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>> RICHARD HILL: Please put on your headsets. We would like to start the meeting. Thank you.

Technicians in the back of the room, can you please project the document? Technicians in the back ‑‑ thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Now that we have the agenda for this afternoon's session we can proceed with our work. Let me first take Resolution 47 and 48, and I will discuss together, because there are some counter proposing the merger of these Resolutions. So if you will allow me, I will note first there is by reason of the contribution in TSB in contribution 29, and after next one is contribution from CPT, Addendum 5 and 6 to document contribution 45.

So can I request some European representative to introduce these two annexes? Thank you. It seems Europe is not present, or not listening.

Because no one want to introduce these documents. Was supposed to be someone from United Kingdom, but I do not see on the ‑‑ okay, we will proceed later on with this introduction.

Yeah, now I was told Administrative Number 11 will be posted soon. First I have to ask, do you approve the agenda? Administrative 11 is out. Do you approve the agenda? Yeah.

Report of previous working party ‑‑ so we'll postpone because there is a revision of TD13 not posted so I'm going to Resolution 47 and 48. Now I again repeat my request, someone from European can introduce the document. Thank you. United Kingdom.

>> United Kingdom: Apologies, Mr. Chairman. I was otherwise detained. Resolution 47, to do with Country Code Top‑Level Domains, the United Kingdom on behalf of CEPT see that this is an opportunity for efficient and effective merging of Resolution 47 and 48 to create a new Resolution 47 named Country Code top level and internationalized in brackets multilingual, close brackets, Domain Names. In doing so, this may require suppressing Resolution 48. In detail, under considering, the international organisations have also had and should continue to have an important role in the development of Internet related technical standards and relevant policies. The on going activities of other relevant organisations, and under "and noting," the development and advances have been made by existing Internet organisations in the deployment of non‑Latin scripts, and that further action in this area is envisaged. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Sorry, United Kingdom. Sorry to distract you from other meeting but we need a presentation of the documents. May I ask another representative of the Arab States to introduce their two documents related to Resolutions 47 and 48.

First, Addendum 12 to document 64 and after, Addendum 6 to document ‑‑ the Addendum for Resolution 48. Thank you. Addendum 6 and Addendum 13. Please, Arab States. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Chairman, good afternoon. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Arab States, I would like to introduce document 64, Addendum 12, on Resolution 47, Country Code Top‑Level Domain names. The modifications proposed by the Arab group are principally editorial. In order to take into account the necessary changes or updates required as a result of past Plenipotentiary Conferences and we consider that Study Group 2 should continue its work and cooperate with Member States in order to continue Country Code Top‑Level Domain names and work too with other specialized parties.

So much for Addendum 12 of document 64. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Can you also, since we are, I put in bulk the two, introduce Addendum 13 to your contribution for the other Resolution? Saudi Arabia?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. Of course, Addendum 13 to document 64 is once again a proposal from the Arab States regarding proposed revisions to Resolution 48. This Resolution concerns internationalized multilingual Domain Names. The Arab States believe this Resolution is still pertinent and an important one. We have proposed therefore some modifications in order to update the Resolution, which had already been updated at Johannesburg. The Arab States believe that we should continue to study internationalized multilingual domain names, and to maintain connections, links, with other organisations both Governmental and non‑governmental, and to continue to cooperate with such bodies. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Now I open the floor for discussion, comments. As you see, there are seems to me two clear position one to merge the Resolutions in one unique Resolution, and the other one to have only editorial amendment to existing Resolution.

So can you take the floor and express your opinion or your idea on that? I think the study also in the merging will be not suppressed, but it is expressed in a different way.

So I ask who wants to speak. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Mr. Chairman, thank you. Chairman, we have carefully considered the proposals made by the CEPT to merge these two proposals, and indeed the proposal from the Arab States. We believe that it is perhaps premature to merge these two Resolutions at this time, and we believe that such Resolutions should be maintained separately as stand‑alone Resolutions, particularly the Country Code Top‑Level Domain names. These are very different things, and the Study Groups looking after these issues are different, and we feel, therefore, that these Resolutions should continue to stand alone.

It is understood that they can be modified in order to update them as has been proposed by the Arab States. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Any other one requesting the floor? United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you. The U.S. would like to support the European Common Position on this point. We think this is quite an effective way to extreme line the number of Resolutions while maintaining all the important points that are currently included in Resolution 48. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Any further requests or clarification, further comments? Because we have two different positions, and it's difficult to reconcile two different positions.

