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>> CHAIR: Good afternoon and welcome back. Please put on your headsets we are about to start. Thank you.

>> Dear ladies and gentlemen, colleagues, we start our meeting, and as first things, I give the mic to the secretariat for some practical announcement.

>> SECRETARIAT: Thank you, Chairman. This concerns the meeting of ad hoc groups that were agreed previously, and so the meeting of ad hoc group on resolution 72 starts today at 1615 to 17:30 so 4:15 in room G, go, and then the meeting for resolution 73 is in the evening from 19:30 to 21:30. That is 7:30 p.m. also in room G, go. And then the group on the ad hoc group on the review group starts tomorrow morning at 8:00 a.m. from 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. also in Room G, go. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Richard for the announcement. Now, we can start the meeting. You have seen the agenda to the meeting is in the administer document 8. We have divided our item for work in days that are at our disposal and as you see today we want to deal with Resolution 75, Resolution 62 and Resolution 40. We have quite a limited time so we request you to adhere to the request of the Chairman to limit your intervention and time‑wise and to be strict to the account set.

I also intend when there are some difference in opinion, I would like this morning group would like to make records to drafting group or the group, but if possible to avoid to solve the problem in our meeting is the preferred solution, let's say. Now, let's see if there is a translation channel. Let's see if there is English channel. Good afternoon.

>> CHAIR: French channel? Spanish channel? Russian channel? Arabic channel and Chinese channel? So we can proceed. I say these are the main principles for our discussion and let's go to the matter. We have the agenda. Can you approve the agenda? Can I see in the screen? Any observation any missing documents. ADM8, I say at the beginning. No? So we can come back to the work plan given in temporary document 11, but we cannot project. This is what we intended to follow and now go to the next point of the agenda is the Resolution 75.

For what we have quite a lot of contribution because it is interesting team. First, we have the contribution from PSB with making some editorial change to the existing text outlining also some Resolution taken by the plenipotentiary. And I don't think that's necessary to introduce, but if you want to introduce? No.

After we have a document we have document 38, Addendum 12. May I give the floor to Asia Pacific to introduce the document, Addendum 2, Addendum 12 to document 38.

 Yes, Brazil? Brazil, please, you have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chairman. My name is Bruno Ramos from Brazil. I try to be very quick. The Member States CITEL hereby present a contribution for the review of Resolution 75. The contribution implementing the outcomes of the World Summit on the Information Society. And we establish a dedicated group on internet related public policy issues as an integral part of the working group of the World Summit on Information Society. In general terms, they are a joint coordination activity on technical aspects of telecommunication to support the internet. We have the terms of reference as contained in the annex of this Resolution to coordination and identify duty work on aspects of telecommunication networks to support the internet through contribution‑based work and to coordinate ITU‑T contributions to the implementation WCIT.

The terms bring the following test, to identify, collect, and analyze the related technical standardization that is currently being studied in the ITU‑T and many other relevant activities on ITU‑T.

Number two, to facilitate coordination with and to identify and understand the scope of abilities of relevant recognized Forums, SGOs and international internet organization, in particular those identified in Resolution 101, 102 and 103 of the 2 thousand 10 plenipotentiary Conference. Supplement three of recommendation ITU‑T 83.

Number three, method of working. The JCA internet will primarily work electronically using Conference calls and emails facilitating with intermittent face‑to‑face meetings when absolutely necessary quiet. And face‑to‑face meetings would normally take place with the context of other relevant ITU‑T meetings and would also assure availability of electronic Conferencing meeting of remote participation.

Number four, the JCA shall report to ZIG. That's it. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: There are request on request of qualification on proposal of CITEL. It seems not for the time being. In this case we can proceed to the next document with document from RCC, document 44, Addendum 5. Someone from RCC introduce this document? Mr. Minkin, please.

>> VLADIMIR MINKIN: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, we have looked at Resolution 75 in terms of all of the outcomes that emerged from various conferences and from the council decisions after the 2008 Conference. As you know, at the PP a number of resolutions were adopted, decisions were taken there and it was decided to set up this dedicated group, this council group. It was decided that it should become a council working group. You know how that happened and in this particular context I don't need to explain to you how this happened and how the name changed. You can see this in the Resolution.

