status of the document, the text shown from the second page was a baseline document which was produced by the Committee 4 meeting.   
 On the first page of this document I have proposed three proposals at the bottom of page 1. The first proposal ‑‑ so those three proposals are the Chairman's proposal to support your discussion to finalize this issue in this Plenary.   
 The first proposal is to replace the current text in resolve with the following text. It is to clarify the status of this Review Committee and with a very good suggestion by the participant we have produced this text. I hope this text clarifies the status of the Review Committee and in relation with the TSAG.   
 Second proposal is to combine the current item 11(b) and 11(c) of the terms of reference, and it was developed by the informal Committee meeting to give more clear, to get more clear understanding. So the combined text of the 11(b) and (c) is now proposed as a new item 11(b).   
 Third proposal is to add the following text and take in to account the comments made by TSAG on the progress report at the end of the terms of reference, Item 9. So three proposals I would like to offer to the WTSA Plenary of Committee 4 Chairman's proposal but based on yesterday's informal meeting with a great support of the participants.   
 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Maeda. We have a request from the floor from Tunisia, please.

>> TUNISIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good afternoon. Mr. Chairman, as you know and as you heard in the Director's remarks when he was in Tunis last year Tunisia has the largest number of sector members of ITU‑T in Africa and the Arab world.   
 Consequently the Delegation of Tunisia is particularly interested in this action which seeks to make the activities of the sector more efficient. Therefore the work of the Committee is particularly important as we hope that the output will contribute to bridging the standardization gap.   
 As a Delegation we have followed the debate very closely both within the Committee and in the Ad Hoc Group of COM 4 and indeed contributed to the mission statement and to the terms of reference. We have said from the beginning that we want a Committee that can work effectively and will allow us to have an overview of the performance of current actions within ITU‑T, and having heard the views of our colleagues and participated in the debate, I believe the Consensus proposal reached thanks to the leadership of the Chairman of COM 4 is a most interesting proposal and might allow us to establish this new Committee along the lines of the principles that animated the original proposal. Therefore we would support these proposals and hope that they will be accepted.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Tunisia. Japan, you have the floor, please.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Actually this proposal, Japan proposed this proposal originally. And through the discussion of the seven Ad Hoc meetings the text has been revised extensively, but we are satisfied with this revision and we also are very pleased that this proposal attracted so many attentions. And we'd also like to express our appreciation to Mr. Rushton from the United Kingdom for the great effort to chair all those seven Ad Hoc meetings. So we ask through you, the meeting to agree this proposal to document, this was original and then establish this Review Committee. I believe this could contribute for the ITU‑T for the future. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan. I thought the requests for the floor was more to the general discussional comments on the document. Since we are moving to the support and endorsement of the proposals perhaps it is best that we look at the proposals made by the Chairman of Committee 4 and explained by him in Document 113. We will go in the order of requests for the floors. And the document is now presented for the approval of the Plenary with the proposals made by the Chairman and the three proposals for the three different parts of the document that are open for discussion and between square brackets. So Iran, you have the floor, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, this Ad Hoc Group was very, very active. First of all, we appreciate the efforts of Mr. Phil Rushton who very effectively and tirelessly continued this work, and also we appreciate the work of the Chairman of Committee 4. Finally he Chair the meeting. Chairman, up to the last 10, 15 minutes before the end of yesterday's meeting there was still discussion who will control this meeting, who will be under the command of whom. However, we find legal and appropriate mechanism not to deal with any more who control whom. We took two examples of Plenipotentiary conference; one establishment of independent Committee and other the establishment of the Council Working Group on the stable constitution. And we took those considerations in to account and drafted the text in a way that we refer to the reference Article in the Convention and try to also add to that and based on the procedure describe law.