You know, although I have preference to have a limited number of Resolutions, the simplest solution is to maintain the two Resolutions with editorial amendments. That's a straight forward solution to me. I don't know if you agree.

So if there are no further requests from the floor, this is the way out I will seek. It seems not, so in this case, if the meeting agree, we maintain the Resolution 47 and 48 separate, and we can maybe endorse the common Arab proposal. No objection? Done.

So just to repeat for the record, we have just approved endorsing the text Resolution 47 and 48 as proposed by the Arab Common Proposal. Clear? Yes.

So we can move on the next one on the agenda is Resolution 49. We have the text from TSB in document 29. We have a proposal from Arab States in Addendum 14 to contribution 64 and from European states, Addendum 8 to contribution 45.

Can I ask Europe to introduce their Addendum? France, please.

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Our Addendum is extremely simple. It is to be considered in the light of the common European proposal which suggests that suppression of Resolutions and the principal reason for such suppressions are explained in this contribution. When we observed that the tasks allocated to two various groups within the TSB have been accomplished, and the Resolution therefore serves no further purpose. And it is in such a spirit that we have reviewed the Resolutions, and more particularly, the Resolution on ENUM which set a number of tasks and instructed the Director of the TSB to undertake certain actions. We believe that such actions have been undertaken and brought to fruition and I think such observations are valid for all our supposed suppressions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, France. It is very clear there's some logic on the proposal. May I request now the Arab States to introduce the reason why they want to continue this Resolution. Please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Arab States I present the amendment to this Resolution on the ENUM system. The series of modifications in order to update the Resolution, most particularly resolves to instruct Study Group 2 to study the current interim procedure for ENUM Delegation and report back to the Director of the TSB. I believe that that is an indication of the importance of the Resolution and this is why we propose the amendment contained in our proposal.

I think this too would allow us to give greater importance to this Resolution in future.

>> CHAIR: Any further requests for comments, clarification, reasoning? I should have really request from Study Group 2 representative to comment on that, but okay, I open the floor to any discussion, question, clarification, positioning, and so on.

It seems no one has taken the floor so my understanding that the meeting has been convened by the Arab proposal to maintain this Resolution, with the text they propose. That is my conclusion. If there are no further ‑‑ United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't believe that the question you asked has actually been answered, because the point made by the CEPT contribution was that all of the tasks that had been asked to be completed on ENUM had actually been done, and I believe you asked for clarification what remains to be done that hasn't, and I don't believe that has been answered.

So if that's your assumption, as well, the conclusion that it needs to remain doesn't appear to be the case. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Exactly. What I really was asking the Arab States to say why, the reason why the Resolution should continue and they add this sentence on ENUM reporting back to Study Group 2, so my understanding for your intervention that you think that this has been already, the ENUM matter has been already studied and performed by ITU Study Group 2. That's the reason I asked also Study Group 2 expertise on this particular matter. Now I will give the floor to Tanzania.

>> TANZANIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Tanzania also subscribes to what the Arab was stated, because although the ENUM was started to be implemented, but we are not certain that the Chair's concluded the study projects or sometimes as Pilot projects. Should we discontinue that list? I think we need to continue so that we can have the status especially from the developing the least developed countries. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I have the chance or the opportunity to have a secretary, also the one that has been Secretary of Study Group 2 for many years up till now, so in absence of the Chairman of Study Group 2, I will ask him to give some clarification.

>> RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. Indeed an interim procedure has been approved and I stress that it's an interim procedure and that has been used satisfactorily now for several years to handle the ENUM Delegations. On the other hand, the work item to have a recommendation is still open even though the work has been suspended for the time being. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: So I repeat my previous proposal on the basis of Arab States contribution, can we continue in this case Resolution 48 with the text proposed by the Arab States?

United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you Chairman. Just stressing on what Mr. Richard indicated and concluding with our colleagues from the Arab group and Tanzania, the requirement is to evaluate the interim procedure that has been set into action, taking into consideration that ENUM Delegation and the naming addressing matters are interlinked with other matters that are being discussed.

So the request here of the need is to evaluate the current interim procedure and report back to the Director of TSB so that it might be enhanced or might be further implemented for a better implementation of that procedure. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Iran requests the floor.

