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>> RICHARD HILL: We will start in approximately 5 minutes.

Will you please put on your headphones. We will start right now. We will end precisely at 12:00, unless of course we finish all the business sooner. So please, we'll start now and we'll end exactly at 12:00.

>> CHAIR: Dear friends and colleagues, let's start our meeting. We have less than one hour, but first let me give the floor to the Secretariat for an announcement.

>> XIAOYA YANG: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. The Secretary is very sorry to apologize that the Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 50 supposed to meet this morning from 8:00, and yesterday this session was confirmed, but we promised that the room allocation would appear on the screen, which didn't. Therefore, I apologize for the problem, trouble for this session, and I contacted the Chairman and he confirmed that he will need more time for this Ad Hoc Group for Resolution 50.

He proposed to further reserve an evening session this evening and another evening session tomorrow and even a third one on Sunday. May I ask the meeting for any consideration of these two slots. We might not need all of them, if not necessary but currently that's the proposal. For Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 50 to meet again this evening at 18:00, and tomorrow evening at 18:00, and we'll book a third session Sunday evening at 18:00.

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

>> Iran: I hope today you will be in a good mood, not like yesterday. I always understand you quite well. I never misunderstand you and I don't think you need to say, as usual, I misunderstand you. I never misunderstand anybody. I carefully listen to anybody. Totally.

Now, coming to the point, I wish to request through you, because I have no other means, the Secretariat, that the agenda of the meeting with the room allocation must be available one day before the start of the meeting. Today this morning we came and we totally lost. There were Ad Hoc Groups. Room was not allocated. We went to the room, was Korean Delegation. We were kicked out and then we came in.

So this should be controlled. I don't want to raise it, but please kindly the Secretariat need the person announcing or putting the room on the system must be available, and must control that, so every night before going, we should have a clear idea what would be the agenda of the next meeting, and what are the rooms and so on, so forth. Otherwise we will be totally lost. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. The Secretariat will respond.

>> RICHARD HILL: Yes indeed, as my colleague said, we apologize. There were some difficulties. There were actually technical problems. That's not an excuse. We must cope with that and we will take all necessary measures to ensure that the situation is improved, and I apologize again.

>> CHAIR: Now we posted the agenda for today, and there is ‑‑ very likely we cannot complete the agenda but we have an afternoon session. So Admin 17 is the agenda. Can you approve the agenda? It seems so.

Next point in the agenda is the approval of the report of previous working party 4A meeting. We have TD13, revision 2, and TD25. Any observation? It seems not. So we can continue, and go to the next point is Resolution 20. Resolution 20, as usual, we have the edited text from TSB in contribution 29, and after, we have two contributions, one from AFCP, another from Arabic country.

Can I ask Africa to introduce Addendum 1 to contribution 56? It seems thought, because nobody's ready to speak. So may I request in this case waiting the African country, Arab States, to present Addendum 1 to contribution 64 ‑‑ sorry, now Côte d'Ivoire ask the floor. Côte d'Ivoire.

>> CÔTE D'IVOIRE: Good morning, Chairman. This item is largely the modifications are largely editorial. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. May I request now the Arab States to introduce their contribution? Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Resolution 20 has some modifications by the Arab States. The essence of the modification is that Member States to manage their numbering, naming, addressing and identification resources is preserved. However, when these are engaged with international telecommunications, there must be assurance of interoperability and avoiding causing harm or fraudulent activities to other Member States. So most of the revisions are behind this idea.

There was in the Resolution itself there is some editorial changes. However, in the resolve part, we try to make some strengthening to the TSB Director to take actions while resolving issues related to the use of numbering.

And you referred also that Member States should assure that numbering, naming, addressing and identification resources are only used by outside needs and only for purposes which they are assigned and outside resources are not used in line with the papers of the Union at large. Otherwise it will reflect on interoperability and misuse of such resources.

This is in essence the content of the Resolution. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Any remark or observation, request for clarification, to the Arab States contribution? I open the floor.

United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. With regards to the proposal by the Arab group in their contribution that has just been presented, providing the Director with action to be taken, this was an activity that we had indeed considered in Study Group 2 in the development of the recommendation that currently exists. Unfortunately when this document was presented to Plenary for discussion and agreement, and I am going back several years now, the point that was made by the Secretariat was that the Director of the TSB did not have the rights to get involved in what was seen to be disputes and issues between Member States. Therefore, looking at the text of this Resolution it seems to revisit that whole area that we have previously discussed and been told that was out of scope. So it would be interesting to understand if anything has changed to the rights and roles of the Director that would allow this to occur. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I give the floor to the representative of the Director.