You also know that the sector was given a number of instructions by the plenipotentiary and by the council and all of this is reflected in various recommendations and resolutions. All of this then has been reflected in our proposal. We have made some editorial amendments with reference to the outcomes from the sector in different areas of work and different parts of the Resolution, and we have tried to insure that they are all now fully in line with decisions that have already been taken. We hope the wording is fully in line with what has already been taken. We hope we can count on support from our colleagues. If you wish I can go into each of the sections in detail, but I think it would be better until we wait until we come to a later stage of drafting on that. I'm at your disposal and ready to answer any questions. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your presentation. I have a request from the floor under united Arab emirate. You want to have something? You have the floor in you want to say something. No. It was a mistake.

>> My apologies, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Now, Mr. Maeda, our Chairman. It seems not. In this case we can proceed with the presentation, next document with a contribution from Arab states, contribution 64, Addendum 27. Who will introduce this document? Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We have here in front of us 64, Addendum 27 which is presented by Arab countries with regard to Resolution number 75. This document translates modifications that have happened over the four past years with regard to the implementation of Resolution Number 75. This is with regard to the Council Working Group on international internet related public policy issues. This document takes into account changes that have been introduced by the PP Conference in addition to the council of the ITU.

You can take, you can read all of the changes that have been introduced, including the editorial ones. We are ready to discuss them in detail should you need more information. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very kind Saudi Arabia for your presentation and the last document on is the document from the African states. I give the floor to introduce the document, their documents. Who will present the African position? I have no request for the floor, so maybe, I ask the Secretariat to save ‑‑ now, he is coming. Ghana first.

>> GHANA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We just ‑‑ would you be kind to just tell us the document number? We will be in a position to present it now.

>> CHAIR: Contribution 56, Addendum 1.

 Give some time to find the document to present to us. Thank you.

 I understand there is only ‑‑ from TSB so maybe it's not needed to have introduction. If you want to say something, please do. It's up to you.

 Ghana?

>> GHANA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Resolution Number 71 is basically an editorial. That is basically calling for proposal of so many resolutions as we have seen here. So as you have said, it's just an editorial that we are totally in agreement to the TSB.

>> CHAIR: I have request from the floor from United States of America. Please, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon. This is a very brief intervention to say that the U.S. fully supports the CITEL IEP as presented earlier by Brazil. Thank you.

 May I add one more point? We do have some additional ideas to be contributed to this debate, and if you have created an ad hoc group, we would welcome the opportunity to present those thoughts. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Let's say thank you for, CITEL for your presentation. I was rather surprised because normally joint groups are being created in the framework of this various study group, but (inaudible) is clearly the assembly has the drive to do whatever they want. I think they all with the exception maybe of one from CITEL are proposing some editorial amendment and improvement. The basic question of the creation of this joint ad hoc group, and it's clear that we cannot solve editorially this problem here in plenary. I wonder if I can charge my friend Vladimir Minkin, if he can carry on the group Resolution Incentive 5, and also see if we can reach an agreement on the purpose of the Resolution 75, provided there are no other interventions? I see Saudi Arabia first.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Specifically foresees the formation of a group like GSA and require the Director of TSP to evaluate and submit a report and recommendation to the WTSA‑12, however, by looking at the terms of reference, we need some time. We do have some comments on these terms of references, and in general, it’s important to realize that the study groups and focus groups already coordinate with external bodies. For us it's not obvious that the JCA is urgently required to facilitate the work. Further coordination within the ITU is already preferred by the TSAG so we might need to look at enhancing the TSAG meetings instead of establishing such a group.

It would, therefore, be appropriate to challenge the necessity of this JCA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. You have more or less, as I would say, is the only principle like the other whose have been presented by the others that have been presented by the other region and that's is the reason we I request if there are any comments or observations. Now, it really is not a work group, I was corrected it is informal consultation group, and, again, I ask my friend, Vladimir Minkin if he can take care and we find the appropriate time, room and location. Please, Vladimir.