>> IRAN: Thank you Chairman, simply just to support the Arab proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. In light of this intervention and explanation given by our Secretary, can we again you follow the proposal to modify Resolution 49 the way requested by the Arab States and endorse it? There's no request from the floor. Done. Bang.

We move now to the next step, Resolution 64 with more maybe complex, not easy to go like the previous one. So the text from TSB is in document 29. We have a proposal from all the regions more or less, so I will start in order, and start with the APT, Asia proposal, Annex 5 to document 35. Indonesia, you have the floor.

>> INDONESIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of APT I would like to introduce the proposal.

Since, we agree that the importance of the need for migration from IPv4 to IPv6 has been recognized by the ITU through Resolution 102 (Rev. Antalya, 2006) and Resolution 180 (Guadalajara 2010) of the Plenipotentiary Conference and its instructions to the Director of the Telecommunications Standardization Bureau, we take into account of the urgent need for the ITU to assist developing countries in this migration from IPv4 to IPv6 and also together we need a guidance and roadmap to state Word IPv6 Ready Day (IPv6 Dominant).

The APT members suggested to include roadmap and Guidelines, individual country assistance to developing countries, in collaboration with appropriate related Organization in the proposed revision that we put on ACP 35 addendum 5.

We believe that the migration of IPv4 to IPv6 cannot done by individual migration but all of us together state the timing when IPv6 should dominant from IPv4 including software vendor, hardware vendor, Networks operator and also the government itself.

The individual Migration can cause an isolated island of information (the Island of IPv4 and the Island of IPv6) and create a connection problems that effect on international issues that related. IPv4 is not forward compatibility to IPv6.

According to that a Roadmap and Guideline for Migration to IPv6 needed by us. It is needed to state the World IPv6‑Ready Day (or the IPv6 dominant), to know the path where we should achieve, to know the need such as resources and allocation needed for IPv6 and the human capability for Migration, and of course this is also to avoid the island of information.

There are also issues that we proposed that based on traffic of internet from developing countries contribute a potential significant traffic to the global traffic. There will be an issues and problems on routing and connectivity when the developing countries not assisted in migrating to IPv6. We need a sustainable connectivity on Migration to IPv6.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Indonesia. Any requests for clarification or comments on this presentation?

None? I will now give the floor to Uganda to present their contribution 42.

>> UGANDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Uganda's proposal is the same as African Common Proposal. In Addendum 8. Mr. Chairman, in the introduction, we point out the challenges being experienced in implementing IPv6 which among others include cost, interoperability, security, and skilled technical expertise, so, Mr. Chairman, we propose that ITU and other interested partners should assist developing countries in setting up test laboratories for IPv6 systems in order to enhance technical skills in those countries so as to enable smooth and fast IPv4 to IPv6 transition process. Mr. Chairman, we are therefore introducing some few amendments in Resolution 64, and considering we are proposing considering C that some developing countries are experiencing challenges in IPv4 to IPv6 transition process due to the limited technical skills in this area.

We also proposing a second amendment in our resolves 3 to add a few words in resolves 3 which I have highlighted. There was a joint training activities as well establishment of IPv4‑6 test bed laboratories. I thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Uganda, for their presentation. Any question or remark. I have a general remark and I think we have to keep in mind since I see also expert from development Sector present in the first ‑‑ in the second row there, that they have launched a programme on the transition, and we have to take care not to duplicate work performed by development Sector in activity typical of the development Sector, and that is in general, not to particularly link it with one contribution or the other. In general, it's a basic principal.

Iran has the floor.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I just want to comment on the African proposal but you mentioned something that I don't agree unfortunately. There was something in ITU‑D, there was a draft project which was brought to the group. It was mentioned but it was totally stopped but now they are just aligned to get information from Sweden and some information from Malaysia and that's all. There is no activity as such. So transition from IPv4 to IPv6 is not followed as you have mentioned so I'm sorry, I disagree with you. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: You misunderstood me, as usual, dear friend, because I was not saying that it has not been followed. I say some of the requests presented in general, not for IPv4 to IPv6 are dealing with the development activity who are better that we in the development Sector and I want to avoid the proliferation of Resolutions at the end for which the standardization Sector cannot act ‑‑ can only ask support from the development Sector.

For example, the training, for example the creation of centers, things like that, are not standardization issues but are more development issues.