>> RICHARD HILL: Yes. I'm not sure I wanted that honor but since I'm requested, I think the point from Mr. Rushton is something that the group here should consider carefully. I believe the point raised by Mr. Rushton is, in particular, on the invites 3 at the very end so it's inviting Member States and operating agencies to report to the Director. That's what is already being done. That's certainly not an issue.

But then the last bit, where it says, "to provide support to the Director of TSB to counter and combat such misuse in accordance with the relevant legal instruments of the Union," as Mr. Rushton said the relevant legal instruments basically imply that the Secretariat should not get directly involved. But this may perhaps just be a question of the phrasing of the provision, so possibly it could be rephrased to make it clear what is being requested of the Director, because the phrase "to provide support to counter and combat" I think perhaps is not sufficiently specific and clear to allow us to see ‑‑ or rather to allow the meeting to see whether this is consistent with the general principle of National sovereignty or whether there is some sort of conflict there. So maybe it's just a question of clarifying what is actually intended here and then finding the language that would convey that with perhaps a bit more precision.

>> CHAIR: In any case, it seems that we cannot ‑‑ we need some revisiting this proposed revision of Resolution 20, and ‑‑ or we stay as African country proposed practically with minor editorial change and leave the Resolution 20 unchanged.

So may I ask, Canada.

>> CANADA: Yes, thank you, Chair. Canada feels somewhat along the same lines as those expressed by the U.K., but we also would like to recognize that Resolution 61 on misuse has quite an extensive guidance in this area, and we feel that some of these additions may need to be clarified with respect to Resolution 61, and we would appreciate to work the text in further. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Australia?

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chairman. Just that Australia would like to associate itself with the comments from Canada. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So can we try to stay with the existing text revised as proposed editorially by African states? I have no requests from the floor ‑‑ Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I'm not quite clear with your intention about making editorial changes. Editorial like making Johannesburg to be Dubai? I think that's not sufficient because we have other provisions that can be maintained easily, like invite Member States to, as part of number 3, and also in other areas we can have some provisions that says, can sustain without much conflict as a part regarding the legal instrument of the Union. And we are ready to discuss this, if necessary.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Egypt, may I ask you to have informal consultation and to come with us with a text of Resolution 20? Having the main flavor of the meeting that's the existing text is clear enough, but if you can avoid duplication with other Resolutions, like 61, for example. So with that, I leave you the task to come back to me with a text, final text on Resolution 20.

With that, we have passed Resolution 20. Thanks, Egypt, for your informal effort.

Now we can pass the next Resolution, Resolution 29. There we have the TSB as usual text in contribution 29 with the editorial change. We have as I say as usual an Arab proposal for revising the text.

Can I ask Arab States to introduce their contribution on Resolution 29? Egypt, you the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Resolution 29 I think has a long debate in the last RTC in Johannesburg and we have made some I think not major modifications in this Resolution. But we have mixed up the date of the latest Resolutions. And once more, we have revisited the issue of hubbing where it was raised at the last Assembly and it came into Study Group 3 and 2 and we have new definition of hubbing, but this was not sufficient. Just sufficient of the words, but not of the functionality or the service provisioning. And hubbing is not the problem but activities through hubbing activities is of concern. So we have made some revisions in this effect and they are in several revisions are included in the Resolution itself in front of you. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I see there are quite substantive additions to the Resolution and I open the floor really to, for example, the request to Study Group 17 to study ‑‑ procedure original edification, and also Member States to include international and other things like that, maybe can be open to discussion. I open the floor for any observation, remark, request of clarification. Canada.

>> CANADA: Yes, thank you, Chair. Going over this proposal, it appears to also perhaps mix some of the issues that are already in some of the existing Resolutions we had proposals for, specifically Resolution 61 and Resolution 65, to some degree.

It seems to perhaps add quite a bit of text, as well. So I think we have some reservations. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: We also agree with the comments of colleagues from Canada, but also to note that it's a little unclear to us why issues to do with misuse and a number of say legal activities are being used in Resolution relating to alternative calling procedures, which may not in many countries, be illegal. So for that reason, we have some difficulty with the draft Resolution as it currently stands.

>> CHAIR: Japan?

