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>> Hello? Good morning. We would like to start the next session now, Working Group 4A so please put on your headphones. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Dear colleagues and friends, we should start our meeting and I give immediately the floor to the Secretary for one announcement.

>> Thank you, Chairman. The announcement concerns the meetings of Ad Hoc Groups this afternoon, and they are as follows ‑‑ there will be an Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 72 from 14:30 to 15:00, that is 2:30 to 3:00 p.m. and there will be an Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 73 from 15:00 to 17:00. That's 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

If more time is needed for Resolution 72, then it will take place after 17:30, after 5:30. The room has not yet been allocated, but you will see it on the screens, so please check the screens for the ad hocs for these groups. Thank you.

>> The agenda of this session is in Admin 10. Can I ask colleagues technicians at the end of the room to pull up the agenda? Yes, thank you.

>> CHAIR: So now we have the agenda. We can follow the agenda. First, approval, so do you have an observation on the agenda? I want to have only very quick report of the ‑‑ but we will really examine next week but I want to know how the work is progressing.

I know that the informal group on Resolution 75 has acted, and there is already a DT available for our consideration next week. May I ask Egypt how is progressing the work in informal consultation? Egypt is present? Or is having still informal consultation?

Egypt, please, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We will start our informal consultation at the lunch break today, so by the end of the day, I will report to you about the progress in our work. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Many thanks. So things are on track. That was my preoccupation, so at least that has been solved.

Now, we can go on and approve the report of the working meeting, approve TD13. So can we have a look and approve TD13? It's not possible to post? No.

It is on the Web. TD13 is on the Web.

So can we approve TD13? Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I think we have yesterday mentioned something, and we wish that it would kindly be reflected in the summary here with respect to Resolution 40, when it said that after discussion it was agreed that the proposed text that recommendation having policy or regulatory implications may be assigned an obligatory status in accordance with the relevant Article of the international and then says, would have significant redrafted. We said yes, redrafted that, without any reference to ITR, add that one, without any reference to ITR, and in consistency with the Constitution and Convention. So this is we have to add here.

>> CHAIR: There is in the last sentence, but however, I agree with you. We have to add, in consistency with Constitution and Convention, we have to add in the report. In the last sentence is the reference that ‑‑ not reference to ITR but the very important in consistency with Constitution and Convention.

With that modification, can we endorse for the time being the report? We will have time to revise it in the final session, but at least I want to have the report endorsed. No requests from the floor?

Secretary is making the necessary correction.

Now there is another document with consequence of the decision taken is TD19, and I ask you to have a look at TD19. please, Richard.

>> RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. This is simply a technicality. We need to transmit to Committee 4 the decisions that we have taken so that Committee 4 can approve them, and then take appropriate action, so there are two things that were agreed. The first is that the matter of the creation of the JCA would not be further discussed in this group but should be discussed by Committee 4 which can then refer it to Plenary or make a decision as the case may be and the second is we've approved some editorial changes to Resolution 62? 62, yeah, and those can be directly transmitted to the editorial Committee for transmission to Plenary so this is simply a mechanical reflection of what was decided yesterday. It's a pure formality and it goes from our Working Group to Committee 4.

>> CHAIR: We have a request for the floor from Iran.

>> IRAN: Yes, Chairman, the explanation given by Secretariat is perfect but this is not affecting the document. This is C26 is quite ambiguous. C26, Resolution 178. We are not questioning that. We're discussing establishment of the JCA relating so exactly what Secretariat mentioned should be the first paragraph of that but not what is here because C26 is not clear and we have no question about 178. We are talking of JCA, so need further clarification. I'm sure that Mr. Hill will do that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: We will provide a redraft with this text. In fact, I think it should be clear that it was decided that Resolution 75 not to deal with the matter, and I think we have to start Resolution ‑‑ it was decided that Resolution 75 will not deal with the creation of JCA. Therefore, it was suggested and I hope that I have not ‑‑ so it was agreed that Resolution 75 will not deal with the creation of the JCA.

