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>> RICHARD HILL: Good morning. Good morning.

Good morning. And welcome back. If you would please take your seats and put on your headphones, we would like to begin this morning's session. Thank you.

And can you project the agenda, please.

>> CHAIR: So ladies and gentlemen, let's start our meeting. We have had group ad hoc and informal group working during the weekend. They worked hard. And some have completed. Others still some pending items and they're still meeting so we hope that we succeed anyway to end on schedule our activities.

You have seen the revision one to 23, the draft agenda for the 6th meeting. First, I request you to approve the agenda. No observation, so the agenda is approved.

We have, after ‑‑ I don't know if you wanted to go to the revision 3 to TD13 for approving the report. Particularly the part where we have the approval of Resolution 75 and the draft group that we decide to meet. No observations, so the draft revision 3 to TD13 has been approved.

After I draw your attention to the revised list of documents in TD11, Revision 1, and now I pass to point 5 of the agenda. We have received a note from the of Committee 2 reminding us the responsibility of the conference, as well specific note from the Chairman to the Chairman of Committee 3 and 4 to evaluate the financial consequences of our decision.

I know the Secretariat is keeping track with that. Maybe, Richard, you want to say a few words.

>> RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. Indeed, we are analyzing all the Resolutions to identify any potential financial impacts, and we will prepare a draft paper on that topic.

>> CHAIR: No observation that, so we for the time being, we take note of this documents 80 and 81, we ensure the Chairman of Committee 2 that we will keep an eye on the financial consequence and will inform him accordingly.

Now I pass to point 1 of the agenda, where we have the report of the informal group that met this past weekend. First one is TD38, where there is the draft text of Resolution 40. I don't know if the convenor is present. I don't know if you want to say a few words so since he's talking with the other ‑‑ is not listening. Convenor, I ask if you want to introduce TD38, or if we go simply to approve it.

No request for the floor, so any observation on TD38 with the revised text of Resolution 40? If not ‑‑ United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Good morning. Thank you, Chair, and good morning to all colleagues. We've had a very busy weekend, and attended lots of Ad Hoc Groups. I'm not quite sure when this Resolution came up. And I wasn't able to attend this particular meeting. It must have been in parallel with one or two others that were going on. I just want to raise a query on resolves 3, which I find very strange. It says, instruct TSAG to study and identify the areas related to quality of service and QoE that might have policy and regulatory nature taking into account the studies being carried out by the relevant Study Groups and report that to the next Assembly WTSA.

I find this something which is very strange. It looks to relate to issues which could involve net neutrality. At one of the ad hocs yesterday, there was a proposal by one country for net neutrality to be included in the work of Study Group 2. That proposal was not supported by any other country, and I would propose that resolves 3 is struck out. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Can I ask if there is support for this proposal? Ghana?

>> GHANA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's unfortunate that the distinguished delegate from the United Kingdom could not participate in this informal meeting. This compromise came from the proposals from both the Arab group and the African group. There's the need from both regions in that some parts of college of service and college of experience be part of the regulatory aspects of ITU‑T work, and so it cannot just be struck out like that if they could not participate. I think that we've all been engaged in many Ad Hoc Groups but we are followed with keen interest, our interest even over the weekend and late into the evenings into these meetings.

So, Mr. Chair, this was a compromise not just between two people but to larger interest groups. It's not to our satisfaction, but at least this is a compromise for us. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Ghana, for the clear statement. There is any support for the United Kingdom proposal? Italy?

>> ITALY: Thank you, Chairman. I just fully support the last speaker. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, so you support Ghana, you mean, to be clear. So in this case, United Kingdom, since it's a compromise solution, can you accept the text of Resolution 40 as is presented in TD38? Canada?

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to all. Canada feels that perhaps we need further discussion about this item. It is true that two administrations support the proposal but we would align with the proposal from the U.K., Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Tanzania?

>> TANZANIA: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to add on what Ghana has stated. I think that was our position when we were drafting that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Finland?

>> FINLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just like to Canada and U.K., we also think that the further consideration is needed in this matter. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So I see that there is no agreement, and I charge the convenor to have some further informal consultation in order to satisfy, if possible, all the people concerned, because here in Plenary, it is difficult draft. Seems two camps. One want to delete completely Item 3 and the other saying there is already compromise to have this text here. So may I ask the convenor from the United States to keep on working on this aspect?