Having said that, Chairman, I think this document now covers points of everyone. It reflects the Consensus and it reflects the heart of the discussions. We suggest, Chairman, in fact, we strongly suggest, Chairman, that the Plenary adopt this proposal which resolve all of the issues and respond to the very need of the future of the ITU. If there is any further explanation, I am prepared to give it, but at this time I limit myself to strongly suggest or propose that this document be approved without any change. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. We request the Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, we would also like to extend thanks to Mr. Rushton and to the Chair of COM 4, Mr. Maeda. We know they did an enormous job of work. It was very difficult work that had to be done and all the participants in this group deserve our thanks. We repeatedly expressed our concern. Our concern was that this Committee should not become a parallel structure to TSAG. You and I know that we have very specific instructions. We know what the TSAG is supposed to be. And within the Convention and with a number of Resolutions that we together have crafted here all of that is very clearly defined. We have either crafted them or modified them and we know that there are direct instructions to TSAG to do what exactly is specified within the terms of reference of this Committee. So we therefore took the view that it was correct for such a Committee in actual fact to work as if it were a Working Group of TSAG within a particular format as determined by the Assembly.   
 Now the formulation that was proposed to our mind is one that now does reflect that idea and I would like that to be reflected in your report, Chairman. And with that I think we are now in a situation where we can avoid duplication. We are now talking about TSAG using the outcome of work of this Committee and there will be no duplication of work. And on that basis we are ready to support the proposals put forward in this document. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation. Germany.

>> GERMANY: Thank you. We appreciate very much all the efforts that everyone put in this issue and finding a way forward. However at the very last ‑‑ at the very end last night we were discussing two words in there and this is in conjunction with the references used. So the way it stands now it says "functioning in accordance with Article 14A of the Convention." And before that we had under Article 14A of the Convention and my ‑‑ our concern is that if we write in accordance with Article 14A it might ‑‑ we might establish a second TSAG which is not what we have in mind. So we would like to seek legal advice and maybe there is a very easy fix to go back to the word we had originally which says under Article 14A. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. Sweden, please.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My comment is relating to the terms of reference of the Review Committee, and maybe we would like to finalize the discussion on the previous issues first before we come back to the terms of reference. But I am prepared to introduce it now and I am prepared to wait until you finalize the discussion of the issues that you are discussing now.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Then I would appreciate if we finalize the issues at hand first and then I will come back to you, please. France, you asked for the floor.

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, indeed we would share the concern expressed by Germany as to the introduction of Article 14A. We are not experts in the workings of the Council. But we believe that it is not quite right that the Review Committee work in accordance with Article 14A of the Convention on ‑‑ while we understand that this Article is actually describing the TSAG itself because which implies that the Committee that we are establishing will have the functions of TSAG. And Mr. Arasteh's remarks who refers to the IMAC Committee, which is an excellent starting point because the Plenipotentiary did resolve the issue we have to deal with. So I should like some clarification as to this phrase referring to Article 14A.

>> CHAIR: Iran, you have the floor, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We appreciate the comment made by our Distinguished Colleagues from Germany referring that instead in accordance with we mention under. In fact, the initial wording was "under". But due to the fact that the Distinguished Delegate from France Telecom said that the word "under" in French for him was not clear, I didn't want to comment on that. In fact, Chairman, under number could easily translate or take the numeral telete. We have no problem to go back to under. It is more appropriate and we fully agree with Germany, but in the absence of the interpretation at the informal meeting colleague says in accordance. I am not personally very satisfied to have two terms in accordance, in accordance. Perhaps should divert back to under Article 14A. And then the key word, Chairman, is that add ‑‑ and procedures provided below or described below. That is a key word that is it works. It functions under Article 14A plus the procedures described below. That is a combination of that.

Chairman, this is an agreement that we have reached and I appreciate the comments made, but I think with that clarification I don't see that there is a problem and no major difficulty, and I think all of those colleagues are now in agreement with that now that they expressed agreement. I suggest that we revert back to under instead of in accordance with. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We will refer to the substitution of the words "in accordance" with "under" after we take the list which I have from Uganda and Armenia because the requests for the floor were before the proposal of the rewording of the "in accordance". If I may take Uganda and then Armenia and then we propose the new wording "under" in substitution for "in accordance". You have the floor, please.

>> UGANDA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to join my other colleagues to thank Mr. Rushton and the Chairman of Committee 4 who have worked tirelessly to reach this compromised text. Mr. Chairman, given the amount of time spent on this very important matter I would suggest that we minimize reopening debates on this matter. And we are ready to support the text as is. I thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Armenia.