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Japan has a similar opinion. If you look at the proposal from the Arab States, even though this Resolution describes alternative calling procedures, the proposal from Arab include not only alternate routing but also misuse and misappropriation, and from technical viewpoint misappropriation and misuse is completely different matter. So and also the misuse matter described in Resolution 61, so I'm very concerned why that misuse and the matter proposed in the revision of alternate routing would be in Resolution. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Egypt you have some response to this very valuable question.

>> EGYPT: Following the discussions in the last days of the legal instruments of the Union I have seen it was obviously relating to the ITRs. That's why this text should be revisited as you have already indicated in other Resolutions and this would reflect also on the other Resolution 61 and others because we have made use to much of this phrase. Regarding misuse, maybe also to it is a wise idea to made omit it in Resolution 61 totally but although there is engagement between all the harmful procedures, they are engaged in some way or another, but this would be clearer if they are confined in individual areas. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: On the basis of this Declaration, can we keep the present text of Resolution 29 and make no modification? That is the easiest way for me, let's say. So we'll not create another group and something like that. But please, United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Hello, this is the United Arab Emirates. So thank you, Chair. We agree with our colleague from Egypt. Nevertheless, the Resolution deals with other matters like requesting Study Group 2 to look into the definition of hubbing, further definition and the functionality and the services that can result of hubbing, and that may result actually in misuse.

So we do support Egypt, and the inclusion of certain work that need to be done by some of the Study Groups. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Thanks, Chairman. But I think taking blanket view of keeping the Resolution as is, is far beyond what is intended by the Arab group, and as indicated by our dear colleague from the United Arab Emirates, there are issues and sometimes requested which is not relevant to that issue. We have seen most of the traffic right now is done through hubbing at aggregation rather than by direct relation and this in many cases reflects fraudulent activities and ‑‑ fraudulent activities, so we would like to maintain some provisions in this Resolution as such. And I propose that we have some time to make these revisions and come to the meeting. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman, and good morning. The United States could support your position that there should be no change to Resolution 29. Since 1996, it has represented a balanced approach to issues regarding alternative calling procedures. We think that making ‑‑ adding undefined terms would be needlessly confusing, and similarly, adding concepts of criminality, such as fraud, would impinge upon the National sovereignty of Member States.

We also recognize that the Plenipotentiary mandated workshops on these issues were held in March, called for further economic studies and efforts to provide information on these issues at the regional level. Results for these studies should be received and reviewed before considering revisions to Resolution 29.

For that reason, we do support your suggestion that there should be no changes. In addition to that, if we were to get into the changes, we have a lot of issues with respect to the individual changes being proposed. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We believe that the intervention from the United States represents a balanced and fair point of view going forward. It is interesting to note that the comments made by Australia, that in some regulatory environments, refiling and other activities are legitimate commercial activities, and I think the detail of some of the changes proposed to this Resolution need to reflect that in some countries, these activities are legal, they are commercial rather than technical.

And I think care needs to be taken if we are to make some detailed changes as currently proposed. To that extent, Mr. Chairman, your proposal is one that we can support. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Now we have Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, distinguished Chairman. On the whole, we support the approach of the Arab States, because we believe this issue of combating fraud is today a very important issue. We think Resolution 29 is also very important, and it requires some changes, because in Study Group 3, we are having an in‑depth study of this issue, and we've seen a fairly large amount of fraud existing today, so some additions made by the Arab States to this Resolution we consider to be correct, and we support the modification to this Resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Australia, please.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chairman. Just to support you and in your suggestion that there be no further changes made to this Resolution beyond purely editorial. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: That was an easy suggestion in order to avoid extra work. But I am afraid that extra work is needed, and with all the interventions I have heard so far. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Unfortunately, we are getting into the difficult part of the discussions. I hope to bear in mind with me that I have to have some explanation, Chairman. When the membership, particularly developing countries, refer to this important issues, whether rerouting, hubbing, or whatever name you give, and they want to have some appropriate actions and they request that it should be included in the treaty they said, this developed country, distinguished developed country, they're supporting each other immediately, they said: No, no, no, no this, is not an issue of the treaty. It should be included in the relevant Resolutions of the Assembly.

Now they bring it to the Assembly, they say that no, we can't deal with that. So how they could deal with this issue? Where could they deal with this issue? In 10 days they bring it to the WCIT. They says no, it is not a treaty, because it is not relevant to the treaty.