United States?

>> UNITED STATES: Yes, we understand the convenor is from Egypt.

>> CHAIR: The convenor from Egypt.

>> EGYPT: We'll continue our consultation, although this text is a compromised Wayne but we're happy to continue our consultation with all parties. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Ghana?

>> GHANA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It looks to us we are going back the issue, because this issue came out at the Plenary, and you requested us to have an informal consultation. An advance notice was put on the monitors for people who were interested to participate. This took us about two to three hours with lots of administrations present including the United States and Canada. So if at the end of the day colleagues from the United Kingdom are saying they are not in support of this, as the delegate from Egypt have already said. It was a compromise. By the end of the day we had to compromise with colleagues from the United States and Canada. If you are saying we are going back to have further consultation, it looks like we're going back the issue. If you agree with us if you could just maintain this as a test for other Delegates because this is actually coming from the whole position of the African states. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: I was hoping that the Resolution can go smoothly really at this Plenary, since there was informal consultation from Egypt. However I see there are some countries who are still not completely happy about this text, so I ask really Egypt to come as soon as possible, maybe as soon as we adjourn this meeting, to get in touch with the ‑‑ and try to have informal consultation in order we can really approve this important Resolution 40.

Côte d'Ivoire, you ask for the floor?

>> CÔTE d'IVOIRE: Good morning, Chairman. We would like to fully support the statement made by Ghana. Consultations were held, and this is compromise language, and the compromise should be respected.

>> CHAIR: Egypt, please continue the informal consultation, and we pass to the next point of the agenda with the informal consultation on Resolution 58 with ‑‑ given in temporary document 39.

I frankly speaking ‑‑ may I ask the United States to introduce the result of informal consultation?

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't know if it would be possible to put it up on the screen, but I can tell you what happened, and I hope it was reflected in the document. There was only one change proposed. That was from Brazil. And it was a reference ‑‑ the Brazilian proposal was to add a reference to a supplement that would was adopted in Study Group 17. A small group of interested parties met, and agreed to some alternative language which I believe has been passed to the counselor, and provided that that language is reflected in the document, I believe there's no further need ‑‑ it can be accepted. There's no outstanding issues.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, convenor. I think this is in document 39 I was referring in noting E.

So can the meeting approve the revised text of Resolution 58? I see no requests for the floor. So I rush, say, approved.

Next one in the agenda is the informal consultation...

A little exchange of opinion with the Secretariat. So now we go to informal consultation on Resolution 20, and ask I think Egypt to take the floor. Sorry, Dominican Republic asks for the floor. Or is Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Thank you Chairman. With some consultation and revision of Resolution 20 we come with the document posted to the website and I think it's more or less like ‑‑

>> CHAIR: Is TD49 is the document. You have to introduce, say if there are any ‑‑ I don't think there are major changes as I can see but if there's anything you want to outline, please go ahead.

>> EGYPT: No, there is no major change so I think this can be accepted as is, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: So any observation on Resolution 20, TD49? If not, we approve.

Let's pass to the next Resolution, next document DT54, Resolution 69. The Sudan has worked hardly to convene and has the floor. Sudan.

>> SUDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think we have reached common text in our consultation. It is posted in TD54 as you said. The only issue left is in resolves to invite Member States, number 1, which is different from taking unilateral and/or discriminatory actions that could impede another Member State from accessing public Internet sites, African States are adding "and services." Now it is in square brackets, within the spirit of Article 1 of the Constitution of the WSIS principles. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sudan. There is unresolved issue I understand, in TD54, in resolve 1. I see "service" are in brackets, in fact. So let's try the first solution, remove the square brackets. Any requests for the floor? United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you. The United States is opposed to the inclusion of the word "services," as this would broaden the scope of the Resolution. Broadening to include the word "services" would, in our view, squarely intrude into trade policy and law. These issues, trade policy and law, in our view, are clearly beyond the remit of the ITU.