>> VLADIMIR MINKIN: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, I will try to do everything possible to work successfully within such a group, and certainly the only point I would like to make at this stage is that probably at the level of all of the groups, we have to take a decision. Are we agreeing that we will have a JCA or not? That's the first decision we have to take. Once that's decided all of the rest follows. If we are going to have three normal groups working on this Resolution, we have to decide that first in all. So I would like to resolve that now, here, at this level. Once that's decided we can decide on everything else, no problem. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I am inclined to agree with you, as usual, and it was my trial to see what is the reaction of the meeting to the CITEL proposal. I have one from the, let's say Arab groups. Now, I see Iran requesting to the floor.

>> IRAN: First we have to decide on the need of the JCA and then term of reference will be discussed formally. So we have to decide on that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I pass now the floor to United Kingdom and after to the Secretariat.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: The United Kingdom supports the intervention of Saudi Arabia. We feel that the JCA is questionable at this moment. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: The secretary, please.

>> Thank you, Chairman. It was presented today that the Resolution of the plenipotentiary 178 instructed the Director of TSB to study this matter and report back to the assembly and he has in fact done so, and that report reflects what came out of some fairly extensive discussions in TSAG which was the recommendation to create a JCA with terms of reference as shown. And that is found in document 26, document 26 of the Assembly. There is that report of the Director. That is simply to put that information in front of the Assembly for it to take into account as appropriate. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Now, if I can say my personal opinion, although the Chairman should not have an opinion, it is strange that we have Resolution for creating a JCA, that is to my knowledge because of the reason normal way to create a JCA, so could we a decision of the assembly or thing like that, but to have a Resolution to me is rather uncommon way, but we are open to all solution. What really I want to have the opinion of the room on this proposal. Now, I have Iran.

>> IRAN: Again, I fully agree with you. I don't know why we have to turn it around. Having Resolution, talking, considering, noting, recognizing, resolve on whether we should, would, may, might, why we need that? We just accept the principal and some simple decision of the Assembly in the record of assembly is sufficient. So why do we have to have Resolution? Don't we have any other thing to do? That is one question. Second, perhaps the issue of creation of the JCA with respect to the issue raised by Brazil at the plenipotentiary Conference of the group, study group dealing with internet might be clarified, one, we say that this JCA would have no conflict with the Council Working Group created for ‑‑ to address the international public policy issues. If that is clear, I think some of the doubt will be removed. So that a question that we have discussed. First of all, we don't need Resolution in my view. Something very simple could be done. We have done the plenipotentiary Conference for many important issues, we have just a plenipotentiary decision reflected in the minute, and that was sufficient. And we do it here, however, with respect to the opposition of some country of the JVA, perhaps we should see whether there is a matter of misunderstanding or matter of doubt or matter of concern that this JCA would have some conflict with the Council Working Group on the dedicated group on the international internet public policy issues.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran for your support to my doubts. Now, we have added at least two countries, U.K. and Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates who express some doubts about this JCA. I think, really, we have to find a compromise. Personally, I really don't think the Resolution is needed, maybe simply a cross reference in the Resolution to the activity of JCA. Now, we can decide to ask the Director to implement the Resolution 178 by as is reported creating this JCA and this is something that would be in the minute of this assembly. We can maintain a Resolution 75 strictly related to the business to which we have common agreement.

So may I ask the meeting if they agree on this proceeding? Brazil?

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chairman, it is not necessary to have one Resolution about this matter, but we believe that it's necessary to create JCA because this JCA is about technical aspects. It's not about public policies of internet. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I think this is really a question, I entirely agree with your approach. I think you agree also with my approach the Resolution will be separated. So in our little framework, let's say, in our working we give mandates to Mr. Minkin to draft a revised Resolution 75 without this question of JCA while we refer back to my Chairman, Mr. Yoichi Maeda that the question of the creation of the JCA and the term of reference should come to this plenary. Okay. United States of America, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A question for clarification here. Our understanding was that TSAG had agreed to the creation of the JCA and had also developed terms of reference. So is it your understanding as well that even without the Resolution that JCA has in fact come into existence? We understand that there is no -- that is not a matter for debate at this point, is that correct?