Therefore, it was agreed to refer the matter to the Plenary with the related term of reference, something like that. Thank you, Iran, for your suggestion, which coincided with mine by accident.

Are there any further requests for the floor? No. So we can proceed to today's business if I can say so and we have quite an interesting time, because we have three major Resolutions to deal with. And I think you are all aware of their importance. Let's start with Resolution 50. We have the document from the TSB in contribution 29. We have a contribution from CITEL, and I request CITEL Addendum 2 to contribution 38 to briefly introduce their contribution.

Someone from CITEL? Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of CITEL, I will present document 38, the proposed modifications to Resolution 50 cybersecurity. It is important to remember that Resolution 30, Plenipot directed the Director to intensify work within existing ITU‑T Study Groups in order to address existing and future threats and vulnerabilities affecting efforts to build confidence and security in the use of ICTs by developing recommendations as appropriate. As a result of Resolution 130, each Study Group was made responsible for security activities in its own areas of responsibility beginning in 2002 and sharing the responsibility for security between Study Groups were reaffirmed over the years and still remains in effect. Mr. Chairman one reason the current version of Resolution 50 the fact that responsibility for security was shared among the Study Groups is not immediately obvious. Consequently as currently written Resolution 50 is ambiguous how the responsibility for security is to be shared across the Study Groups. This ambiguity has resulted in Study Groups drafting or updating new questions which is normally filed may result in duplication of work, and possibly even to centralize the responsibility for security in one Study Group instead of it being able to remain district. Duplication of work and the responsibility for security are both unacceptable. It is imperative that Resolution 50 be very clear in regards to division of security responsibilities. CITEL members states proposed the number of modifications be made to Resolution 50 to improve its readability, clarity and direction, Annex 1 to this document provides a marked‑up copy of Resolution 50, cybersecurity. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, this concludes my presentation.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Any question or clarification of the presentation? If not, let's proceed, the following one is from European administration is Addendum 2 to contribution 45. Someone from CPT to present this document? United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much. The European proposal makes minor revisions. For example for further instructs the Director of the TSB to cooperate with all relevant international organisations and stakeholders who have international/regional recognized experience of working on cybersecurity frameworks and issues where appropriate. In detail, we made changes to areas such as under recalling, WTSA 2008's Resolution 52 countering and combating spam, and also in WTSA 2008's Resolution 58, encourage the creation of National computer incidence response teams, particularly in developing countries.

Under recognizing, we've made an amendment in that WTDC 2010 has adopted the Hyderabad Action Plan and its Programme 3 on cybersecurity and ICT applications and IP based network related issues, which identifies cybersecurity as a priority activity of the Telecommunication Development Bureau, and defines activities to be undertaken by BDT; and has also adopted Resolution 45 in Hyderabad in 2010 on mechanisms for enhancing cooperation on cybersecurity including countering and combating spam.

We've also made another change under further instructs the Director of the Telecommunication Standardization Bureau to cooperate with all relevant international organisations and stakeholders who have international/regional recognized experience of working on cybersecurity frameworks and issues where appropriate. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom. Any request of clarification? If not, I will now give the floor to Korea to introduce Addendum 2 to Contribution 59. Korea, you have the floor.

>> KOREA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Korea recognized the importance of updates of this Resolution 50, so we propose modification to this Resolution 50 to reflect newly approved ITU‑T recommendations and emerging security issues. Study Group 17 has important achievements during this study period on developing new recommendations for emerging security issues such as security for cloud computing, intelligent transport systems and smart grid. I'd like to go to the details of our proposals. Under the consideration, to consider the distribution by Web and the impact to the computer as a typical example of this so item E has been updated to include those two instances.

And under the consideration, item E has been proposed to add, in order to consider there is a need for coordinated national, regional and international action for preventing cyberattacks which is described in PP Resolution 130.

And under the consideration further, one item has been proposed to be added to consider approve the recommendation ITU‑T X.1500 which is "Overview of cybersecurity information exchange" that provides cybersecurity information exchange model and discusses techniques that could be used to facilitate the exchange of cybersecurity information.