As a proposed alternative, the United States would like to suggest replacing the phrase "public Internet sites and services" with the following expression, "telecommunication/ICT technology and modern telecommunication/ICT facilities, services, and applications." This is the expression used in Resolution 20 and Resolution 64. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Can you read again your proposed text at dictation speed? I got the flower, but not the exact sentence. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The proposal is to replace the phrase, "public Internet sites and services" with the following phrase, "telecommunication/ICT technologies and modern telecommunication/ICT facilities, services and applications," full stop. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Is clear? Iran, you have the floor.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning to you and to everybody. Perhaps we forgot what we have discussed in WTSA 2008. There was a Resolution proposed by Cuba complaining of the access to the Internet sites and access to Internet resources, and now we totally change the concept. We are talking telecommunication model technology. The people complain they have been unilateral action by one Member States to impede the access of another Member State to the Internet and Internet sites and Internet services or resources and so on, so forth. So we are certainly proposed to the new proposal. The issue was whether or not to add "and services," and that is all, Chairman. Either we agree with that, where we don't go back and main the concept of the Resolution 69 which was debated, and United States agreed with this text.

I was in the meeting convening and with Mr. Ennis we are together and we discuss into the evening with many other colleagues and they agreed with this text. We are not going to go back and change. Internet site is the essential and whether or not we add "and services" or "resources," that is another issue but let us not to open the entire discussion and change the whole things we have agreed at WTSA 2008. This is important element, and many countries, Chairman, suffering of that, and we are not going to accept any changes to the refraining unilateral action by administrations of Member States to impede or put problem for another Member State to have access to Internet sites. That is essential, fundamental and vital. And we are not going to change that at all. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Ladies and gentlemen, the title of the Resolution is non‑discriminatory access and use of Internet resources. Internet resources do not simply include sites, but indeed services and applications. Therefore, we consider that the proposed language in the document is appropriate, and we would propose the removal of the square brackets around the words "and services."

>> CHAIR: Cuba?

>> CUBA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We'd like to clarify Cuba's position in 2008. That is, that we should call a spade a spade. In public Internet ‑‑ access to public Internet sites which are ‑‑ to which certain countries are denied access to Internet, and this is what we are dealing with now. We certainly agree with the statement made by the distinguished delegate of Iran, and we would be opposed to the elimination of this element and replacing it by something quite different.

>> CHAIR: United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Yes, we understood Iran to say that if the word "public Internet sites" was maintained and the word ‑‑ and they could live with deletion of the word "and services," if that's the case, we could agree with Iran to go back to the original text and just use "public Internet sites." The word that concerns us is the word "and services," not "public Internet sites."

>> CHAIR: Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, distinguished Delegate of Saudi Arabia mentioned clearly that if you go to the title you're talking of resources, and the issue is here the sites and services perhaps instead of and services, put "and resources" to be in line with the title of the Resolution, Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: That is the proposal. Can we see if there is any objection to this revised text? Sudan?

>> SUDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We agree with the last comment from Iran. It could be resources, it would be okay with us.

>> CHAIR: United States?

>> UNITED STATES: Mr. Chairman, the term "resources" would seem to encompass services. We would prefer to return to the original text in this regard, "public Internet sites." Thank you.

>> CHAIR: There is support from U.S. position? So U.S., since it's in the title, maybe you can accept the Iran proposal? United Kingdom?

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I think in the spirit of compromise, we would accept taking out "and services," and return to the original text. If there was proposal for alternative text, I think we'd need to see it in writing because we don't quite understand what's been proposed and what the implications are. But we'd prefer to return to the original text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Let's try the latest suggestion: Can we return to the original text? Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Put and resources in square brackets and send it to Committee 4. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Tanzania?

>> TANZANIA: Thank you, Chair. I think as Iran has said, one is we can agree to put the resources as it has been proposed and it would to away with the square bracket. Or if need be then we will remain with the square bracket. But we support to include the resources instead of services. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United States?

>> UNITED STATES: We would support the proposal of Iran to put the words "and resources" in square brackets and send it to Committee 4. This will give us additional time for consultation. And it may help resolve the issue. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay that will follow the United Kingdom request to see text in writing. And France?

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman we would go along with the U.K. proposal. I think in the spirit of compromise, we would prefer to keep the original language without any new additions.