>> CHAIR: We will give the floor to the Secretariat to respond to you, please.

>> SECRETARIAT: We are looking at document 26 which I believe is the Director's report on this matter. From memory, what was agreed at TSAG is to present the matter to WTSA, so TSAG agreed to the terms of reference, of course, and agreed in principle on creation but referred the actual creation to WTSA. While it is of course correct that TSAG could at its next meeting decide to create the JCA if it so wished.

>> CHAIR: Now, I have again United States of America.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A follow‑up question, if in fact TSAG has referred this issue to WTSA for Resolution, is it note appropriate for us to take this issue up and decide it in this context of a proposal as set forth by CITEL.

>> CHAIR: Secretariat, please?

>> SECRETARIAT: To be clear it's not the TSAG that referred the matter to the assembly, it is the Director as instructed. So there are really two independent paths on this which I think it creating procedural confusion. There is the Director's report which is, of course, asking the assembly to endorse the decision of TSAG and there is the CITEL contribution which is proposing to do that but in the tomorrow of a Resolution. So the question before us is whether to simply defer the matter of the creation to the plenary and focus on the resolution without looking at the creation of the JCA which is handled by the Director's report.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Now, I ask the Russian Federation to take the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, maybe we could do the following. TSAG has looked at this. The question has then been referred to the assembly. The assembly could, therefore, instruct TSAG to establish at its next meeting a group, and in any range, this has already been accepted. There is no need for a specific Resolution on this. You can just record this in your report, and that would be sufficient. You could simply say the TSAG has done its job and this is how we are going to handle it now. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Is more or less what I have proposed, but you have outlined that there will be dealt with the final by TSAG. Iran, you have requested the floor.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. There are two issues, one is Resolution 75. You have given that task to Mr. Minkin to deal with that. The second is JCA and I don't think we should refer the matter back to TSAG. Some colleagues have concern, perhaps, Chairman, in order to allow to proceed to ask this distinguished colleagues United Kingdom and represented Arab countries to say what is their difficulties and concerns about the creation of this JCA, then if they resolve, the issue is resolved by a simple decision of the Assembly, we would support the creation of JCA, but don't give it back to the TSAG because some countries may not be present at the TSAG. The issue is before the assembly. Let's in a bigger representation try to decide on the matter. So, Chairman, let's separate the issues.

Now, the issue is JCA. Do we need a Resolution to create that? No.

How we create that, it is before the assembly, and we have to see whether we agree that there are some concerns, let's listen to the concerns to see whether we could remove them. If it is removed, then we will look into the term of reference of the JCA. If we agreed with that, that will be established by the assembly. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. In a sense, I initially have proposed to give back to the plenary or Mr. Yoichi Maeda the exact deaf nation term of reference. It will advance with our Resolution 75. Now, I say that I will listen to the meeting wishes and now we will give the floor to United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chairman. Good afternoon. We have listened with interest to the clarifications that have been provided during the discussions here this afternoon with regard to the relationship JCA related to TA, TNI and its potential relationship with Resolution 75. Our understanding has been clarified and we have no objection to the creation of the JCA. We were uncertain of the relationship that it was going to have with that particular Resolution. That has been clarified and, therefore, we have no objection. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So I understand that you, United Kingdom, has no objection to the creation of JCA, and it may be with the clarification to separate the two items the Resolution 75 dealing with business matter and the JCA created by this assembly, the problem can be solved. May I ask the United Arab Emirates if this is solution or Saudi Arabia ‑‑ Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you. We support your conclusion to work in the Resolution and separate the GSA matter in another Forum, and we suggest and recommend to discuss this when presenting documents 26, the report by the Director of TSB, document 26. Our concerns still we need to know if there is evidence that the existing structure of the ITU‑T is inadequate so that the terms of reference mentioned in the JCA is needed, and if there was any alternative we have taken in this regard before going to establishing the JCA. So in short we support your conclusion, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Time is running and we already almost proceeding with our time schedule. So I wonder if you agree with my conclusion to give to Mr. Minkin the informal group on the Resolution 75, and to give to the plenary working party for the task to work ‑‑ we have in principle agreed to creation of the JCA, but we have the task to agree on their functioning. Mr. Minkin. It is okay for you?