Go to standardization, and now standardization says no, we can't do that. So I think we need to have a reply on that. It is an important matter. The Assembly need to reply to these questions. We agreed that in some countries it is legal but in many, many countries, more than 125 countries now, it's not legal. So the issue should be addressed, and they have severe economical impact on many developing countries, Chairman. So you cannot simply say the most easiest way. Chairman, the most easiest way not to have an Assembly and agree everything we had in 2008 so we are here to do some proposals and you receive a proposal from 20 countries, and supported by Russia and supported by Iran and other countries you have to treat that properly. This is very important issue and we could not take the simplest actions. We should go into the depth of the matter and to find a way, Chairman. Otherwise it would have difficulty in future, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Very kind, Iran. You have just saying what I want to say that we need an Ad Hoc Group to take care on that and I ask all the other, whoever request the floor, to please do not speak because it's useless to have discussion one side or the other. There is a need to have an Ad Hoc Group but I want to have a colleague link this discussion together with all the Resolutions because maybe is one of the groups can deal with all the matter.

There was an intervention from Australia or Canada mentioned also Resolution 61 and 65. Maybe the Ad Hoc Group can take care of all the matters, but ‑‑ and not to have for each Resolution a separate Ad Hoc Group. And I was thinking again to Egypt to take care of this Ad Hoc Group, if Egypt agree.

So let's first have the Egypt agreement to Chair this future Ad Hoc Group, and after we decided what will be charged. Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think we can take care if this Ad Hoc Group. Thanks, Chairman.

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

>> JAPAN: This is Japan. The timing is right but basic understanding that I would like to support no change of this Resolution, because this proposal from Arab have some misunderstanding on the misuse and alternate routing and from another viewpoint completely two different matters and one is core number. Another one is dealing with coding numbers. And also the Arab proposal include legal binding matters so this type of matter should be discussed in WCIT, not in WTSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I conclude now. I don't think I will give the floor, if Tanzania agree, because I want to stop the discussion there. There is a clear guidance to the Ad Hoc Group, because first of all, any reference to WCIT or future conclusion of WCIT, avoid duplication of efforts with all the existing Resolutions that we will treat soon, as I say mainly 61 and 65.

And avoid any reference to National law, or the power of each Member State, let's say. That is to me sufficiently clear. I think also to the convened Ad Hoc Group convened previously in this respect.

Now, Tanzania, you insist to speak on this respect? No.

>> TANZANIA: Mr. Chair, I'm not existing but I wanted just to caution that fraud is an issue, in particular to our countries, because despite the fact that in some countries it's considered to be a commercial issue, I think as we work in the Ad Hoc Group, it is important that we take this matter seriously. That's what I want to point out. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: The Ad Hoc Group will take care, I'm pretty sure. But very likely we have to combine some of the discussion result. And that is the point before saying which Resolution we take care. We can maybe go now to Resolution 61, to the next one, and to see what will be the final charge of the Ad Hoc Group. Resolution 61, please, we have always TSB contribution document 29, and we have the Arab proposal in document 64. Someone from Arab 64, Addendum 19. Is someone from Arab States can introduce. Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm sorry for taking the floor too much, but these are all related issues, and 61 maybe is the main Resolution for misuse as was indicated by our colleague from Japan, and I agree with him to a great extent that we can focus on misuse issues here, and we have noticed lately in Study Group 2 that there was reporting of a great number of misuse cases raised by the GSM association. It was just 104 cases in February month only of this year. We have 14 cases, over 3.5 years. This indicates there was misreporting of the cases. The cases exist all the time but when this was investigated, result in 100 in one month so this issue is very significant, the misuse of numbering.

And in this Resolution, we have some resolve issues relating to the use of numbering which is repeated in several Resolutions, like ensuring numbering, naming, addressing, and identification resources are used by assignees, and the rest of the sentence in resolve 1. And we requested to initiate study in Study Group 2 and Study Group 3 to study the impact of such misuse, economical aspects and operational aspects. That is the essence of the Resolution. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Just want to thank the United States for reminding us with the workshop helped about misuse and misappropriation and the impact on developing countries was significant in many presentations in economical and operational aspects. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Any requests for clarification apart this normal message from my side, avoid any reference to ITR that will be coming next, in the revision. And I see that it was there. United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Question for clarification, Mr. Chairman. Has Study Group 3 completed its economic study of call blocking that's mentioned in resolves further 7? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I give the floor to the Secretariat.

>> RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. For those who do not know, I am the counselor for Study Group 3. To my understanding, actually, we did not receive any contributions on the matter, at least not recently. And as you know, the work of the Study Groups is driven by contributions.