>> CHAIR: Can we in light of the discussion we have had send this text with square brackets "and resources" to the Plenary of Committee 4? Seems so. So with this I hope minor item and I hope will be solved before coming to Committee 4. Very likely this afternoon. Can we pass to the next item? Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. What we're suggesting I think has some logic and rationale. We just take the title of the Resolutions and make it consistent with the title. It is not something new, Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Anyway, we have decided to go with the square bracket to the Plenary. I don't know if it will be not the meeting following because we have no time to process, but next Com 4, Com 4 is meeting after us. So next session.

So keeping on with our agenda, next one, you say that is since quite a long time some talk is not on paper 4 but Resolution 52 ‑‑

No, so I think what is available is Resolution 52 in DT47 dealing with counter and combating spam. U.S. was leading this group? Can I ask introduction of TD47? U.S.

>> UNITED STATES: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is on the spam issue. Is it ‑‑ you want to do 52 or 50? Which version?

>> CHAIR: 52 first in the agenda, because 50 is not available in paper form so 52, please.

>> UNITED STATES: 52 is on the subject of countering and combating spam. We spent a very productive three hours on Saturday morning in an Ad Hoc Group and came to agreement on some text, which I forwarded ‑‑ I reviewed and forwarded to the counselor of our Ad Hoc Group. I believe it accurately reflects the agreement that was reached, and I believe it has no square brackets around it, and I believe it is available now to be approved.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Can we approve the revised text of Resolution 52? No requests from the floor, so has been approved. I see is not available in paper form but is available in the Web, the Resolution...

What is available is Resolution ‑‑ 29 is available? So we have the Resolution 29 with our label is in TD50. And there were several Resolutions really. I don't know if all are available but definitely ‑‑ all are available. So may I ask the convenor of the Ad Hoc Group at this time to introduce one after the other, starting with Resolution 29? Please, you have the floor ‑‑ sorry, Jordan requests the floor before. Jordan?

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chairman. Just to point out some developments about the text of Resolution 64. I wanted to inform you that the document published on the ITU website gives results obtained at the Saturday meeting, which was held at mid‑day. The Ad Hoc Group held a second meeting. This morning between 8:00 and 9:30, the Ad Hoc Group held a second meeting this morning.

We achieved a consensus text bringing together the various proposals and views on this text, except for certain paragraphs, so we did achieve an agreement, except for certain paragraphs which were placed within square brackets.

Consequently, I should like to request you, Chairman, to allow me ‑‑ or rather the take a decision. I seek your opinion, Chairman: Should we have more time to hold a third meeting? Or do you prefer for us to present the text with the square brackets to group 4A?

So I'm asking your advice on this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I am afraid I prefer the last solution, that you have another meeting, try to eliminate as far as possible the square brackets. I am sorry with Egypt one. I ask him first to introduce the document, but there is another matter that we want to resolve prior the end of this morning's session, and that's because maybe there is other work necessary after that.

And I ask the legal adviser, I don't know if he's arrived ‑‑ in the time being, and this is point 8 of the agenda, draft new Resolution actual implementation network externality premiums, legal view reply from the ITU legal adviser. He has given the reply and will illustrate in short time. While I have the floor, since we are waiting the legal advice, may I ask the convenor of Resolution 50 how things are progressing so if they need extra time or things like that. Please, Mr. Kremer.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. The Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 50 held three meetings. I'm happy to inform you, we managed to agree all the proposals which came in currently. The members of the Ad Hoc Group have had sent out to them a draft of Resolution 50 which includes all the agreed changes. Today at 14:00 hours at 2:00 p.m. we will be meeting for final approval of agreement on the modified text then after lunch, the documents will be published and I hope I will be able to report to you about completion of the work of the Ad Hoc Group today after lunch. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: So I thank you for the work that you are progressing, as I thank also Jordan for the work you will complete very likely in Resolution 64.

In the time being, the legal adviser has arrived, so I ask him to introduce document 94.

Before that, I have the request for the floor from United Arab Emirates. Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I seek your indulgence. When you propose a document, please refer to the DT document rather than the Resolutions. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Normally, Mr. Arasteh, I quote both, the Resolution plus the temporary document. But in this case, is draft new Resolution document 94, is correct?

So I leave you time to search for this document. It's in six languages, so can you introduce the document?