And under the recognizing, there's small minor editorial proposals were made to reflect PP Resolution 130, and under the recognizing, item C, in order to consider the updates made in WTC programme 2, item C has been modified to add the title of the programme on cybersecurity ICT applications and IP‑based network related issues.

And under the resolve, item 1, in order to consider there is a strong need for developing recommendation for emerging security areas, such as cloud computing, smart grid and intelligent transport systems, item 1 has been modified to include these requirements.

And under the resolves, item 4, item 4 has been modified to consider the X.1500 be used as a framework for assessing networks and protocols for security vulnerabilities and to share experiences and facilitate the exchange of cybersecurity information. That's all. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Korea, for the clear presentation. Any question or clarification? If not, I will ask now the Arab States and I will explain why last is Russia, and RCC. Arab State to introduce document 64, Addendum 15. Please, some representative of Arab States? Sudan.

>> Sudan: Thank you, Chairman. I am speaking on behalf of the Arab States. This proposal can be found in document 64, Addendum 15. In this document we propose some amendments. Firstly, we would like to add confidence to the title. We have also made an update by adding some Resolutions adopt at the Plenipotentiary Conference. We've also stressed the importance of cooperation and collaboration with the organisations dealing with this matter particularly IMPACT. We provide our full support to Study Group 17 and hope that work in that Study Group as Russia and Canada stated this morning will be bolstered within that framework. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sudan for your presentation. Any question or need for clarification? If not, I will give the floor to Russia to introduce their contribution, 49 please, Russia. You have the floor.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, distinguished Chairman. The administration of the Russian Federation proposes additions to Resolution 50 on cybersecurity to take account of Resolutions 130 and 181 of the 2010 Plenipotentiary Conference and new documents drawn up within ITU‑T related to confidence and security of ICTs.

In particular, we are proposing that pursuant to Resolution 181, the term "cybersecurity" is one of the basic set of terms for building confidence and security in the use of ICTs, and it is necessary to continue work to improve this base set of terminology, including the term "cybersecurity."

We also propose noting results of work done in the previous study period related to Resolution 50. That is the approved guidance in ITU to create National IP‑based public network security centers for developing countries, also mentioned in Resolution 130 of the Plenipotentiary Conference. This guidance looks at exchange of information on security issues.

The second document is the baseline for security for telecommunications operators which defines the procedure for assessing level of security through the interaction of networks of operators. Moreover, we propose some editorial changes to the text of the Resolution in instructs the Director of the TSB to carry out studies on C5 of WSIS on building confidence and security in the use of ICTs.

These additions to the text of the Resolution are given in the Annex to our contribution. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Any requests for clarification to Russia? If not, we can open to general discussion, and I have two observations, premiere observations. First, we have to keep in mind that the assignment work between the various Study Group, in reference to various Study Groups is dealt with in a group of working party 4 and we have to follow the consequence. I see there are different opinions on that so we have to try to reflect these in the Resolutions that remain as far as possible general.

Secondly, I don't think I've seen in some cases some sedation of ITR Article and again my observation is valid not to pre‑judge the result of WCIT by putting some text that will give us some possible trouble in the future.

Apart from that, I open the floor for any discussion, clarification, proposals. So the floor is yours if you have any questions.

Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Apart from what you have said, no reference to the ITR or no prejudgment of the WCIT, I think the issue is quite clear that you have to find a victim, and to give the victim to look at all the proposals and try to find very compromise within all of them. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. That was my final goal. But I want first to see if there were some general mood from the meeting apart the two opinions I have expressed, and that you share.

If not, that's the reason why I ask last Russia to present in contribution. I have a designated victim from the Chairman of Study Group 17, if he can agree to Chair the group on this matter. Russia?

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. I would be very happy to do as you ask.

>> CHAIR: That makes me relax. Yes, it's okay. Now we give you the time where to work for the Ad Hoc Group. I understand this is another group. So Secretary, please go ahead.

>> SECRETARY: We have already booked a room for tonight from 18:30, so 6:30. Is it okay with you?

