

Raw file.
October 26, 2016.
1430.
ITU.
World Telecommunication Standardization
Assembly.
Hammamet, Tunisia.
WG4A.

Services Provided By:

Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
800-825-5234
www.captionfirst.com

This text is being provided in a realtime format.
Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or
captioning are provided in order to facilitate
communication accessibility and may not be a totally
verbatim record of the proceedings.

***.

>> CHAIR: Dear friends, colleagues, let's start
our session, because we have limited time, and we should
proceed accordingly.

First let's check the interpretation channel.
English.

>> Good afternoon, Chair.

>> CHAIR: French. French? (pause).

Okay, okay. No problem.

Okay. Let's suppose that all the channels are
working well. If they are not working well, please let

me know. So, you have in front of you the general agenda, DT13 and you have there for all our session, and I hope we have not forgotten any documents. We have also the detailed agenda for today in TD, ADM 7.

So since in the agenda there are some opening remarks of the Chairman, let me make some opening remarks.

First of all, I hope that choose well in our meeting will prevail the spirit on cooperation, avoid conflict that are not good for the union as a whole.

I think we have to take into account also the request from Director was presented to TSAG, it was quoted at the opening plenary, to have all resolution take into account the existing text and the question activity made in the various Study Group already study the question, take into account the activity and scope of various sector of the union, if conflicting. That I say also because I am the Chairman of intersectoral cooperation group, and I want to not to have to complete from one sector to the other. So I think D, R and this sector are working to the ends assisted by the Secretariat. By the way in ITU Malcolm Johnson is sharing the corresponding T sector group.

Now I'm afraid due to time we have to limit the time of intervention to two minutes, if possible, when

there are presentation documents should be made from one representative of the region and avoid multiple repetition.

I thank you for your cooperation and understanding, and I open for to all suggestion to make the life of myself and my assistant easy.

Last thing, we will follow strictly the documenting the agenda so you are requested to open before we start discussing, so we will not lose time. So thanks again. Now we can start with another point, work plan allocation of document, we have already seen.

So we can start with the first item is resolution 20. Are you ready? I give you exception one minute to prepare the document. The first document is 4,221. Procedure for allocation and management of international communication numbering, naming, addressing identification resource.

So someone can present the document in two minutes. No request for the floor. No presentation. Yes, finally, Cameroon.

>> CAMEROON: Thank you very much, Chair, for giving me the floor to introduce this document concerning resolution 20. First of all, on behalf of the Cameroonian delegation I would like to congratulate you, Chair, on

having been assigned to Chair this session. Having said that, I would say now that numbering, naming, addressing and identification resources are natural resources that have, that are limited in the mid and long term in the current infrastructure context, as regards installations and services. The demand for these resources is growing exponentially.

It would be expensive and extremely difficult to operate, create a transformation of infrastructures, and service provision, in order to face the extinction of these resources. It is therefore way to decide what resources and NNAI resources which are of limited nature and they could get even more rare if they are not efficiently used, given the increasing demand for these resources and the evolution of applications and machine to machine services and the Internet of Things. The allocation and management of NNAI resources is carried out according to efficient procedures, that are nondiscriminatory, but also these resources should not be misused or misappropriate taken into occasion and reaffirming the role of TSB in this regard. It is highly important to create a climate of trust as regards NNAI resources to ensure global connectivity and fight against fraud. This contribution contains modifications that

are proposed to be made to resolution 20, from WTSA 20, to tackle fraud in NNAI resources and to reaffirm that these resources are limited in the long and midterm, in the current infrastructures, installations and services and should be managed and used efficiently so we can avoid a lack of these resources.