>> ARNAUD GUILLOT: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Chairman, I know you don't have much time so I'll try to be very brief in the presentation of this document, and I hope it's a document which is readily understood. You remember legal opinion was sought at the fifth meeting of Working Group 4A and you'll find this legal opinion in document 94 submitted to you for your consideration. This legal opinion is made up of three parts as you can see. First part, introductory row marks to mind everybody that the nature, scope, and legal status of an instrument adopted by an international organisation are not necessarily determined by the instrument's designation. This is just by way of a reminder. The second part analyzes the nature of the draft new Resolution submitted to you and concludes that this does not contain instructions nor obligations to the parties to which it is addressed and therefore the legal vector of Resolution is probably not the most appropriate. And then the third part looks at the various possible solutions highlighting the advantages and disadvantages of these possible solutions.

The solution of the opinion appears in this case to be that which could be favored even though the inclusion in the report of the Plenary is in the summary record of the Plenary, is also possible in our view. So I'll confine myself to this brief presentation but remain available to give answers to any questions you may have. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, legal adviser for your contribution. Think request of clarification, comments, or any ‑‑ Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We express our sincere appreciation to Dr. Guillot, in spite of the very heavy workload that he had, he kindly analyzed in the most appropriate manner the situation and proposed Resolutions and these solutions are now available and your meeting need to take one of the solutions which to be most appropriate and preserve the rights of the Member States. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United States?

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe it was the United States that requested the legal opinion, and we're delighted with the ‑‑ we accept the results that were expressed by Mr. Guillot and either of the options that he presents either an opinion or a statement in a Plenary I think would be acceptable to us. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Australia?

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We'd also like to thank Mr. Mr. Guillot and support the previous comments of the U.S. and Iran. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So can we, since we request an opinion from the legal adviser, can we go for an opinion? And in that case, we can charge the Secretariat to make the necessary editorial alignment as requested by the legal adviser and have approval, discussed later on in our next following session. Any opposition to this proposal to have an opinion? Cameroon?

>> CAMEROON: Thank you, Chairman. It's not objection as such. I thank the legal adviser for the work which he has done and presented to our Working Group, but I don't really understand why we can't have a recommendation, because in his text, it says that there can be confusion between recommendation and Resolution. Why isn't it possible to use a recommendation? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Cameroon. I do understand you have no objection to my proposal, Cameroon, that we should have an opinion of the Assembly. I think you are merely requesting clarification as to why we would not use a recommendation. In the legal opinion, our legal adviser has told us the advantages and disadvantages of using this terminology. I do not think there is any objection on the principle to have an opinion.

So if you agree, it will be so decided, and I request the Secretariat to produce a text for the next meeting or the one after.

So now I'm afraid I'm coming back to Egypt. I interrupted him before. Can I ask so kindly to introduce Resolution 29 in temporary document 50. Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We held an Ad Hoc Group for revising for Resolutions related to numbering issues and this lasted from 5:30 till about 8:00 in the evening. It was very good cooperative work. The result appears in document DT50, 53, 51, and 52. I'll start with DT50. It's about Resolution 29, alternative calling procedures, taking into account the discussions along the last week. The Arab States made some revision of the text to account for the discussions and to simplify the issue and that's why we can get into good compromise in reasonable time.

In Resolution 29 we just simplified referring to the text of Resolutions 22, Plenipot Resolutions and other Resolutions, but just citing the relevant parts with numbering not with the text to simplify the issue. Then we have only one square bracket repeated. It is about hubbing.

I did find that hubbing is not an illegal ‑‑ has no legal implications or prudent application by itself. It's a legitimate commercial application but to use or abuse is the problem that can arise from hubbing so it was proposed use, "that call‑back inappropriate hubbing, refiling, non‑identification," and so on, is considered under the harmful ‑‑ that have harmful effects, so we have inappropriate and inappropriate. Hubbing is between square brackets, and we are trying to seek compromise that these square brackets can be removed and the whole text can be approved. So if we can discuss this right now and remove the brackets, this will be quite simple to adopt the Resolution.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt, for clear introduction. I see these appear as you say three times during recognizings, correct? In recognizing B, there is in square brackets, "inappropriate hubbing," recognizing C, and recognizing D. So your proposal is to eliminate the square brackets.

Egypt?