>> Thank you, yes. I agree. I just wanted to clarify one further point. We are going to be dealing with Resolution 75 without touching upon the issue of a JCA. Am I correct in that understanding? Is that our mandate? Is that the terms of reference for the group I will be dealing with? The JCA will be looked at separately not in the context of Resolution 75? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Correct. So now we can maybe, Saudi Arabia. You want to have the floor?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, please. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We still have some reservation in the establishment of the JCA. We need some time and maybe until the referral of the committee 4 we can come up with the agreed principle on this matter. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Yes, that is another reason to have some time and to allow you to have some informal consultation in order to come to the plenary of committee 4 with maybe an agreed solution. So Mr. Minkin, I think we will have a room for informal consultation, no? Informal, Mr. Minkin, you want to have a room? Yes. He prefer to have a room. Room H. Today is okay for you? At what time?

>> I'm happy with the room but I'm not very happy with the time proposed because it would be two meetings in parallel at that time. And I have to submit contributions so either before or after. Another time, in other words, please.

>> CHAIR: Propose a time yourself, Mr. Minkin.

>> Thank you. Well, if everyone is happy, immediately after the fourth quarter I would be ready.

>> CHAIR: 6:00 p.m. is okay for you?

>> 6:00 or 5:30, 5:45.

>> CHAIR: Fine, 5:45 I judge. The request for the floor from Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you Chairman. I was a little bit delayed after the Saudi Arabia intervention where I support that there are two separate issues, one is the existence or no existence of JCA, approval or not of JCA. The second is a term of reference the way it was managed. So these are two separate items to be put. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: We can finally move to the second item 6 of our agenda Resolution 62.

 No contribution editorial, so we can approve the revised text to Resolution 62 as presented by TSB in document 33, 39 ‑‑ 29? 2923. Yes, I see no request for the floor. So that is done. We move to the last Resolution, Resolution 40, we have document 29 from TSB, document 56, Addendum 5, document 64, Addendum 9, 29 no necessity to introduce. I think it's all editorial nature. While maybe the older documents require an introduction, so may I give the floor first to the document from African union, document, Addendum 5 to document 56, someone represent Ghana, please.

>> GHANA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This document is coming from the Africa group, and basically what we are saying is that during the TS08, the meeting actually recognize both technical matters and matters having policy on issues of ITU‑T and to address to relevant study group. And we reserve that the end to end quality of service has become an issue which Resolution 40 has failed to address, and what we are saying as Africa is basically to propose an addition of the issue of quality of service to be included in Resolution 40. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Next is a contribution from Arab states and I ask someone to introduce the Addendum 9 to document 64. Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I would like to introduce to you the document 56 with regards to amendment of Resolution 40 with regards to regulatory matters concerning the recommendation of the union, and the Arab position is quite compatible with the African position in terms of the wish to add these questions that have to do with quality of service, total quality of service and also the numbering and titles so that the recommendations of regulatory and political nature be complimentary to these questions.

We would also like to have a possibility to see some of the recommendations that have a political or regulatory nature that these be compulsory or obligatory and not facultative, thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thanks for your introduction. Any question or request for clarification? I have myself one problem, let's say, and in both contribution, there is a point 3 that's says something about the, some discussion that can be dealt with during the forthcoming week and I do not want to prejudge the decision on the WCIT, so I wonder if really this point 3 in both contribution is rightly. It's a question to the meeting. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, however, we have the WTSA is preceding the WCIT and we have no chance to come back to the Resolution after the WCIT. So if we said that in accordance with the relevant articles of the ITRs, if there are relevant articles it will apply, if not, it will not be harmed, but there is a reversal process. So vice versa will not work. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Now I give the floor to Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chairman. Just to say that Australia shares your questions, I think, about the wisdom of including words relating to the ITRs which are in a sense prejudging the outcome. So our preference would be that those particular words not to be included. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: South America. United States of America. Sorry.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, we join Australia in supporting the view that it's inappropriate at this time to include in a Resolution anything regarding the mandatory status of recommendations which is an issue that will be decided by WCIT but has not yet been addressed. In fact, we know that CITEL has opposed that proposition, and, therefore, the matter is very much in play at the WCIT. And it's inappropriate to anticipate the outcome of that.