It also deals with necessary measures that should be envisaged by Member States and by the ITU to avoid misuse, misappropriation of these resources. I thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your presentation. I hope that everyone has read this document. I speak in French now. But I'm addressing you. The next one will be document 43A from Arab States. Someone will present that? Yes, Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Good afternoon. As regards resolution 20, as regards international numbering, naming, addressing and identification of resources for telecommunications, this is an important resolution. The Arab regions' contribution to this, to resolution 20 is, consists in affirming that NNAI resources are limited, naturally limited resources, in the context of currently available infrastructures, and we can expect an increase of demand for these resources. We need to

manage these resources efficiently to guarantee that there is no scarcity, and also in light of the significant developments that we are seeing in the telecommunications sphere.

Also, we need to create a climate of trust as regards the resources allocated, and we also need to take all necessary measures to ensure the fair allocation of these resources.

Also, we need to combat any unfair allocation of these resources. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your presentation. I open the discussion after the presentation of all the different position. Next one is document 45 from Europe. Someone from Europe, United Kingdom, show the document.

>> Thank you, Chair, good afternoon. On behalf of Europe I'm pleased to produce and present document 45 addendum 9. The changes that we propose to resolution 20 are to strengthen the role that the Director has of the TSB has with specific naming, numbering and addressing identification issues for which the Director is responsible, specifically international or global resources.

The proposed changes to the results to the instruct to the Director aligns the roles and responsibilities

of the Director with those commonly found within national regulatory bodies. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom. Next one is 47 from RCC. Someone from RCC present the document? Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Chair. Colleagues, this proposal from the RCC is dedicated to the growing role of issues of numbering, naming, addressing NNAI resources. We propose here to consider this is linked to resolution 20, 29, 61 and 65. In this resolution 20, we propose some editorial clarifications, and also invite, would like to reflect the work carried out in line with resolution 49 of the WTSA, an enum protocol. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Now I have contribution 53 from Canada and the United States. Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Yes, thank you, Chair. Good afternoon, everyone. Canada would like to present document 53. In document 53 we have proposed edits to resolution 20 to reflect newly adopted Plenipotentiary resolution 190 on countering misappropriation and misuse of international telecommunications numbering resources.

The revisions contained in this document will help to ensure consistency between the two resolutions, and it will also reflect the ongoing work of, within the ITU-T Study Groups such as Study Group 2.

In addition, ITU-T Study Group 2 has undertaken work to implement res 20 as well as res 190 and the proposed revisions are to seek to ensure that those are properly reflected in the new, newly revised proposed text.

So with that, I would propose our document for consideration, and thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thanks to you. Now I open for discussion, and I can see what maybe there are the basic point that I see need maybe solution. If I'm wrong, please correct me. But I try.

First one is the proposed by African Arab state to focus on the register on or by subscription establishment of ITU-T database for plan, now this is a proposal. At the same time there is a proposal for a new resolution from RCC that's on this respect. So again, if possible, if everyone agree, try to merge the proposal in one considered form. But I will open the floor later on for this point.

Now, RCC has pointed out in the presentation that proposal, calling identification quoting enum IT3 basic

text so this is another point. Finally, Canada propose the misuse, it can be simplified, Director can give this some role and so on. I now open the floor for any comments, question, point of agreement, where we can go forward. The floor is yours if you are requesting. Mexico. And United Kingdom, sorry. United Kingdom.

>> Thank you, Chair. A question for clarification from colleagues from Africa and from the Arab States. The proposal under resolves to instruct 6 refers to numbering resources that are reserved, assigned or allocated for each country. I'm sorry that this is rather a detailed question. But can we have clarification on what they mean by numbering resources? Does it mean specific individual numbers? Or numbering blocks?

It's to do with the administrative nature of undertaken by Member States as to how they allocate reserve and withdrawal numbers. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I will give after the floor to them. First Mexico has requested the floor. Maybe you can ponder the question together. Mexico.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chair.

Good afternoon to all.

First of all, I would like to express our gratitude for the different documents to modify resolution 20.

We have already had some consultations, and we have heard the remarks from UK and so on, concerning this proposal and the database as proposed here under number 6, in the proposal presented by Africa and the Arab States, which we feel could have different implications in our country, and when it comes to numbering, and may also lead to regulatory overload.