>> EGYPT: I will say this was because we were trying to use other words like abuse of hubbing and fraudulent hubbing, but beside that, inappropriate would be maybe milder expression but representing the fraud that can result from inappropriate use of hubbing. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: So United States?

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The United States could agree to deleting the square brackets around "inappropriate hubbing." However, we would request that there be two very minor changes made to the resolves to reflect and make it compatible with this change, and so I could give you those now or later, as you wish.

>> CHAIR: United States, I think is better you give it now since we are dealing with the Resolution and I ask the convenor Chairman of the other group ‑‑ Richard will take care of this change but the Chairman to tell me if these are adequate changes. United States, please go ahead.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you. In resolves 4, of the document, there's a phrase that says, "as well as other aspects, as well as other aspects." We would ask that that be deleted, and in 5, in front of the word" hubbing," add the word "inappropriate hubbing," because that's consistent with what we just agreed. So it would read "refiling and inappropriate hubbing."

>> CHAIR: So I repeat your point 4, should read, "to instruct Study Group 2 to study service definition and requirements for hubbing" ‑‑ no, "as well as other aspects ‑‑ no.

Delete "as well as other aspects," so read, "Study Group 2 to study service definition and requirements for hubbing and forms of alternated calling procedures." That's it?

And in the following point 5, to add in front of "hubbing," "inappropriate hubbing." So Egypt is okay with these requests for modification? Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Of course, the second one is the right word to use "inappropriate," but we find difficulty with, "as well as other aspects," because studying only other forms of alternative hubbing, then just lacks description but other aspects, it's related to the issue of this Resolution about if there is misuse or misappropriation how this is done. So this word has a meaning and also it was included in the original text of the Resolution. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: So it's clear that in point 5 is really the editorial correction, it will be as inappropriate hubbing as requested, while point 4 need further clarification. Tanzania, you have the floor.

>> TANZANIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think it is fine, but my problem is how to measure the appropriateness of the hubbing. If we say appropriate and inappropriate, how can we be sure that this is appropriate and this is inappropriate? Perhaps if I can be enlightened on that.

>> CHAIR: Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Leaving aside whether we could say what is appropriate, what is not appropriate, this "inappropriate" was the result of some consensus because we couldn't find any other alternative. As distinguished delegate of Egypt convenor said use the word abused hubbing it was not accepted and further was not accepted. Inappropriate was more or less general. I am not commenting on that, but I have difficulty to touch resolves 4 and take other aspects. Leave it to Study Group 2 to study. If there is other aspects they do other aspects. If they do not, there is not. Why do we get into so much detail? The issue was not to modify 4 the issue was to have inappropriate hubbing in square brackets and we had our colleagues remove square brackets but let's will leave that and not touch resolves 4. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Mr. Chairman, the question was raised about number 4. The reason that the words as well as other aspects is the reason we're proposing to delete that is that the current read, if you read it with that language there, it implies that hubbing is one aspect of alternative calling procedures, when in fact, they're distinct matters.

By deleting the words "as well as other aspects," it now reads, "hubbing and forms of alternative calling procedures," thereby making it clear that we're not equating hubbing with alternative calling procedures. So I believe this is a clarification which is appropriate and worthwhile. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Now I'll give the floor to the Secretariat that maybe we'll find another text or another deletion that will satisfy everyone. Richard?

>> RICHARD HILL: Yes, going in the same direction as the United States, perhaps it would be clearer and would satisfy everybody if we also delete the words "forms of." So then it would read," to study service definition and requirements for hubbing and alternative calling procedures, including refiling and non‑identification." Then it's perfectly general, and we've I think covered everything.

>> CHAIR: Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We do not share that view. We would not want to touch resolve 4 at all. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United States?

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. The U.S. could accept that change in language in the spirit of compromise.

>> CHAIR: So if this has been accepted, United States, can we proceed with this text as read by the Secretariat? Egypt, you got the text, the meaning, and the work that Study Group 2 has to carry. Egypt?

>> EGYPT: The text have been read quite fast and removed from the screen so I'd like to have the text again to read it carefully.

>> CHAIR: Secretariat, can you repeat reading all the sentences at dictation speed? Thank you.

>> RICHARD HILL: It is proposed it would now read, "instructs Study Group 2 to study service definition and requirements for hubbing and alternative calling procedures, including refiling and non‑identification."