>> CHAIR: Japan?

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For our clarification, when in the proposal in Arab, Section reserved to invite Member States, the first sentence, to ensure blah, blah, blah, are described in the same sentence in the proposal for Arab to WCIT. So in my understanding as I mentioned before this matter should be discussed in the WCIT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan. Any further ‑‑ United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chairman. I wish to also thank the United States for recalling the useful workshop that was presented and held prior to the Study Group 2 meeting earlier this year.

In addition to the 100‑plus cases that was presented by the GSMA at that meeting, and that was subsequently attached to the reporting method that currently exists, I think it should also be useful to note that the members of the GSMA that had reported those cases of fraud had also dealt with those cases of fraud. And perhaps that is something that is without the requirement of the Director of the TSB being involved, that there was this self‑regulation.

I think it is also worth noting that some of the modifications to Res 61 we would like to discuss further, if that is possible, going forward. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I have now request for the floor from Kyrgyzstan. You have the floor.

>> KYRGYZSTAN: Thank you, distinguished Chairman. We would like to support the contribution from the Arab States, because cases of misappropriation and misuse of numbering resources are on the rise. We think adoption of such a Resolution will help to solve some of these problems. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. The issue of misuse or misappropriation came to the 2008 Assembly under the hijacking of numbering. The delegate of Canada, Mr. Dupuy proposed this is not a good term, language, and put misappropriation. Coming from the Pacific Islands, I don't know whether any of those countries are present here, but they are victim of that, and they continue to be victim of that, and they complain that, and the broad proposal to the APT, which our countries belong, that is still the issue is there, and that for general support of APT for that. I hope Japan is not opposed to that here. The general support of the Pacific Islands in APT regions need to the assistance and need to resolve this matter.

So this is an issue that exists. I don't think that there was any solution for that at all. There might be one or two cases, or 10 cases, GSMA resolved the matter. I don't know, self‑regulation, I don't understand self‑regulation but they have not heard anything from the Pacific Islands that the problem has been resolved. on the contrary, it has been increased so the proposal of the Arab countries is quite valid. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So it's clear to me that there is some editing in any case required because there are a lot of texts that are speaking about WCIT next week and need to be deleted or outlined. And I think that since I have already designated victim Egypt, I will burden also with that, and it's not the end, very likely. And will say at the end of discussion next Resolution what will be your task, if you agree.

Thank you. I see nodding so we can if you agree everyone, we can move to the next Resolution, Resolution 65. We have as usual the edited text from TSB in document 29, and we have the Arab proposal in Addendum 21 to document 64.

Can I ask to introduce this modification? United Arab Emirates, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman. I'm speaking on behalf of the Arab States. Since there is little time, I shall be brief, as brief as I can. As we've already explained, we are seeing an increase in cases reported to Director of TSB on misuse of numbering for various reasons. Sometimes because of the change of the calling party number.

This shows us the importance of identifying the origin of the calling line. And we have recommendations concerning misuse, the hiding of the name of the caller and the calling line identification. Also, measures to recognize the calling party number and the code of the country of origin.

This is absolutely possibly in technological terms, and information has to be provided in specific cases where identification is concealed. This information should be provided to legal bodies, if required.

So through this Resolution, we ask Study Groups 2 and 3 to carry out a study to see the correlation between misuse and concealment of the identification of the caller or calling line, so that we can identify the origin in case of misuse or fraud. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Arab Emirates. I ask if there are any questions, requests for clarification, apart my general guidance that we should not pre‑judge discussion result that will take place next week at the WCIT. A week after. Yeah, yeah, the week after at WCIT.

So any requests for clarification? United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you. Request for clarification regarding the "instructs" 2. In instructs 2, the original Resolution called on Study Group 2 to expedite work on recommendations that would provide additional detail and guidance for the implementation of at least the principles listed above. Could we get some information on the status of that, and whether or not it's been resolved? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: The Secretary to Study Group 2?

>> RICHARD HILL: Well, it's of course for the membership to decide whether or not that resolves has been carried out, but I can provide some factual information. Following the WTSA in 2008, and taking into consideration the Resolution that was adopted there, Study Group 2 did approve the recommendation E.157 on transmission of calling party identification.

>> CHAIR: Any further ‑‑ Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are following the work of Study Group 2, and indeed, Resolution 157 was based on the recommendation 157 was based on the Resolution 56 from the last Assembly. And there was some provisions that make such recommendation not sufficient to fulfill the requirements of many developing countries, and maybe other countries, as well.