>> ARMENIA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, I would also like to express a view with reference to the basic issues that have remained outstanding. In other words, I am talking about the idea of this Review Committee and to whom it should be accountable. I don't want to go over all of the arguments that have already been put forward. I don't want to take up your time with that. Yesterday evening it seemed to me that we had reached a mutual understanding. That being so despite the fact that I don't see much difference between in accordance with and under, I would say that and I am speaking at any rate for our administration, we would be ready to agree to this change.   
 This Review Committee we understand should be accountable to TSAG. And let me make that clear and say that we support all of those who have spoken to that effect. Editorial amendments were made to the text of the Resolution yesterday and we certainly support those changes. We also support the proposal with reference to the terms of reference of this Committee. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Armenia. Now we have got the proposal of changing the wording in accordance to under Article 14A. And the remaining of the text would remain as it is. So now this is a proposal brought forward, and I need to remind ourselves that this text has been delivered after considerable amount of time of discussion and compromises between all parties. We said we don't want to reopen all the compromised text and reopen all the hard work that has been carried out by Mr. Rushton and his team. I would put forward to you this proposal of changing "in accordance" with "under" and moving ahead with the approval of the text. And if I don't see any objection to this proposal, I would like to move ahead with the approval of the proposals made by the Chairman of Committee 4 in this document. Is the meeting okay with that? Is the Assembly okay with the proposal of changing the wording under ‑‑ the wording in accordance with under? Russia, you have the floor, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, I was waiting for the response from the legal advisor to the question from France and Germany to be quite honest, but it seems to me if we are talking about 14A, then in this context what is important is 197G. And this is where it is made clear that the TSAG is supposed to decide upon its own working methods in accordance with the procedures that are decided upon by the WTSA. In other words, this is one of the forms of work of TSAG. And to that extent I understand everything. It is one of the forms of work recommended by the Assembly. So perhaps if instead of saying 14A we actually refer to this 197G in this particular Article, then the question raised by France and Germany would be more understandable and would be understood clearly by all. For the rest of the text I agree. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Iran, you have the floor, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I think we have no major problem we said Article 14A but general. You may say if you want to go to the particular provision unfortunately you have to maintain in accordance. If that's the case in accordance with the relevant provision on Article 14A, but if you say under Article 14A, that is general. Again I am in favor of giving a general term under Article 14A. The key point is the sentence after, "and procedures provided below." This is an important key point. But if colleagues want to say a particular provision of Article 14A perhaps might be usual and better as we do in all conferences that say in accordance with relevant provisions of Article 14A. The two options is before you.

What I request perhaps my Distinguished Colleague from Russia whether they agree it is in the first one or second one. But there is a necessity to change. If you go under we don't need to refer to any particular provision. If you go in accordance with, then that general sentence is okay, Chairman, and you can refer to a particular provision, but it is very unlikely that we decide only one provisions. The other part of the Article 14A also apply, review, so on and so forth. Perhaps you say in accordance with relevant provisions of 14A. Just to finish this business, Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And I would count your comment if you put under Article 14A then by default all the relevant Articles ‑‑ relevant parts of the Article would be applicable only. Not everything is not relevant. So again I would seek the approval of the Assembly to proceed with the simple change we made to exchange "in accordance" with "under". We have any objection to that? Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Chairman, a question was put to me, I would however like to hear from the legal advisor. I would like to hear from the legal advisor. I would like to stress that point. Am I correct in my understanding that having this reference to Article 14A whether you say under or not, does, in fact, mean that TSAG will make use of its own working procedures, its own working methods in accordance with the recommendations of the Assembly? In other words, there will be nobody duplicating the work done by another body? We are talking about one of the forms of work of the TSAG. If that is correct and you put that in your report, then I am happy with anything, under, in accordance, anything. I am happy if I am correct in that understanding. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Could you seek the opinion of the legal advisor please on this matter? Yes, please. You have the floor.

>> Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, I will try to be brief. The use of the words "in accordance with" or "under" prior to Article 14A does not, in fact, seem to me to be appropriate or pertinent with reference to the 14A as a whole. I think this could indeed create some ambiguity as to the terms of reference and mandate and working methods. So I think it would be preferable to use terminology referring to the relevant provisions of Article 14A, it being understood that those relevant sections or relevant provisions will be identified in the light of discussion here at this Assembly. So if we say in compliance with the relevant provisions of Article 14A or in accordance with the relevant provisions of 14A, under the relevant provisions of Article 14A, any of those, but any of those would be acceptable it being understood that we take due account of the wishes that have been explained here clearly in this room. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, I fully agree with the legal view expressed by the Distinguished Legal Advisor, Dr. Julio, that we can say in accordance with relevant provisions of Article 14A. In fact, that's what I had suggested earlier.