>> CHAIR: Will be extra financial cost for the sector, because to establish, maintain required resources. Can I give the floor to Egypt, please.

>> Yes, please.

>> CHAIR: Show the, consider the proposal on the screen. There is a text the Secretariat has been very, put to resolution 20 all together, and that's easier task. Please, Egypt, go ahead.

>> EGYPT: Okay. To the block on recommends comes from UK he was asking about, are we talking about blocks or specific numbers, what we have mentioned in this contribution is to trying to utilize efficiently these resources, even by block or numbers. That's what we are mentioning here in our contribution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Jordan. Please do not repeat the same position if possible.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chair. I wanted to add a

clarification, when we talk about allocation by different states, they are allocating digital capacity and not a number. And as states know, states cooperate with the ITU to send digital servers that need to be allocated so that they can be published at the ITU to open international communication channels.

So all this information is sent to the ITU and they are collected at a database, and they are therefore documented, and that does not need any supplementary resources. It is just information that we would send to the ITU. What we are asking as a resolution is that for our colleagues bear this information in mind and we put them into a database, and they create another database does not need any further cost or resources.

Any employee who has any IT knowledge can create this type of database, because the information is provided to the ITU.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for repeating what was said before. But I say that I want only one for region, not the same comments repeated by several speakers. I have Russia, I have Syria.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon, colleagues. I would like to ask you permission to create a draft new resolution and put it,

you have referred to earlier that we could have, we could unify efforts. Perhaps I could now introduce the resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Please not to today agenda, but I think it exceptionally if possible, you can introduce -- I guess we have to come back once we have taken a decision on that. Please go ahead.

>> Thank you, Chair. I would turn your attention to document 47, addendum 18. The main aim of this document is to propose to create a database for operators across the world. The main task, the main problem that is often faced by operators is the lack of the necessary information as regards these numbering plans which often means that cost, it is hard to establish a cost of calls, of routing numbers, and in some cases, numbering resources are misused.

ITU and the TSB would often receive information from states, as regards the recommendation E129. Therefore, all information is collected in principle and is regularly published in the bulletin, in the operational bulletin.

The task is to have this information in electronic form, and to regularly publish it in electronic format, because for example my company has a special individual

who follows on paper in this operational bulletin, and we need to, in the 21st century, we think that it's a bit archaic to have people who are working in every company do this on paper. Therefore, we propose to improve the electronic working methods, and have all the information that is today published in the operational bulletin should be included in the operational database.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. It's clear that my suggestion is to avoid duplication of resolutions, either one or the other or none. I'm the Chairman so I have no personal opinion. I have to say also, I spoke with the TSB before, and with the financial service, also although everything I'm telling should be someone who served the data, control the data, and make so there is some human results implication and some cost.

Now I give the floor to Australia and Canada, Australia, please.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Australia would be more cautious about what would likely be involved in terms of setting up a database like this, both in terms of human resources and financial resources. Our administration has some experience in this, and setting up a database that is actually usable and searchable

is a very complex thing. It takes a lot of time, it needs to be very carefully scoped.

So as well as thinking through what would be involved for the ITU, I think we would also need to consider what would be involved in terms of costs upon our own regulators who would be required to set up their own interoperable systems, and have to set somebody aside who they don't at present to input data. I'm not sure how regularly it's envisaged, but that again is a significant financial and resource involvement.

I think I would urge caution, and the need for anything like this to be very carefully scoped before it was proposed. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia. Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair. It was a question for clarification on the African proposals which note a realtime database. When considering information technology systems, databases, or more broadly there is potentially operational considerations, we have heard also the aspects of routing. I'm very concerned that this database would be used in an operational context. We also heard from the Russian Federation about publishing administrative data through the operational bulletin. That is currently the work in process.

Putting that into an electronic form is one thing.