It's Room G, G George.

>> CHAIR: This is a very important subject, interesting subject, so I count on Mr. Kremer to examine the solution that comes up next week.

Thank you. Now we move to the next Resolution, Resolution 52, another important matter. We have the TSB editorial amendment in contribution 29, and we have a contribution 57, Addendum 6, from Brazil. So Brazil can introduce your document.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Brazil proposes to two improvements. The first one under recognizing further we propose to add the reference to Resolution 174 of the Plenipotentiary Conference that resolves to instruct the Secretary‑General to take the necessary measures in order to raise the awareness of Member States regarding the adverse impact that may result from the illicit use of information and communication resources. And maintain the role of ITU to cooperate within the mandate which order United Nations bodies in combating the illicit use of ICTs.

We propose also to modify the existing text that developing recommendations to combat spam falls within the objectives of Resolutions 71, and Resolution 174, and Resolution 130, also. We propose also under the "considering" to add that Resolution 130 strengthening the role of ITU in building confidence and security in the use of Information and Communication technologies, recommends that ITU‑T focus its resources and programmes on those areas of cybersecurity within its core mandate and expertise, notably the technical and development spheres, et cetera.

And we propose also to add a last bullet: There is no unique globally acceptable definition for the term spam as meaning ‑‑ as the meaning of the word spam depends on each national perception of privacy and what constitutes spam from the various national technological, economical, social and practical perspectives.

And our second contribution is under noting. And modifying the existing text, important technical work carried out to date in Study Group 17, and in particular, recommendations ITU‑T X.1231, X.1240, and X.1241 and we would like to add also X.1242, X.1243, and X.1245. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil, for your introduction. Any question or clarification? Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I tried to open the document but was unsuccessful due to access. Chairman, why in order to raise the awareness of the countries or members we ask the Secretary‑General to do that? We can ask Director of the TSB in close collaboration with Director of BDT to do that. What is the reason that we take this particular path? Because usually this is an action to be taken by the two Directors in collaboration with each other.

Second, could Brazil kindly identify that with respect to spam, is it an attempt to define spam? After the answer, I would have further questions. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Before giving the floor to Brazil, United States requests the floor.

>> UNITED STATES: Mr. Chairman, I'm very sorry. If I may, I would like to take you back to the time that was proposed for the Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 50.

Would it be appropriate for me to raise an issue regarding that at this time?

>> CHAIR: I am afraid we have already booked the room, but please say what is your problem.

>> UNITED STATES: Well, as you may know this is our Thanksgiving day in the U.S., and we had ‑‑ the Delegation had arranged to have a celebration dinner this evening at that time. So we were wondering, after consultation with members of the Delegation here, if it would be possible to reschedule that for 8:00 tomorrow morning? So we would ask for your indulgence in that regard. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: The victim, Mr. Kremer, can you adhere to the request?

>> ARKADIY KREMER: Chairman, yes, that is fine for me. Tomorrow at 8:00 in the morning. Now, if you would give me the room number, as well. I would be very grateful.

>> CHAIR: The room I think will be reconfirmed soon, but it will be on the screen. And sorry that I forgot this Thanksgiving day. So with my personal excuse but good celebration.

Now I give back the floor to Brazil to respond to the request from Iran.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Responding to the request from Iran about the definition of spam, Brazil is not trying to define spam. This question is already discussed in Question 5 of Study Group 17, and we are only trying to improve the existing Resolution 52, giving some additional references, and we consider that the subject is very important and must be kept in the scope of Study Group 17. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. Concerning the ‑‑ I see in the text from Brazil, invitation only to Director to the Telecommunication Standardization Bureau to continue to cooperate with the Secretary‑General, so I do not see directed to do that. Maybe I misread the text but what I read is that. So you say Iran that you have further requests, but first Russia has request for the floor.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. We would like to express some concerns at the proposal under recognizing E. In light of your proposal not to preempt the decisions of the World Conference on International Telecommunications, we have a difficulty with this point, because we know that a number of countries are proposing making proposals about spam for the International Telecommunication Regulations. Therefore, we think it is too early at this time to have such a provision in this Resolution. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. That is always my problem not to have prejudgment of the WCIT discussion, so that is the principle that is valid. I know that there is another contribution quoting WCIT and the principle remains always valid.