>> CHAIR: Keeping that in mind I will do the change in the first proposed text and replacing in accordance or keep in accordance or we add in accordance with relevant provisions of Article 14A of the Convention and we will add the ‑‑ we will note in the summary of records and the reports of Plenary the comments made by the Russian Delegation that there will be no duplication of work within TSAG. And we'd appreciate it if the Russian Delegation can provide us with the exact text and exact wording of their preference so we can add in the Assembly records. If that satisfies all, I would like to move ahead with the document Resolution, the document in front of us. This just brought to my attention that Sweden had a point in terms of reference. Sweden, you have the floor, please.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the terms of reference I would like to refer to No. 3 and No. 5. In No. 3 we talk about between ITU‑T and other standards bodies. And I would propose in No. 5 to include the word "other" before standard bodies to align the text in No. 3 and No. 5. So No. 5 would read "To identify ways and means to enhance cooperation with other standard bodies." The second proposal is an issue that was already raised in the Working Group and the Committee and that is the question of their standards with ITU‑T or between standards. And I would propose to replace "of their standards with ITU‑T" with the word "between" to clearly indicate that we are talking about different standards bodies. And we need to make sure that there is no conflict or minimize the conflict between the standards. It is not a one‑way discussion. It is a cooperation. And there both parties have to take and give. So the word "between" would better reflect this. So my proposal should read "To identify ways and means to enhance cooperation with other standard bodies with a view to minimize conflict between standards." Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sweden. I believe the first proposal is editorial and the second one is more of a substantive nature. I see a number of requests for the floor. We start with Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We appreciate the Distinguished Delegate of Sweden. We have no difficulty with the first amendment, putting others as you kindly mention. It is more or less editorial, but the second one, Chairman, we have discussed that one hour yesterday. One full hour. And we did not agree to that. Chairman, it put ITU subordinate of other international or national or regional organization body. We are a leading standard body making. We are free ‑‑ not free. We are ‑‑ we wish really to collaborate and to enhance collaboration, cooperation to minimize the conflict and so on and so forth. But we could not say between. This word was proposed and it was not accepted by Consensus. I am not saying that this is wrong. But we need to have a Consensus. And the text yesterday, Chairman, was a Consensus. Should we not go back again?

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we, too, as with Sweden have had some concern about this and we appreciate that there was much discussion yesterday. And many of our colleagues came to this language from the perspective of their native languages. And we heard that they need ‑‑ that language needed to be aligned with one of the six languages of the UN system. And we have heard others make the same point. Mr. Chairman, for two reasons; one is the comments made with respect to 3 and the spirit that is suggested in 3. And secondly, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the ‑‑ as we have mentioned before the Resolutions of 101, 102 and 130 and the footnote that is attached there coming from Guadalajara with respect to cooperative relationships between the ITU and other Internet‑related organizations, for that reason and for the reasons stated by Sweden in addition to what we believe to be at least in this text a preferred stylistic approach in English, that we would associate with the intervention of Sweden and would prefer use of the term "between".   
 And we believe that this term has been addressed in a number of interventions yesterday and it would not be disruptive of the overall Resolution or terms of reference to return to the use of the term "between". Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, yesterday we had a long discussion on the question of whether we should say conflict in or conflict between. And we said that we preferred conflict in. However in order to rally to the Consensus we accepted the words conflict of their standards with ITU‑T standards.   
 We agree with what has been said by Iran, we should not reopen discussion. It was discussion that took one whole hour yesterday. And we call for this text to be maintained as it stands at present in 5.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: This matter was discussed yesterday at length at a meeting under the Chairmanship of the Chair of COM 4 and it was thanks to that discussion that we produced the paragraph that is now before us for consideration.   
 We consider that maintaining this wording is the best way of moving forward and continuing with our work efficiently. For that reason we endorse what has been said by Iran and Egypt. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Bahrain.

>> BAHRAIN: I would like to approach this from a linguistics perspective. Talking about ways and means to enhance cooperation with and standard bodies that means we are trying to organize our work and trying to harmonize better with them. But when we use the word "between", the terminology becomes slightly ambiguous because then it implies that the ITU is now responsible for all coordination between all standards bodies. And that is clearly not the case. We want to harmonize our work with standard bodies, but what the standard bodies do between each other is left to their discretion. So from a linguistics perspective I strongly support that we keep the word "with". Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Bahrain. South Africa.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, Chairperson. I wish to align with those countries that wish to maintain the current text under 5. The text that is there was hard foot compromised and it was not discussed last night but it was discussed on Sunday. And the compromise I think ensured from our perspective that we did not prejudge the work of the Committee too much. But we did set it at a particular direction. So I think it is quite important for us that we retain the paragraph as it is. Thank you, Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, I would like to express support for the opinion that has been expressed here in favor of retaining this paragraph as it stands. It took many meetings and many hours of discussion to reach this compromised text. An initial proposal was submitted and then some concessions were made. The initial proposal was abandoned and we came up with this compromised text and we would like it to be maintained. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. I would like to call the Chairman of Committee 4 to advise us on how the discussion has been going and where the Consensus is within Committee 4 so we can build up on that Consensus, please. Thank you.