>> CHAIR: Can we with that approve taking out the square brackets, approve this Resolution in this revised form? I see that Iran is requesting for the floor.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Perhaps I was not clear: Why we do not allow the Study Group 2 to study whether there are other forms of alternative calling? Why Assembly get into the details of the issue? Leave it to the Study Group to see whether there are other forms of alternative calling or not. If there is not, there is not, Chairman.

I don't think that we should enter into the details of the micromanagement of the Study Groups. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: China?

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Chair. To address the concerns of the United States, we recommend that we can change the order of the sentences.

I'd like to repeat in English, first maintain the original sentence ‑‑ "including refiling and non‑identification, "as well as service definition and requirements for hubbing."

So I don't know whether my recommendation can be accepted by the Plenary.

>> CHAIR: We give the floor to the Secretariat to see how we have interpreted the Chinese intervention, if the meeting agree with the Chinese proposal. Richard?

>> RICHARD HILL: So if I understood the intervention from China, it would be to go back to the original text of resolves 4, leaving that unchanged, but then add at the end, "and service definition and requirements for hubbing."

>> CHAIR: China, is that what you have proposed?

>> CHINA: Yes, it is our proposal. We believe that with such changes and it is in line with the essence of the proposal.

>> CHAIR: Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Egypt accept that proposal, because this was our original proposal, and this was intention to include special focus on hubbing, and it is appropriate to put at the end of sentence, since ‑‑ alternative calling procedure, since it is major, and proposal is minor. I accept the proposal of China.

>> CHAIR: United States.

>> UNITED STATES: We have a request for clarification here. Is the word requirements for hubbing appear twice? Or is the intention to ‑‑ perhaps you could read the entire sentence from beginning to end because as we got it language on hubbing is still in the main part as well as the secondary clause.

>> CHAIR: So may I request the Secretariat to read the entire point 4?

>> RICHARD HILL: Yes, Chairman. So point 4 will now start exactly the same as in the old version, as in the 2008 version, and then something will be added at the end. I will read the entire clause.

So it would be, "to instruct Study Group 2 to study other aspects and forms of alternative calling procedures, including refiling and non‑identification, comma, and service definition and requirements for hubbing."

>> CHAIR: United States?

>> UNITED STATES: Yes, that would be fine. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So can we finally approve ‑‑ thanks to China for their constructive proposal ‑‑ approve the text of Resolution as presented and amended in TD50? Resolution 29? No further requests for the floor. So thanks again, China.

And we proceed to the next. Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Next document will be about Resolution 60 found on DT53.

Is this document available now? We can start responding to challenges of responding to the challenges of the evolution of the identification/numbering system and its convergence with IP‑based systems/networks.

As we did before, we changed the original text to reach consensus, and we moved the text of the referred to Resolution 133, 101, and 102. And I think there was no square brackets in the document. We came into good compromise and consensus of the text so it is in front of the distinguished Delegates and we hope we can approve this document. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: So thanks for your work, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Group. We have the text in Resolution 60 in TD53. Any requests for clarification or comments? I leave 2 minutes for Delegates to go through their computer.

If not we can approve Resolution 60, and ask Egypt to go to the next document in their work.

 Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: The next document is document 61. Sorry, Resolution 61 in document DT51 about countering and combating misappropriation and misuse of International Telecommunication numbering resources. And as previously, due to consultation, we came up with the document with no square brackets, and get consensus from the Ad Hoc Group.

>> CHAIR: I repeat, draft revised Resolution 61 in document 51. There are no square brackets, I understand, countering and combating misappropriation and misuse of international telecommunication numbering resources.

And United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Good morning. During the ad hoc which unfortunately overran yesterday, I had to leave to go and Chair a meeting, and in so doing I reserve the right to come back to your Committee to raise any concerns on this document. And unfortunately, with regards to resolves further 5, we do have some concerns. Basically we see the description in definitions for fraud and fraudulent activities as being National legal matters. With that in mind, we would find it difficult to agree to this text and would seek more time to perhaps endeavor to find alternate. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Canada?