Having said that, I have a request from United Kingdom, Australia, Uganda.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair, and good afternoon. Regarding the discussion, I recall the outcome of the IPv6 group that had its final meeting in June, and it reported to Council on the successful outcome of its studies. One significant outcome and one to which it was congratulated at the time was the development Sector's project, looking at human capacity building in this whole area related to IPv6, and the success that had emerged from the discussions within the IPv6 group that had led to the ITU‑T. ITU‑D cross‑sector activity that resulted in the project.

My understanding that that project is on human capacity building, and is currently under way. If that's not the case, then something has been incorrectly reported to Council but my understanding is that that activity is under way, and is proving very successful. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom. Australia?

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chairman. This is just for the benefit of members to report back that certainly the ITU Regional Office in Bangkok has been running a very successful and on going programme in capacity building on IPv6 transition, and has been working very closely with the regional Internet registry organisation on making that a sort of ongoing and very sustainable project.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Also I was present with the Council group and Director Initiative on that. And the conclusion of their work and I was on the opinion that something has been passed to BDT but maybe I'm wrong. And now continue the introduction of contribution, I have the contribution from European, Annex to contribution 45. United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of CEPT, I would like to introduce our agreed Common Position with regard to Resolution 64 on IP address allocation and encouraging the deployment of IPv6.

CEPT notes that the work of the ITU Council group on IPv6 has finished its work, where it was agreed that the work on IPv6 was one more of capacity building and awareness raising, particularly in developing countries.

CEPT also notes that IANA has allocated the last IPv4 blocks to the regional Internet registries and that some regional Internet registries have already exhausted or close to exhausting their allocations and that all other regional Internet registries are expected to exhaust their allocations within the next year or so.

Therefore, it is important that the migration to IPv6 gains speed and is fully effective in its deployment globally. This is particularly true when you consider that IPv6 extremely large address space enables Global Connectivity to many more electronic devices, mobile phones, laptops, in‑vehicle computers, televisions, building sensors and medical devices, et cetera.

Therefore, under the instructs the Director of Telecommunication Standardization Bureau in close collaboration with the Director of the telecommunication development Bureau, we in CEPT request that both ITU Directors to facilitate capacity building awareness raising, and the importance of IPv6 deployment for all ITU members and interested entities and provide information related to training events being undertaken by relevant entities in the Internet community.

For example, the numbering resort organisation, original Internet registries, local Internet registries, operators groups, and The Internet Society. Under the invites Member States and Sector Members Section, we ask them to contribute to these important activities. With that, Chairman, I conclude CEPT's introductory remarks. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, as usual, any comments or requests for clarification or things like that? It seems it's not so in this case. Let's proceed with the next contribution is contribution from ‑‑ is African Common Proposal Addendum 1 to contribution 56. Someone from the African states can present this Addendum 1? The resolves by the way Addendum 8 to the same contribution.

Someone from African states is willing to present these two contributions? Nigeria first.

>> NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Nigeria was not supposed to present this, but however, I'm presenting this on behalf of the Africa Group. Africa have looked at this Resolution, and it feels that there is need for an addition in the recognizing for the work of the ITU IPv6 group between 2010 and 2012, and Africa group is supporting this addition.

Furthermore, Africa is supporting the following provision in the resolves, that is to instruct Study Groups 2 and 3 each according to its mandate to study the allocation and economic aspects of IP addresses, taking into consideration the challenges and issues identified in the report of the Chairman of the 4 to 5th September 2008 workshop on IPv6.

Africa also is in support of the update of the provision in the further instructs the Director of the Telecommunication Standardization Bureau to report to ITU Council in its 2013 session. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Nigeria. Now I have a request for the floor from Uganda.

>> UGANDA: Chair, you requested for someone to present Addendum 8. Chair, Addendum 8 is the same as the Uganda proposal which I've just presented. I thank you.

>> CHAIR: Very kind of you. So it's clear, any requests for clarification from the meeting? It seems not so in this case, let's proceed to introduction of the last contribution, Addendum 20 to contribution 54 from the Arab States. Sorry, United Kingdom requested the floor. United Kingdom?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Just a question of clarification with regards to the last presentation. The reference there was made to the IPv6 group. Was that the same IPv6 group that we identified in earlier discussions within this Forum that both you and I had identified as having ceased? I'm getting confused as to which, and what we may be talking about. So guidance there would be welcomed.