So if you have no further requests for clarification, if you allow me, I will ask Canada to introduce Addendum 2 to contribution 58. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. As you mentioned this proposes modifications to Resolution 52. Which deals with countering and combating spam. This Resolution has been the driving force for technical work in the ITU‑T specifically in Study Group 17 where question 5 of 17 deals with the establishing of countering spam by technical means. It is Canada's view that Resolution 52 should be revised as there is a continuing need to counter and combat spam using technical solutions.

It is proposed that additional text be added to Resolution 52 to make the reader aware of Plenipotentiary Resolution 130 and in particular, to point out the areas where the ITU‑T should not direct resources to undertake work which is outside its scope and responsibility. Additional text is also proposed to reflect the view of Study Group 17 in recommendation ITU‑T X.1240, technologies involved in countering e‑mail spam. Mr. Chairman, Study Group 17 note that there is no consensus in the meaning and implications of the term "spam." As the meaning of the word spam depends on each National perception of privacy and what constitutes spam from the various National technological, economic, social and practical perspectives.

The proposed modifications to Resolution 52 are shown in the marked up text in this document. Specifically we propose adding two new clauses, clause C and the D to the recognizing further Section. Clause C reads as follows, the Resolution 130 strengthening the role of ITU in building confidence and security in the use of Information and Communication Technologies, revision Guadalajara 2010 recommends ITU‑T focus its resources and programmes on those areas of cybersecurity within its core mandate and expertise. Notably the technical and development spheres and not including areas related to Member States applications of legal or policy principles related to National defense National security, content and Cybercrime which are within their sovereign rights.

Clause D that there is no consensus in the meaning of implications of the term spam and the meaning of the word spam depends on each National perception of privacy and what constitutes spam from the various National technological, economic, social and practical perspectives. This concludes the presentation of my contribution, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Any questions or requests for clarification to Canada? Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I am worried that in WTSA we try to bring the issues from the Plenipotentiary Resolution, put it in the Resolutions but if we put something, we should put the whole things. Canada took part of the resolves 3 of Resolution 130, but not the remaining part.

The remaining part, it said that however, ITU could continue to do some of the things as well. It does not exclude the ITU from carrying out its mandate to develop technical recommendations designated to reduce vulnerabilities and so on and so forth, so I don't want that part of the resolves be quoted and other parts not quoted. We cannot be selective with a part of that. So if you want to quote that, I think you quote the whole thing. I don't think it is necessary. You could put reference to Resolution 130 that's all, but not making a part of the quotations and leaving the other part.

The other one, Chairman, is that part D said that there is no consensus. I don't think that it is appropriate that in the Resolutions of ITU‑T we say that we don't have consensus, Chairman. We don't have consensus, we know that we don't have consensus but why we have to announce that we don't have consensus? We need to find the consensus so I don't think that it is appropriate to refer that last of consensus at this stage and show to the outside world that we have difficulties with getting consensus, so on and so forth so I don't think it is quite relevant to put that one. We agree there's no consensus but not put it in the Resolutions quite openly as such.

So I have difficulty with both parts proposed by Canada. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Canada is clear the objection from Iran, the observation from Iran? Are there other requests for clarification? If not let me ask Arab State representative to introduce Addendum 16 to contribution 64. United Arab Emirates, please you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Yes, on behalf of the Arab group we would like to submit a proposal to modify Resolution 64, which contains minor modifications and which we have the burden of network operators, service providers and even end users to combat spam. We'd also like to instruct the TCB Director to initiate a study on indicating the volume and characteristics of spam traffic to better assist Member States and operating agencies to identify such routes and sources and volumes, and in estimating the amount of investments and facilities and other technical means to counter and combat such spam.