Operating a realtime database that would take care of aspects of security, eroding interconnection that is something completely different. And I'm very concerned we may be falling into an aspect which would have immense cost. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Chair. Good afternoon, friends. We share the concerns with regard to the database proposals that we have heard from many colleagues. We would note that the bimonthly operational bulletin published by the ITU-T adequately informs all Member States and Sector Members on this issue.

Any additional requirements on Member States to report will be operationally and technically burdensome on Member States and the ITU-T.

We also would note that a number of commercial entities already create databases for these purposes. Some based on information provided by the ITU-T, others based on information they obtain as number administrators.

The ITU-T cannot be responsible for coding and harmonizing the data. Considering that not all

countries publish all information regarding their national plans, it's not clear that the ITU-T would even be able to perform the coding and harmonization necessary.

Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I have the final request for the floor from Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. Also Japan's position is similar to the U.S. or Australia, so we need to consider several issues before including this item to the resolution. We need to clarify why we need such a database and activities of this database and how to monitor the database and the relationship between the database and the some government and the network operators. We need to handle this item carefully, and we don't agree to include this item to be clarified in this issues. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Since we have the proposal from Russia, and coming to discussion tomorrow, what I propose that we will have now informal discussion between the interested party, and come to a solution by the time we will discuss tomorrow the new resolution proposed by Russia. So we know how to go further in each direction, because I think if we continue discuss like that, we

will be Ping-Pong. I am a tennis player. So I like tennis and Ping-Pong but it's not very useful in this case.

So let me go at the next point, the proposal from Russia to add the reference to enum. Are there any objection, point of clarification. You can see, show the proposal on the screen if possible, the compiled proposal or not? Sorry to -- I can tell you where it is. Now you see on the screen where the enum appear, if there are any problem for this insertion? We come back to resolution 20 entirely after discussion, informal discussion.

No requests for the floor. So seems that this is okay because silence means agreement to me. Okay?

So, next point is the proposal from, that is outlined to give some role to the ITU-T Director. Can you show also that? (pause).

In several place, so is someone objecting to this proposal from Europe? It seems not. So that will be included. There are to me minor changes. Ah, yes, there is, Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. Now, concerning the European Union's proposal in add 3, let me just emphasize the fact that improper utilization can affect all numbering, whether it's national or international.

So just speaking about the numbers that would be utilized by ITU, it is very restrictive, so we wouldn't be able to accept that addition.

>> CHAIR: Okay, in this case let's have informal discussion between the party. I do not want to open the floor, because I do not want again the tennis ball. I like as I say tennis, but I hate in this room. (chuckles).

But I see the request from Russia, you insist to have the floor and Egypt, a different position from Saudi Arabia, Egypt? No. Russian Federation, please. No different position. Thank you. That means Egypt, you insist the floor? You want to say different position? No?

>> Yes.

>> CHAIR: In this case let's have informal discussion and come back at the next session. It means we have to come back for these two points. As I said, the order to me seems minor editorial, however, if some region think that are fundamental, please contact proponent and try to find a solution for the next session as possible. Yes, please, I see the request for the floor from -- push the button. Egypt, please go ahead.

>> EGYPT: Yes, I don't think we need to remove, we need to remove, we don't need to add anything to the

main authorities or for the TSB Director. I think TSB Director is responsible for all numbering, not only global and international.

>> CHAIR: I don't know if everyone agree from that, because is International Telecommunication Union, it is not national telecommunication union. That is how it can be, however, please join the group for discussion and see, find a solution. Thank you. Consultation can be during the coffee break starting, because when we will have the coffee break, I'm afraid in a relatively short time, you can have time to have this informal discussion.

But I want to progress in my agenda, if you agree, and we can go to resolution 40. It's correct? Resolution 40. I have only one document, document 45 from Europe. Someone from Europe present the document. Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Chair, we just wanted to clarify, as regards the previous issue, as regards resolution 20. Are you going to ask opinions as regards document 53.1? Or are we going to discuss in the break?