>> YOICHI MAEDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As many Delegates expressed after the very, very long discussion our proposed existing text will be widely supported. And I would like to ask the floor to try to support the proposed existing text. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Maeda. To build up on the Consensus reached in Committee 4 and to acknowledge the hard work and the efforts made by all parties involved I would like to propose to remain the text with the editorial change proposed by Sweden in No. 5 which reads "with other standard bodies." However remaining the second part, minimize conflict of their standards with ITU‑T standards. And this will be the proposal from the Chairman of the Assembly to proceed with a document of the Chairman of the text as it is. If there are no objections, I would like to proceed with the approval of the text here. So are there any objections to the proposal I am bringing forward? Nigeria.

>> NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Nigeria is actually not objecting to the proposal. We requested for the floor a long time ago to add our voice to the contribution to the debate. We only wanted to propose that we do not reopen this debate because the issue was discussed intensively, and this particular text was accepted as a compromised position and we wanted to suggest that you as a Chairman do not allow the issue to be reopened for discussion but instead we allow the text to go the way it is as presented. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Nigeria. May I ask the Distinguished Delegates, those who have pressed the button to unpress it unless they have an objection to the proposal I made because I have quite a few on the list here. So whoever is in agreement with the proposal, would you please delete your selection? And whoever is in ‑‑ has an objection to the proposal you made would remain on the list. Bulgaria.

>> BULGARIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We all remember that we have been misled by the knowledge of English by Mr. Malcolm Johnson. He was confirming to us it would very well suit and this was his advice. We have had a long debate about what is the best option. Either way of wording would be acceptable provided that we understand one thing very clearly; ITU is a place where they have worldwide standards and under standard setting bodies or standard development organizations are having products of regional or world nature. So all this is to be well taken in to account and to avoid that someone is prejudging or prevailing over the other. The cooperation should be done based on the wisdom and practicality. That's what I wanted to say. And perhaps you can note this in your report, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Bulgaria. The attempt here is not to make any specific linguistic changes or correction. We are attempting not to open the discussion which has been already concluded in Committee 4 and has been discussed throughout the last week and the week before. So there has been enough efforts put in to this and as the Committee 4 Chairman has highlighted and all the members who have spoken already that there have been lots of discussion and Consensuses reached in order for us to reach the document in front of us. If we open it at the Plenary, it will be a waste of effort and time. Once again I bring forward my proposal. Keep in mind that we need to build on Consensus and agreements reached in Committee 4, keeping the text as it is with the only editorial change that we mentioned earlier. Do we still have any opposition to this proposal? Sweden, please.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I listened carefully to the debate and I note that there seems to be a Consensus that we are not saying that one organization is above the other. We are talking about cooperation. This was expressed by ‑‑ in the text and expressed in the Resolutions from the Plenipotentiary conference and has been expressed in the debate here. If we note in the report of the meeting that we are talking about cooperation on the same level between the different organizations and it is not saying that ITU standards are both the other standards, then I can go along with the text here. I think the important part is to show to the outside world that we are talking about cooperation and we are prepared to cooperate. We are not dictating. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we would wish to note in Resolution 101 Resolves 1 which states that resolves to explore the ITU, to explore ways and means for greater collaboration and coordination between, between ITU and relevant organizations involved in the development of IP‑based Networks in the future Internet. The choice of the word "between", Mr. Chairman, is consistent with that Resolution and we believe it expresses exactly what was intended by Guadalajara. We would also note the footnote attached to that resolves which lists a number of relevant organizations and we would highlight the Internet Engineering Task Force, the IETF.

Secondly, the other issue we have with the terms of reference you have not addressed but we wish to reiterate our position that we have stated earlier that with respect to 11(c) we would encourage, as a note in your record we would encourage the Chair of this group to invite associates to participate in this structure and ‑‑ Strategic and Structural Committee, Review Committee as we believe that there are a number of associates to the ITU that would enrich the dialogue with respect to the subject of this Committee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. With regards to the last proposal on the Item C under 11, the terms of reference I think we will come back to it once we reach the Chairman's proposal. We will address it at the time. I see requests from Algeria, Iran, Egypt and Japan. Is it on the same substance of the discussion? Yes, you may take the floor. Please be brief.