I would also point out that it really, if WCIT adopts it, it will be applied regardless. If WCIT doesn't adopt it, it won't be applied. If WCIT makes everything mandatory it will be applicable if it makes nothing mandatory as is the current status of the ITRs, that will be the status, so you don't need to put that in a Resolution here. So for those reasons we would be opposed to that inclusion of that language.

Mr. Chairman, while I have the floor, I would like to address another issue that was raised in these contributions, and that is regarding adding the quality of service as an element to be considered when deciding whether a draft recommendation has regulatory or policy implications. Generally speaking we have the accelerated approval process which does not have regulatory, or policy implications, and under that accelerated process, we approve a great, great many recommendations, and that process has worked extremely well in the past only a very few recommendations each year go through the traditional approval process.

What this proposal would do is to greatly expand the reasons why something could be declared to be regulatory or policy issue, and, therefore, detract from the accelerated approval process. In our view, quality of service is a matter that should be a national decision, and we in fact ‑‑ we think that many Member States would think that it was never appropriate to regulate quality of service. So if we add this element to the list of factors and somebody tried to assert that this was appropriate, we would be engaging in a lengthy debate over whether it's a national matter or not every time it came up.

So for these reasons, we don't think it's appropriate to expand the scope of the Resolution 40 in this regard. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United States. Now, I give the floor to Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We of Japan also share the opinion expressed by the Australia and U.S. I notice that the newly ‑‑ if the recommendation should have the regarded status or not that this discussion should be taking place in the WCIT, so we postpone that discussion to WCIT. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Now I give the floor to Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We agree also with your views and feel it would be inappropriate for the Resolution in resolves 3 to include language that might prejudge the outcomes of WCIT. Furthermore, in addition, we feel that adding aspects to, relating to quality of service or other technical aspects may actually delay, add delays into the approval process into recommendations and would feel that this should be avoided. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Now, I give the floor to Iran.

>> IRAN:  Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the kind attention of distinguished African colleagues in the AAP proposal, at any time, in particular refer to the diagram in the process, any Member States, if have any problem that are not in favor of AAP, could go to TAP. And that is foreseen after the ‑‑ assembly some country has difficulty.

>> AFRICA: A lot of discussion at the council and TSAG we have put that in the Resolution and that is there. I don't think anybody has any difficulty if anybody has a problem at the stage of regulatory even at A ooh P they could recourse could the procedure, so I don't think real necessity to complicate the works. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran, who very often is reading my thinking, but any way. Ghana has the floor.

>> GHANA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. At this point in time what we would like to say is that as much as the issue of numbering, the issue of naming, addressing, negotiation, all have the clear mandate from some of the study group, Study Group 2 and 3, quality of service is also an issue that normally go would study group 12 and we all agree that quality of service has become a global issue now and we cannot at this point say that it's not an issue and, therefore, must not be considered.

So we think that this issue of quality of service must be considered in this Resolution, and it should be part and parcel of the overall scope of things that the ITU or the TSU will be doing. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Now, I give the floor to United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The U.K. supports your views, and your proposal, also the views of Japan, Canada, Australia and United States. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom. Now, I give the floor to Egypt, and you have to push the button.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Regarding item number 3 in the result part, we may propose another language to reach some sort of compromise and also not to go to the WCIT issue and WCIT ‑‑ we may propose the language of that request the TSAG to study the necessity of implementation of recommendation having policy or regulatory implications, maybe assigned and obligatory status.