>> CHAIR: All together, because at the end, we will come to a package let's say, either to amend resolution 20 to all who have a solution or to leave things as they

stand. This is the proposal. Maybe I can ask someone to lead this informal discussion, if you want. But I want it to be real informal. So get together and try to come with a solution, because as soon as I, the drafting group will need the room and so I hope it can be solved friendly in international spirit of cooperation.

Now I give the floor to the United Kingdom for presenting a contribution 45, please.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Contribution 45 addendum 7 is an amendment to resolution 40 which deals with the regulatory aspects of the work of the ITU telecommunications standardization sector.

Under the resolves of this resolution, the items that are identified as being of a regulatory nature and therefore subject to the traditional approval process are identified.

One of the items under there refer to the use of the limited natural resources of numbering and addressing. There has been a discussion around resolution 20 in the text of limited natural resources, numbering and addressing are limited resources but that is because their man-made limitations, not because nature has decreed it that way.

The changes to resolution 40 is to reflect the fact

that all numbering and addressing resources that are defined within and are the responsibility of the ITU should be subject to TAP. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Can the meeting agree to this proposed modification? Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chair. Now, we have certain reservations on this proposal. We could agree about the need for mentioning that these are natural resources.

But we also have to state that these are limited, these resources, and that each state defines its resources and the degree of limitations that they face. So we would ask that we maintain utilization of limited resources, naming and addressing.

>> CHAIR: Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. We would like to express some concern from our region as regards this proposal. In our view, excluding, removing the word "use" of limited natural resources, so use, would rule out several areas of our work. In our view, it is very important aspect which would enable us to prevent misuse of telecommunications networks with numbering resources. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair. Briefly, I think this

text does help to clarify and is more accurate natural resources being from a natural realm, and of course we are all talking about resources defined within ITU-T recommendations. Recommendations can change, can be revised, can be improved. This would all potentially address the availability of resources.

Furthermore the limited nature, not all numbering schemes are potentially limited. They are all finite, but they are in various cases of utilization. That said, I think the all numbering and addressing is sufficiently accurate to cover this and we support the proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Ivory Coast.

>> Thank you, Chair. Thank you for giving us this possibility of expressing our thoughts on this contribution from Europe.

We believe that it's not necessarily appropriate here to talk about natural resources. We would tend to say limited resources. So we wouldn't agree to deleting all of this item concerning the addressing. I think we should say limited resources instead of natural resources. That would be our point of view on this.

>> CHAIR: United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much,

Chair. Briefly, to support the comments from Canada and to support the proposed edits in document 47, addendums 45 addendum 7. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: China.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. China is of the view that this contribution made revision of contents related to resolution 40 which will result in the work conducted of SG 2 NNAI that will delay the SG 2 standardization work. Therefore, we think the Assembly should be very prudent in approving this contribution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be brief. Japan supports the proposal from UK and also Canada and United States. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I understand that with some minor amendment, sorry, Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Just to be very very brief, we would also support the proposal from our colleagues in CEPT.

>> CHAIR: I propose again we have informal consultation, Ivory Coast suggested changes. We will have a common agreed text and come back to that and as part of a package that we will try to have for all the

numbering resolution. So I ask to get in touch with the proponent in this case, and try to find a solution. If not we will stay to the existing text. Next document is resolution 29 and I'm afraid we will not finish today, but I try my best. Resolution 29 we have several documents. We have to start document 42. Someone from the region can present document 42, please prepare your document. Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chair. Chair, we are talking about the importance here of broadening Internet networks, and resolution 29 brings up the issue of alternative communications, other than Internet, which may have a negative impact on the activities of governments.

So this proposal first of all reiterates the sovereign rights of each and every state to organise as they see fit, means of communication, without this affecting other states, while underscoring the importance of maintaining international cooperation in this field.