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair. We had similar time constraints last night with ad hocs and I was unable to attend the latter part of the ad hoc here due to other priorities. Now we also would have some concerns with the text, resolves further 1 and 2. There is now deletions on "within the constraints of their National laws and regulatory frameworks." We would prefer to keep this text and we would agree with the U.K. suggestion to continue to work this Resolution somewhat and improve the text. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Thank you. Talking now on behalf of the Arab States, this Resolution came from, this contribution, and we in the discussions we came into compromise that these constraints of the National laws is already embedded in the Constitution, and no need to insert it at everywhere to remind people that it is the right of Member States so it was like common consensus, it was to a great extent except as what I heard now from the colleague from Canada that we delete this text in consistency with what is in the Constitution.

Regarding Article 5, I think it is totally related to fraud, misappropriation, totally related to fraud, and we have to know what is the mechanism that this can happen. Of course ITU will not be involved with dispute resolution, but at least we want to know what is the cause, and then the next action can be taken, legally, the appropriate venue. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. We have not a lot of time left but I have three requests from the floor and after, I will tell what we will do.

Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chairman. Like other colleagues, we have some difficulty remaining with the text of resolves, primarily resolves 5, so we would support time to have a little more work on this to get some language that we're all comfortable with. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United States?

>> UNITED STATES: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We would like to associate with the views of Australia, Canada and U.K. regarding the need for some more time.

>> CHAIR: Finally, last speaker, Iran.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Perhaps we should deal with the resolves 1 and 2, the expression within the constraints of the National law, just that part. We have no difficulty to reinsert that, although it is in the Preamble of the Constitution and it is elsewhere, but we have no difficulty reinserting of that portion only, within the constraints of the National law. That portion only. We have no difficulty. It is repetition, but no problem with that.

With the resolve 5 perhaps we have to have some informal discussions to see what is the difficulty but I don't see any problem to ask Study Group 2 ‑‑ 3, the study to describe that. What is the difficulty? Nevertheless we are ready to discuss that but only resolves 5. 1 and 2, we are in line with reinsertion of the portion "within the constraints of National law," that portion only. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. May I request as a conclusion Egypt carry on informal consultation to clarify the text in resolves further, and come to agreed text again to this Plenary. Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. I think we can do that in the lunch break. However, just remind the attendees that Study Group 3 has already studied fraud and is progressing that work, so I see no difficulty in addressing that in Study Group 2, or in Study Group 3 work, as well. There is no new item, and I'm happy to convene that informal consultation. Thanks, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: So thanks for accepting to have additional work and you carry on starting from the ‑‑ I understand at the end of the Plenary of Com 4 through in the lunch break, you have this informal consultation.

Now, Richard?

>> RICHARD HILL: Yes, I just want to announce the Ad Hoc Group meeting on Resolution 64 that will take place starting at 14:00 hours, 2:00 p.m., and for two hours, until 16:00 hours, 4:00 p.m., and that is in Room G, G for golf. Resolution 64. Thank you.

>> CHAIR:  okay, Iran?

>> IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Is it coincident with the working 4A or 4? If that is the case we have difficulty because we cannot divide ourselves in two parts, Chairman. It should not be in line ‑‑ inconsistent ‑‑ sorry, in the coincident with the holding the meeting of 4A or 4. If it is the case we have no problem but we have no time to go to two meetings at the same time. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Richard?

>> RICHARD HILL: Thank you, Chairman. We will change the time to be from 1:30 to 14:30. So that will be 1:30 to 2:30, 13:30 to 14:30 in Room G for golf. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Egypt?

>> EGYPT: Thanks, Chairman. I think it's appropriate to have it from 1:30 to 14:30 for this consultation. Thank you. Is that true?

>> CHAIR: You mean consultation on your group? Or which one?

>> EGYPT: I did capture, 1:30 to 14:30 is for 64 or for our Resolution?

>> CHAIR: Richard?

>> RICHARD HILL: Room G, 13:30 to 14:30 is Resolution 64. And for your consultation, I was thinking we don't assign a room. Maybe you would simply consult with the concerned parties here in this room after the break.

>> CHAIR: Egypt is agreeing so it will be as soon as I close the meeting, you can start your informal consultation.

In this case, I close the meeting now, because there is another session in less than half an hour. Thank you for your support, and we will see us again this afternoon.

[ End of meeting ]
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