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, coming back to the terms of reference, looking at 5, I have a problem with one of the words here. And it is the word "minimize", minimize conflict. As I understand from looking at this from the point of view of an operator who intends to operate and respect ITU‑T standards and ICT standards in general in creating their network infrastructure, from their point of view having the word "minimize" in here implies that we have not yet attained a very clear idea as to what standards precisely should be implemented. And I think it is better to talk about avoiding conflicts. We are talking about avoiding conflicts here. And we shouldn't leave this idea of minimization hanging over this because this does imply that there can still be a conflict. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I think what's worrying me now is more and more proposals to changes to text that we have already passed through Committee 4. Iran, would you please be brief on your intervention? Thank you.

>> IRAN: Yes. Certainly. I think as you mentioned we have discussed we cannot go to the perfection, avoid totally 100% impossible. Minimize could be also 0. Could be. That is the maximum you could do here, Chairman. So I don't think that we go back to change that word. Chairman, let's express that may not have all of us be equally unhappy. Unequally unhappy but we are unequally unhappy. Please do not open discussion because otherwise English and other languages are sufficiently reached and you can put words and words. With respect to the statement of the Distinguished Delegate of Sweden it could be included in the Plenary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Egypt, is it on the same subject? Be brief, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, on the question of this reference to Resolution 101 I think that here in the resolves section we should refer to the action plan which is indeed referred to in Resolution 111 with the footnote that is appropriate. Thank you. Now on another point that Paragraph 5 in the terms of reference our position remains unchanged and this should be retained without any amendment. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I note the revision on Item 5. Thank you. So my proposal is to again back to go to the same text that we had initially and as proposed by the Chairman of Committee 4, with the editorial change proposed by Sweden and we would note in the Plenary report the comment made by Sweden as to the observation from the Delegates of the ‑‑ of Sweden. And this is the proposal I am bringing forward for approval. If we don't have any objection, we could proceed with this item. Item No. 5 of the terms of reference and we would like to go back to the proposals made by the Chairman again for the final approval. Do we have any objection to the proposal that I am making? I see none. Then would the Distinguished Delegate from Sweden please pass the text so we can include in the Plenary report?   
 Thank you. So with that the text of 5 remains as it is with the editorial change and the first ‑‑ let's first ‑‑ it reads that "To identify ways and means to enhance cooperation with other standard bodies with a view to minimize conflict of their standards with ITU standards." Thank you for your contribution and cooperation.

We go back now to the proposals made by the Chairman of Committee 4. The first proposal on the resolves have already been approved and we discussed that and we didn't receive any comments on it. Second proposal combining Items 11(b) and 11(c) in the terms of reference. Any comments or reservations on that? Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you. This combination is as a result of extensive discussions and colleagues at the yesterday meeting were all agreed that this properly reflects the earlier B and C in a combined B. I suggest that we take it and approve it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. Any objections to the second proposal made by the Chairman of Committee 4 as we see it in Document 113? I see none. Thank you. So the second proposal is approved as well. We go to the third proposal adding the text in terms of reference Item No. 9. Do we have any objection to the proposal? Thank you. I see none. We move now to the comment made by the Delegate of the United States. Would you please remind us of the comments? Thank you.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We had asked earlier and we wish to reiterate as a matter for your Plenary record that we understand that in the terms of reference 11(c) where it refers to the invitation to other experts, including associates, that we would expect that the Chair of this group would reach out to associates. And we would encourage the invitation of those associates to participate in the group as we have indicated there are a number of associates of the ITU that are very important in our industry. And we believe that this could make a very valuable contribution to the discussions that will occur in the strategic and structural view of the ITU‑T, particularly as we look forward to the Networks and the work of the ITU‑T in that regard. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I would ask that that statement be entered in to the record. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. It is noted and reflected in the record of the meeting. We have reached our end of the session. It is almost ‑‑ we have passed it by three minutes. We have a request for the floor from Sweden and Iran. Could we retain to this issue after the break please? Can we come back to you after the break? Thank you. Iran, Sweden, can we come back after the break? Okay. Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: Yes, we can come back after break.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Shall we break now and we resume ‑‑ so we resume at 6:30. Thank you. This meeting is adjourned.   
 (Meeting adjourned at 17:34 CET)
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