>> CHAIR: I think it's only one group, but maybe there are ‑‑ it's a wrong misunderstanding. Someone can comment?

No? So it seems so. Sorry, I forgot in the order really, I should come to USA Addendum 1 to contribution 46. So next one to present is Addendum 1 to contribution 46. Please go ahead.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. Referring to contribution number 46, Addendum 1, the U.S. proposed revisions to Resolution 64 consist of editorial updates and also reflects the work done during the last study period including the activities and conclusions of the ITU Council Working Group on IPv6 which concluded that IPv6 allocation policies and processes met the needs of stakeholders and that additional capacity building activities should take place in ITU‑D. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States. Any requests for clarification or comments? No? So last is the Arab States proposal in Addendum 20 to contribution 64. Someone from Arab States can present. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: ‑‑ Addendum 20 concerning Resolution 64 which has to do with the allocation of IP addresses and the publication of new versions. The Arab countries have updated this Resolution according to the last events that have led to changes in the ITU Resolutions, and we have also taken into account the encouragement to change to IPv6, so the Arab countries think that we should continue studying the two aspects, the one that has to do with allocation, and also the economic aspect of the transition itself.

The Arab countries have asked the TSB to continue with the allocation of addresses according to the protocol of IPv6, including addresses that have not been used. This is something that would allow the developing countries to fulfill their ambitions.

In short, this is what we want to have in this document. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Any requests for clarification? Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. First of all, we support the Arab proposal, and second, just for clarification, perhaps Secretariat could give the proper appellation of this group. I don't think it was Council on Working Group it was Working Group on IPv6 but I seek clarification by Secretariat. There was a group on IPv6 so Secretariat for the benefit of everybody should clarify the matter. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Since we have the Secretariat from this particular group, I ask Xiaoya to clarify.

>> XIAOYA YANG: Thank you, Chairman. For clarification, this group is called ITU IPv6 Working Group. It was Council 2010 endorsed, the proposal for the TSB Director in close collaboration with the Director of the BDT to set up our group. This group is endorsed by Council, but not considered a Working Group. The name of this group is ITU IPv6 Working Group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: I thank Secretariat for that clarification and indeed, I agree that it was not a Council Working Group. It would be good if the Secretariat can just confirm the status of that IPv6 group. Thank you.

>> XIAOYA YANG: Yes. After its last meeting in June this year, the meeting agreed to ask the Chairman of this group to inform the two Directors that this group has completed its work. The Chairman had done so, and it was reported to Council 2012 that this group is finished. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. If I am not mistaken the Chairman of the group from the United Arab Emirates, if I'm correct, and since we are here, perhaps the distinguished delegate from the United Arab Emirates that putting Arab proposals could confirm that this issue has been completed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I think this is simply reporting on the situation of fact. If I make full confidence to the report of the Secretariat was made the conclusion of the group, and I know that the last meeting was this year, in June, and there was the last ‑‑ there was the end of the session.

Now, I think we have had all contributions presented. There are quite different diverging views, let's say, all with some proposing some revision. May I have any general comments from the meeting? Because if not, I will ask for a volunteer to Chair an Ad Hoc Group, and ask you to raise your hand under hands to be raised to find a volunteer.

Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. May I suggest that someone from Arab group Chair this group, this Ad Hoc Group? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: If I see a raised hand, I will follow the indication. So I request for a volunteer not to have any criticism from some Delegates on the choice. I think consultations are going on. For the time being, I have no volunteer, but maybe I have in a short time.

Please push your button if you want to be a volunteer. Saudi Arabia, finally I got one.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would love to be the volunteer, or the victim in another way, but we will consult and we'll get back to you very soon in this regard. But for the time being, I don't have a final call on behalf of the Arab group to Chair this Ad Hoc Group but I will get back to you as soon as possible. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: What I can say on report‑wise, that the Arab group will provide the Chairmanship for this Ad Hoc Group who by the way I will give now the Secretariat to say when and where it's supposed to meet.

>> XIAOYA YANG: I would like to ask for the opinion from our distinguished Saudi delegate whether they would like to meet on Saturday or in the morning or in the afternoon. Thank you.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Actually, as I stated, we did not say that we are going to Chair this Ad Hoc Group. Being here and representing this on behalf of the Arab group, I have to do a consultation, and I will get back to you if one of the Arab group's members will Chair this group.