So the ‑‑ our proposal to looking for the necessity to apply that concept. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: It was quite quick reading so I didn't get your sentence, I think we need really to think over about that, but before really I think we have to have complete redrafting of Paragraph 3 or simply not to quote it. It still not solve the question of recommendation of service. I understand the preoccupation of Africa and other states because I know quality of service is very important, but it acts like other aspect of our really implementation at the end at the national level and it's a national decision. We have seen also on other occasions some amnestation who have requested to pass the accelerate the procedure to the normal procedure because they felt that some technical recommendation of a policy and publication, but not making that the general.

By the way, that is true also for Study Group 2 and 3, recommendation in some case they are going for different track. Now, I have a list, but I give first the floor to Bonaire because they have requested that they didn't know to press the button, so you pass before.

>> GUINEA: Thank you, Chairman. We are saying here that quality of service might not need to be included. That's for developed countries, but for developing countries this is a very important issue. We can accept the text, but we would like a certain amount of rewarding to be done. We should think about rewarding the text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Guinea for that statement. I would like to now continue speaking French and to pass the floor to France.

>> FRANCE: I would like to state on behalf of the CPT that we agree with Japan, the United States and a number of others who have made statements to the effect that we would not like all recommendations on quality of service to be in Resolution 40. As a Chair of Study Group 2 which works on quality of service, as you have already said, I can say that there is always the possibility for these recommendations to be dealt with in TAP. That can occur whenever a country believes that a particular proposal has regulatory or political implications. In that case, TAP can be requested.

So there is no problem for the time being. References to the ITR in this document don't seem possible for us because the WCIT hasn't taken place yet and can't, therefore, have taken a decision. So we believe that it's premature to include that in this recommendation because those aspects haven't yet been discussed by the WCIT. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, France.

>> IRAN:  We need to be cautious with respect Paragraph 818 of Resolution one, selection of the Study Group. All recommendations relating to domain 4 and 11 are TAP. Others are AAP. And however, explicit action at this Study Group meeting can change the selection from AAP to TAP, and vice versa if consensus of the Member States and second members at the meeting or so decides. If consensus is not achieved, the same procedures at WTSA Paragraph 111 that needs voting will proceed. Chairman, we have all procedures in the Resolution one, Chairman, and we could follow that, however, if you should make any decision which have impact on Resolution 1, you have to be careful and modify that or cross reference that in Resolution 1. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. Algeria, you have the floor.

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Chairman. I would like to make a statement about item 3 or point 3. We need to recall here that the obligatory nature can't apply posteriorly after the event. If there are regulatory or political implications I think today we have local or national regulations in place and they fall within each country's sovereignty. In terms of obligation then, it might not be appropriate for particular provisions here to be made explicitly obligatory where quality of service is concerned. It might be better to broaden our line of thinking about quality of service, network interconnectivity at the international level, convergence, NGN and other future networks, so on.

I think this is very topical matter and, of course, it appears on the WCIT agenda, that Conference which is surely to be held here in Dubai. So I think we should reword this text slightly both in terms of what it actually says and the intention to introduce Resolution 40.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. Now, I give the floor to Italy.

>> ITALY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to clarify with the U.S.A. the definition of the policy and regulatory issue. When U.S.A. stated that quality of service is a question of the country and as such it should not be considered as a regulatory and policy implication, I stated that this is a request of a point of view. Because universal service for such as worker service and now Voice Over IP service is to be provided in order to guarantee, insure the highest availability, reliability and quality of service and all universal service should be insured to the user the highest quality of service and in my opinion, this aspect is an aspect of regulatory and policy implication.

And I don't for this reason agree with the U.S.A. opinion on this aspect. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Italy. Now, I think we are ‑‑ I keep on receiving requests from the floor from the same country, so I want really to give time to conclude, and it seems to me that there is quite a big concern with the present text of the revised Resolution. Definitely on the aspect, point 3 that I understand can be either revisited or deleted. I always prefer the Australian way because it's short and the text more clear, but if the meeting agree, we can ‑‑ I have revised wording.

It remains the basic question of difference of opinion on the additional quality of service. And there really we need some drafting activity. So I wonder if I can find a victim for informal consultation on this matter, and I think of a country and the country could be Egypt, if Egypt agree. But if the meeting agree.