We'd also like to take this chance to second the opening or suggestion made by our colleague in Iran regarding the mentioning of the no consensus in the definition of spam in the Resolution. We also do believe that this is all members are aware about such situation and we really have to find a solution for this. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Arab Emirates. Any requests for clarification or further to the United Arab Emirates? United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is in the nature of a comment. With respect to the proposal to initiate a study to determine the origin of cyberthreats, and also the cost of solutions to that problem, I would like to bring to the attention of the group that this work is being done already in the ITU‑T development Sector, notably in Question 22.

In fact, we have a document which I would be happy to provide to anyone who is interested that identifies ‑‑ that basically points out the difficulty of identifying the source of spam because of bot nets which may originate in one country and appear to come from another country. Nevertheless, there has been research done by private entities such as IBM and Symantec which have identified the primary countries of origin of spam, so that information is already available.

In addition, the report goes into detail about what needs to be done, the best practices that need to be undertaken, to stop spam, and these information is divided into three parts: End user practices to protect against spam, securing mail servers and client applications, and securing mail and network infrastructure.

So this document lists all these different recommended practices, and if a country was interested in trying to assess the cost of implementing these practices, this would be a very good place to start.

In short, if I may, I think that the work that is being requested here has already been largely done, and I would commend your attention to this report. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. United Arab Emirates, you have something to add to your ‑‑ or to respond to request to clarify? Please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Yes, we thank the Delegates from the United States for pointing out this report. We'd like to have the time to look at it, study it and see how we might be able to consider this within the Resolution. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Arab Emirates. Iran, you request the floor?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We also thank the clarification by USA but I show the gentleman from USA if you want to open my e‑mail today I will open them and see three pages of spam every day I receive. I don't know what has been. Three pages Chairman. If I do not open for 7 days, my quota in ITU will be finished, normal e‑mail will be exchanged. Tens of pages of spam. I don't think that anything has been done so effectively. Problem exists, and continues to exist. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I have a request from Kenya.

>> KENYA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good afternoon. We would also want to thank the UAE for sharing with us this proposed amendment to this Resolution. The challenges of spam are true and real, and we would welcome any work that the ITU can undertake in order to help us combat this challenge. We also thank the United States for sharing with us this information, but we still think that with this information, it would still be necessary to undertake a study as proposed by the UAE to give us authenticated and unbiased information that can help us combat this problem.

So thank you very much to the UAE and thank you very much for the U.S. also for sharing with us the information that they already have. But we propose that this study that has been proposed be undertaken. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: I have a request from Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I support the proposal of the United Arab Emirates which is on behalf of the Arab group. However, I would like to stress on the economical aspect and impact, indeed to combat spam we have to invest in the infrastructure with a large amount of who are innocent, who are not the initiator of this spam. If you get Symantec or whoever to pay some boxes of dollars every year, not once, this is burdening even the individuals. And manage to the Governments to put such filters so the economic aspect is very significant and Member States should collaborate in combating spam.

It is not only the burden of the user but there must be an active role from the originator of the spam, of the countries from which the spam is originated to help combating such illicit activities. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

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

>> UNITED STATES: Mr. Chairman, I wondered if you intended to create an Ad Hoc Group. I think if you do, this would be a good place to ‑‑ opportunity to discuss this issue in more detail. In addition, the U.S. has some concerns with some of the language in these contributions and would welcome an opportunity to discuss it in an Ad Hoc Group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. It's clear that we cannot solve completely the problem here. It's clear also that as I stated at the beginning, we have not to pre‑judge the discussion result of the forthcoming WCIT so any reference to that should be avoided.

It's clear that we are in favor of streamlining the activity and study within ITU, and I know that ITU‑T Study Group 17 has a role on that, and maybe Mr. Kremer will contradict me but I think they're studying the problem. And now we are also aware that Study Group 2 is active on that.

So having said that, I have to find a victim to Chair one Ad Hoc Group, and the intervention from Mr. Jamie Ennis point me as a possible victim. Do you agree with me to be the victim?

>> UNITED STATES: We would be happy to assist in that regard. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So now the Secretariat will tell you where you have to be the head of the victim.