So we have revisited the work in such Resolution, in such recommendation after adopting this Resolution. That's why we have requested Study Group 2 to pursue the work further. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: So your intervention gives to me the possibility to give also Resolution 65 to you to revisit on the basis of the general principle, so we will be an Ad Hoc Group dealing with Resolution 29, 61, and 65 all together because there's linkage. This is the group I will ask the Secretariat when will be officially announced on the screen, but the proposal is to meet the first time Sunday in the afternoon. At 2:00 p.m. 2:30. Is okay for you, victim? Egypt, victim?

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, but it depends on that, because this Resolution is of great importance to developing countries, and if I see none of them, then it is no sense to make this meeting. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: In any case we need a meeting. There are several from developing and on depth country and the meeting is needed so I am afraid designated victim, you cannot escape. And the proposal is to have a meeting at Sunday, 2:30. It will be on the screen. And I hope we'll have sufficient participation. And I encourage really interested contributors to be present at this meeting. I know that Iran has a problem because he has not the possibility to split in 100 parts but I make a plea, because there is no other solution envisagable to accept this proposal. Iran?

>> IRAN: Chairman, I'm not the only one with problems. Sunday afternoon you have two meetings. All of them Iran is involved. Mr. Sherif is the main one in those two groups so we cannot divide him in one. So it is not me only. So I'm sorry, you have to find other way. No Saturday, no Sunday morning, Sunday afternoon, already booked. Two meetings and all of them Arab group, Mr. Sherif and United Arab Emirates, it's not me only. Don't put your target Mr. Arasteh.

>> CHAIR: I never put the target to you Mr. Arasteh. I ask the Secretariat, are there other possibilities? There is a different proposal, in particular, the convener, Egypt, have you other proposal?

>> EGYPT: I don't know what the case in Monday morning, if there is some gap or at noon time. Depends on the schedule of the Committee 4.

>> CHAIR: I am afraid you have to work during the weekend or this evening, because we should have the result on Monday and Tuesday, and if there is a problem, there is not time to convene again. So really, I will be delighted if you can during the weekend or this evening ‑‑ during the weekend really to do some activity.

Your choice, Saturday, Sunday. What is less colliding with the other activity? Sunday is the preferred date because the Secretary will not be present Saturday, so Sunday. If you prefer Sunday morning, Sunday afternoon, it's up to you. Iran want to have the floor.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Please give a little bit of time to Mr. Sherif to think it over and decide. I cannot push him, put him under pressure now. He has a lot of things in mind, and they have to put them together to see where he can find a slot. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United Kingdom?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. To help my colleague Dr. Guinena and looking at the time line for Sunday, Sunday morning may be available to be considered by Dr. Guinena to hold the ad hoc. There seems to be currently little posted that is meeting. Maybe he would like to consider an early morning start on Sunday that we could enjoy the discussions on numbering misuse and other elements going forward. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Russia.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. Since we are trying to look at the timetable for other additional meetings, I'd like to inform you the Ad Hoc Group on modifications to the cybersecurity Resolution 50 didn't complete its work in the course of the meeting today, and we need an additional one or maybe even two slots, so I would request the Secretariat to inform us of opportunities for having these slots. What times could we have these slots? But they have to be slots, of course, which wouldn't be at the same time as other meetings. And then the participants of our group could choose the time which is most suitable. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We have to conclude our meeting, so it will be in principle announced on the screen. For both, we will discuss with the convener of these Resolution 29 and 61, the best time during the weekend and we will announce on the screen.

With that, I am afraid ‑‑ yes? One announcement.

>> XIAOYA YANG: To reply to Mr. Kremer, the Ad Hoc Group for Resolution 50 has planned for this evening and tomorrow evening, and Sunday evening at 18:00. These three slots are booked and will be displayed on the screen.

And for the Ad Hoc Groups for Resolution 29, 61, and 65, it will be Room C Sunday morning, from 9:30. Thank you.

>> RICHARD HILL: Yes, with the understanding this will be confirmed with Dr. Guinena. So the time will be different. We will display that as soon as we have it. I'm asked to announce on ad hoc group of Committee 4 on the Resolution 73 and proposed new Resolution on e‑waste will be meeting in 2:30 today in, 14:30 on Resolution 73 and new Resolution on e‑waste in Room F, Foxtrot.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the announcement so now I close because we are near noon, and we will see you this afternoon. Thank you.

[ End of meeting ]