Can I ask Egypt if they agree to have informal consultation on this matter? Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, we entirely agree with what you have suggested, and we do indeed agree to coordinate informal consultations with a view to reaching a consensus text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Is the meeting agreeing with my basic principle that I said before? Point 3 should be either preferably deleted or completely redrafted and the quality of service needs to find the compromise between the two parties. If the meeting agrees, I will proceed in this way, and maybe we have to have another room for informal consultation. Okay. Let's ‑‑ the Secretariat suggests to be really informal consultation, so I charge Egypt to get in touch with the main speaker who are quite a lot, United States, Italy, France ‑‑ what were ‑‑ Saudi Arabia or emirate, African country, because I have seen the request from Ghana before, and to come to United Kingdom and to come with the revised text to our next session, if possible. So we will be in the agenda tomorrow morning.

I hope you succeed to have a text by tomorrow morning. Okay. This next week in order not to interfere with the present scheme. Nigeria has asked the floor. Please, Nigeria.

>> NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Nigeria has listened keenly to the debate on this issue and we want to totally agree with the position of Italy. And secondly, we want to agree with your position that Resolution Number 3 be redrafted and then a compromise be sought on the issue of quality of service, but the issue of deleting the resolve 3 completely, we do not support that position. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Yes, my problem is you have not have any implication on a judgment or the ten days to come WCIT debate. So I want to have a clean Resolution, stand alone, not depending on possible result of WCIT where we don't know what will be. And so that's the reason why I will ‑‑ there was a proposal text from Egypt also on this point. I don't remember one was proposal, Brazil, who have proposal very quickly and I say need more time to think over, and the quality of service there are two different positions, and also we have to find the compromise between the two camps. We cannot impose one or the other, and I think we have to find a compromise text.

So Egypt, I count on your diplomacy and your good willing and come back with a text for beginning of next week. It's okay for you? So please those interested, get in touch with Egypt and we will try to have the final text. Now, we have completed to the agenda. We perfectly on time. If there are no other requests for the floor ‑‑ yes, Brazil.

>> BRAZIL:  I would like to make a clarification about the JCA previous discussion. I would like to know, in fact, when this subtle return to the assembly because it's not very clear if document 26 will be submitted to assembly or not, and even if Resolution 75 will have the terms of reference of the JCA or not. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I think we have to inquire, definitely your request for JCA as I said will go to a Committee 4. So I have to report to the Chairman of Committee 4 and see when you intend to discuss the matter and after concerning Resolution 75, as I said, this matter will be dealt with by Mr. Minkin. So with that, United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, just a question for the Secretariat. With reference to the agenda for the different meetings my point is this I would like to request that agendas be made available sufficiently in advance of meetings for delegations to review documents prior to the particular meetings concerned. For instance, for today, we got the agenda for what we did here this afternoon only this morning. So it was difficult for us to review documents, to prepare proposals to have to be submitted and so on because we did not have very much time. For that reason, I would request the Secretariat to take appropriate measures and to do their very best to insure that agendas are issued sufficiently in advance of meetings to allow delegations to prepare the relevant documents. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: That is also my request, and it was my request, and to I give the floor to the Secretariat.

>> SECRETARIAT: Yes, of course. And you will notice now that although the agendas for tomorrow is not published, it is in fact available in DT11. So in fact DT11 contains the agenda for this entire week for this group. So please refer to DT11, and do not wait for us to produce the formal agenda which will come sometime later. So you can refer to DT11 to look at the documents that will need to be discussed tomorrow.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: With that, I think I have request from floor from Iran.

>> IRAN:  Just to be very clear to our request to distinguished delegate of Egypt redrafting the text, point one, no reference to the WCIT at all. Point two, do not change the current status of recommendation in ITU‑T, which are voluntary basis. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, that is ‑‑ was clear to me in the conclusion and I thank you again for having restated my conclusion, let's say. With that, I thank all of you, and I give good wishes of good result from Egypt and Russia in their respective task, and see you tomorrow. The meeting is closed.
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