>> SECRETARY: Yes, I will now announce the time and since I know Mr. Ennis fairly well, I will permit myself a slight joke. Jamie, it's going to be on Saturday morning. I hope that's still okay with you. What time did we say? 9:30 a.m. on Saturday morning in room F, Foxtrot. That will be, of course, on the screens.

>> CHAIR: So the only thing I can ‑‑ with the principle I state avoid overlapping and have notes quotation of the WCIT possible result and recognize that spam is a worldwide problem. Good luck, and I hope I have a good result on Monday.

Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We'll start with schedule Saturday. Be careful not to have too many meetings at the same time, 9:30 in the morning. So Mr. Hill has requested to kindly consult with the other people and try not to have 10 meetings on 9:30. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: That is very wise and I think I hope Mr. Hill will respond to you, please.

>> RICHARD HILL: Yes, thank you. Indeed, we are attempting to coordinate the meeting times but as you see our first attempt failed because we wanted to have a meeting tonight and that was not accepted, but indeed, I think we're okay with the slot which chose tomorrow, and we did try to plan Saturdays so as to avoid overlapping meetings but again I stress we are trying. I cannot guarantee.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Richard. So now we go to the last Resolution of this morning, and I hope we will be on time for the interpreter and for all of us, is Resolution 58. The first text is coming from editorial modification provided by the Secretariat, a really minor one, and the second text is a contribution 57, Addendum 7, from Brazil. May I request Brazil to introduce the proposed change?

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Brazil proposes only a small addition, under "noting," clause E, the ITU‑T discussions and complementary studies on National IP based public network security center for development countries. That has been developed by SG 17 as a published supplement 15. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Any questions or requests for clarification? United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We do have a concern with this language. As the language indicates, this is a supplement that was adopted by Study Group 17. What that means is that it's not normative text and the reason it wasn't normative text was there was a substantial group of administrations that did not agree with it.

So in a spirit of compromise, it was agreed to be included as a supplement. Nevertheless, we view that including it now in a Resolution of the WTSA would give it undue weight. It was not accepted ‑‑ it was accepted only for information. And the countries that felt that it was possibly one way to approach a problem, but by no means the only one, or perhaps even the best one.

So for that reason, we would propose that this language not be included in this Resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. It is clear that supplements are by fact not normative text. Really that is normally a way out in the Study Group meeting to find a compromise. So on the life of this explanation, Brazil, do you insist to have this modification? Or we cannot approve the amended text provided by the Secretariat. Russia?

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. We support the proposal from Brazil, and we think this work is important, and such studies should be carried out in ITU‑T. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: I agree with you, the studies are important, but the supplement is not normative. So is strange to include in a Resolution and not normative text. That's from a logic point of view, let's say. But I have Iran.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We also support Russia and Brazil. However, in order to satisfy the colleague, perhaps we could work out to have a acceptable language put into the proposal of Brazil to have a proper reference on one hand. On the other hand, encourage the studies and so on, so forth. So we should work out and take on Board the proposal of Brazil with some modification in order to satisfy the concerns of colleagues, but we are in favor of the proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I have Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you. Japan would like to share the same concern with the United States, so in Study Group 17, we discussed a lot on this topic, and as the United States said, we didn't ‑‑ didn't have a person consensus to be a standard so we decided for it to appear in the supplement so it's not a good idea to be in this Resolution of WTSA on this topic. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Sudan?

>> SUDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In Sudan, we support what has come in the supplement and we would like here to add a few ‑‑ taking into consideration a few editorial mistakes. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United Kingdom?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. The United Kingdom would also like to associate itself with the comments made by the United States.

>> CHAIR: So we are in a clear position, one side they are studying in Study Group 17. Maybe instead of quoting the supplement, which is not normative, we can quote some study going on in Study Group 17, and have a positive attitude instead of negative attitude because supplement as I say is not normative. So may I request the assistance of Mr. Kremer on that if he can assist me in some way?