We would ask the group to study all optional solutions here for these alternative procedures and to take the appropriate decisions in this respect we would ask group 3 to look at the economic aspects of these alternative procedures. We would also ask that these

tools not just be limited to the calling procedures or other systems of communication, but rather to ensure that we stay abreast of new developments in Internet networks.

For example, the misuse of communications through OTT procedures.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the introduction of your contribution. We will have discussion later on. Next one is 43. Someone from the region can present 43. Egypt again or you present both together?

>> Common proposal for Africa and Arab groups. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: RCC, you have document 47. You want to say something? Or it is also common proposal? It is different. I ask Russia, please, for RCC.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. Yes. The Russian Federation is introducing this document on behalf of the RCC. As we have already said, we consider, we are looking at four resolutions here, as resolutions that are linked all together. This is why taking into account that the terminology of the current version of the resolutions is not unified. We propose to make or add additions to the text as regarding telecommunication operators/operating agencies to add reference to

resolution 65 of WTSA. Note the work carried out in the standardization sector as regards this issue, and also we share the concern expressed in the African region and Arab States and propose to have, include Study Group 17 in work on this issue. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. That is the end of the presentation of contribution. There is text proposed to relevant on service QOA and OP T and Study Group 12 is adds to resolve. This is common Arab and African proposal. They propose to change the term operating agent with term operating agency and that is the terminology used in the ITU I have no idea, I'm not remembering, but and that as you say the Study Group 17 discuss, so there are in this case some far-reaching proposal. Are there any question for clarification, requests of additional information? United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Just a question of clarification for colleagues presenting the common position from Africa, which is revision 1 to addendum 4 in document 42. There is a distinction made between in resolves 1 referring to alternative calling procedures, and resolves 5, talking about the role of the over-the-top telecommunication applications in our alternative calling procedures.

Do colleagues from that region who have presented that document see any other examples of alternative calling procedures? Or are they only focusing on over the top procedures? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any further question before I give the floor to Egypt? Canada.

>> CANADA: Yes, thank you. It was just on the subject question for clarification for the African and Arab counterproposals, regulated to telecommunications or identification, could they potentially describe that term. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Chair. Just for clarification on the RCC proposal, we note the suggestion to add telecommunications, operators slash in front of the term operating agencies. We understand operating agencies, the defined term in the basic instruments of the ITU. So we would ask for clarification of the need to add, telecommunications operators. Likewise, the suggestion to add Study Group 17, we would like to understand the work that would be performed by Study Group 17 as both Study Groups 2 and 3 are responsible for this particular area. Then we would also support the question from the UK. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: May I ask in the room, before Egypt, the first question was to add the Africa for the Egypt and after to Russia to respond to the question, first Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Yes, thank you, Chair. Now concerning the question raised by the United Kingdom, our intent here, what we meant to say was not to limit alternative calling procedures, to specific identified points, but because there is very rapid development in this area, in the field of Internet.

I think we could imagine new applications arising in the future. So I don't think it would be a good idea to generalize here, or put it this way, it would be more advisable to have a more general formulation here, and not have more specific or precise description, because there are applications that we are aware of already, which you wouldn't have imagined two or three years ago.

So maybe some more general wording would allow us to cover that possibility of new developments. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Open to possible modification. Russia, you can respond to the question.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes, thank you very much, Chair. We are very grateful to the speakers for the

interesting questions. Yes, as we were saying, when we presented our proposal, we consider the block of four resolutions, and they are linked, they have a link to numbering resources and in them terminology is used, for example, in resolution 61, they use both operating agencies and telecommunications operators. And the situation is such that in these sectors we can find many recommendations, and you can hear these, see these later in the document, but the term telecommunication operators is used. These are, they have a wide area of activity in international telecommunications. We can't ignore this. We can't narrow the scope of the resolution which is used by Member States.

So our proposal responds to the challenges of the time. The second aspect as regards Study Group 17, in the text we have reference to a workshop which was held by the TSB, and as a result, we saw that Study Group 17 should work with Study Group 2 if necessary, as regards issues linked to alternative calling procedures.