So we are not volunteered yet to Chair this Ad Hoc Group but we would get back to you very soon. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. In any case, the meeting of this group is at present scheduled for the time being if I correctly understood Saturday morning, in parallel with the other group?

Do you agree to have the two Ad Hoc Groups in parallel? Or you prefer to have in sequential? In this case, one will meet in the morning, and the second one in the afternoon. There is any preference? Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. This group of IPv6 I suggest for your kind consideration would be in the afternoon. The morning is already booked for some other issues. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Fine for me, if it's fine for the Secretariat. Yes, so this group will meet Saturday in the afternoon.

And I will ‑‑ they will discover who will be the Chairman because I will be contact and would like to know who will be Chairing.

Now there are some practical announcements from our Secretariat, and after, we go to the report.

>> RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. I've been asked to announce that the Study Group structure refinement ad hoc meeting, that's the Study Group structure refinement ad hoc meeting, will take place today, 17:30 to 18:30 in Room D, Delta. So that's 5:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. in Room D for Delta and it is on the monitors. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So the report of the meeting is in 13, revision 1 that I try to open ‑‑ and now I succeed. As usual, from our Secretariat, the report is made day by day and will be completed at the end of the session, so the final report will be only at the end. So we have only for the time being the opening, the term of reference for our group, the list of contributions is quoted and the discussion on Resolution 75 that we have already performed yesterday.

The discussion Resolution 62, and the discussion on Resolution 40.

So United Arab Emirates, please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Back to the previous one. In regards to the Ad Hoc Group for IPv6 and after a quick consultation of the Arab group, we are ready to Chair that ad hoc group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Arab Emirates, to Chair the group. I thank you personally. Good work, and good result, I hope so, also.

Now I'm back to the Uganda, please.

>> UGANDA: Thank you, Chair. You have said the IPv6 group will meet on Saturday afternoon. Can we know the exact time, Mr. Chairman? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I give to the Secretariat, time and location, if possible.

>> XIAOYA YANG: We agreed to have it in the afternoon, so presumably it will be 14:30 until 17:30, Saturday, and the room will be ‑‑ will appear on the screen. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So we are back to the report in revision 1 to TD13. We have the discussion of the first day. We have also the discussion on Resolution 50, I see, this morning. Maybe only in Resolution 50 is really our Committee 4 ‑‑ is Com 4, yeah. And so group 70.

Resolution 52, Iran, you have the floor.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman, on Resolution 52, the third line, it said that it was noted that ITU‑D ‑‑ ITU‑T Study Group 18 question 22, so on and so forth, Study Group 1, carry out the studies on spam, as do various industry groups. I don't understand this part, as do various industry groups, and that duplication ‑‑ we are not dealing with industry groups here. We're ITU‑T Assembly. Why we are dealing industry ‑‑ I don't know what industry group is doing so this was not discussed at the meeting. So understand that ITU‑D doing something, ITU‑T also continued to do that, and then that's all and we do not agree with this portion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: First there is a typing error very clear, because it's ITU Study Group 17 not 18. That is a typing error. And ITU Study Group 1 we were told there was a frame request of 22/1, and please correct if it is wrong are studying. Maybe we can simply if meeting agree delete "as do various industry groups."

And this will be as do various things group to be deleted, if you agree.

Resolution 56 I hope in the time being, the consultation is going on. May I ask United States?

>> UNITED STATES: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps through you it could be announced, we intend to meet at 5:30 in the far corner of this A, conference room A. We expect that ‑‑ we hope that it will be able to be resolved fairly quickly. We would like to ask if you could announce that to everybody.

I recognize that there is some overlap with these other Ad Hoc Groups but at least if we have to, we would meet at 5:30 and agree on another time.

>> CHAIR: So can I ask the meeting if you agree to get together with our Coordinator on this matter at 5:30? I think it's easy ‑‑ what I heard in the corridor is not so far to reaching an agreement between the interested parties. So really, I ask the interested parties to get together at 5:30 and to follow our Coordinator on this matter, and so we can have a solution and have me happy for tomorrow morning.

So it's okay? So if you have no other point, any other business, I think we can close almost on schedule ‑‑ ahead of schedule our meeting.

Any other point? No. So the meeting is closed.

[ End of meeting ]
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