>> ARKADIY KREMER: Thank you, Chairman. A supplement as proposed by Brazil, this supplement was discussed and studied in Study Group 17 throughout the period after the Plenipotentiary Conference. I would like to remind everybody that this topic was pointed out in Resolution 130 of the Plenipotentiary Conference, and pursuant to that reference, the work was carried out. Of course, as to the substance of this work, which presupposes the establishment of IP‑based public network security centers in developing countries, as to the substance, there was no agreement achieved to publish this as a normative document.

At the same time, Study Group 17 unanimously decided to publish this guidance as a supplement. We are aware that a supplement is not a normative document. However, it is nevertheless an official document. It is published on the ITU site, and therefore, at least to give information that such work has been done and results obtained seems to be correct.

I think we have to think about editorial changes to the substance, including a reference to this document, and at the same time taking into account that this is a supplement, not a recommendation. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Kremer. I have to say that you didn't assist me a lot, but I try myself and see if everyone agree.

In the proposal little E, we can read, the ITU‑T discussion and complementary study on National IP based public network security center for developing countries carried out in Study Group 17, stop. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Once again here, I don't think that we should convert this group to the editing group so I think you assigned this task, find another victim, maybe Brazil, to find out a proper works. I don't agree that supplement has no value. Otherwise we delete the supplement from the ITU‑T working. If people say we're wasting our time in Study Group supplement, there's a difference between supplement, and the recommendation is that that will be agreed at the Study Group level only and would not go to the Member States and so on, so forth. But if it has some value we could not totally negate the value of the supplement. Otherwise, we have difficulty.

So I suggest that you find another victim and try to find the proper language the meet the requirements. However, we as a developing country has a lot of support for these activities and would like to be reflected in the Resolutions. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Russia?

>> RUSSIA: Thank you. I apologize for taking the floor again. Maybe what I propose will be something which could be a possible compromise.

First I'd like to point out that the Section to which we are referring is called "noting."

The second point is that maybe we could proceed as follows: We could stop after the words "IP based for developing countries," and take away the brackets where it says that this is a supplement. On the one hand this would enable us within this Section to give the information about the work which has been done, and on the other hand, perhaps it would allay the objection that we are referring here to a non‑normative document which at the same time is nevertheless an official ITU document. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Now you help me. Everyone can agree with the proposal from Russia? Uganda?

>> UGANDA: I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I want to support Russia's proposal. Chairman, it is a fact and after all as Russia pointed out, this is only noting, and it is a statement of fact that actually studies have been going on in Study Group 17 on this subject. What's wrong with stating a fact, moreover noting? We do support Russia's proposal. Mr. Chairman, I thank you.

>> CHAIR: Last speaker, because I have to close, is United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Mr. Chairman, regretfully, I don't think we could support the proposal of Russia, which if I understood it correctly would delete the identification of this document as a supplement. Therefore, leaving the impression that it was in fact more than a supplement. So we would have problems with that.

I would point out that in Question 22 of ITU‑D, we have developed an entire report, probably 50 or 60 pages, on how to set up one of these CIRTs which we didn't ask to be added to this noting. But if we're going to get into this, we could add a lot of information about what's being done in the ITU on the subject of Computer Incident Response Teams.

So I believe perhaps we would support the proposal of Iran to create a small group to consider this language and perhaps develop something, an alternative. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So Iran, are you willing to Chair ‑‑ to take care of this informal group, informal consultation?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I am only alone, one more delegate. We are so many meetings. If the meeting was from Sunday on ward yes but up fortunately no, I cannot. Maybe give it to Brazil, thank you.

>> CHAIR: I will request first USA, if you want to carry informal consultation.

>> UNITED STATES: Yes, we would be happy to have informal consultations. Are you asking if we would be willing to lead this effort?

>> CHAIR: Yes.

>> UNITED STATES: If it was acceptable to the rest of the group, we would accommodate that at your request.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So please contact the U.S. Delegation to find a suitable, and in particular Russia, Brazil, Iran, get in touch with U.S. and find a compromise solution.

Thank you. The meeting is closed.

[ End of meeting ]
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