These aspects that were expressed by the Arab region and the African region, thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your explanation. As a personal comment out of, not Chairman but personal feeling, to quote a resolution this workshop sort of

limited attendance, maybe it is not the idea, maybe you have to find other way to carry the message, because in the workshop in four year time will be obsolete. So I do not like to refer to something has happened but maybe you can find the way to solve.

Has this explanation satisfied the questioner?
United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. With respect to the response from our colleague from Egypt on the proposal in the revised text from Africa, I think he has suggested a way forward, namely that the including OTT and other examples in the text can be considered, I'm happy to work with him to address the issue. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Fine. I always want solution, and that's, I'm very pleased. Senegal, no, sorry, Algeria.

>> ALGERIA: Good afternoon, Chair. I would like to offer some clarifications to Egypt, as regards their proposal, probably as what was proposed by the RCC region. Indeed, this resolution was established in 1996 to bring solution to the problem of procedures, calling procedures, alternative calling procedures that is, but with new technologies appearing and convergence of networks, we will certainly have other procedures that we are going

to identify. This is why we are interested at SG 17 on NG and OTT with the support of the proposal of the RCC because it adds to the proposal made by Egypt.

Thank you very much, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Clearly I finish now this question, I ask really the proponents to try to take into account a possible revised common draft all the observation and come back, we will come back to the number later on.

So I understand that there is a possibility, you said maybe there is not. But I'm always hopeful. So I hope there will be a possibility to come to some common agreed text, because in the case we have different opinion, and that is what I want to avoid. Thank you for your understanding. Now we move to the next because in the case we not finish the examination of all documents of today, and next resolution is resolution 65. Correct? And we have a document 42 from African region. Someone can present this very shortly this document. African region? Document 42, nobody? Kenya. Sorry, finally.

>> Kenya: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I will be very brief. Mr. Chairman, the African region wishes to propose some amendments to resolution 65 basically to take into account the various evolutions of ICT infrastructure and services, so that we ensure

that we, you know, deepen the trust in the use of ICTs by ensuring that we take into account studies regarding the calling line identification for purposes of ensuring that there is more trust in the ICT, and in doing this, Mr. Chairman, we are proposing minor amendments to address this particular issue, and the proposals that we are putting on the table relates to inviting Study Group 2, 3, 11 and 12 to study these particular issues with a possibility of updating recommendation E157 accordingly.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, we also propose that TSB Director should continue to report on the progress of the revision of resolution 65. In terms of specifics, Mr. Chairman, we have indicated certain amendments that speak to the changing environment in terms of delivery of networks and infrastructure, including NGN and future networks.

We also have made also the reference to delivery of international calling line I.D. by signatory Member States to the ITRs and other 11 provisions in other text. So Mr. Chairman, in brief, this proposal 6 to update this particular resolution to take into account the new and emerging environment relating to the use of ICTs, so that we can deepen the trusts in the use of these

services going forward. I thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Kenya. Now we ask presentation of document 46 from IAP, someone, Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair. Yes, I'd like to present document 46, addendum 32 on behalf of the Member States of CITELE.

This contribution proposed modifications to resolution 65. As many of us know, ITU-T provides guidance for international calling party number delivery in recommendation ITTE157. This guidance is meant to be technology neutral, and in the delivery of international E164 numbers.

This topic continues to be studied within Study Group 2 and we look forward to contributing to the work.

To improve the resolution, 65, we have proposed editorial amendments, as well as we propose to retain the terms calling line identification and calling party number as they are well-defined within many ITU-T recommendations.

We also are looking to focus some of the terminology. We feel origin identification is not well-defined within ITU-T recommendations, and while we recognize we have come across recommendation T140 recently which uses the term, but it does not use it in the body of the

recommendation. That said, we also feel that calling party number sufficiently covers aspects related to origination.

Finally, we feel that the reporting with respect to the TSB Director instructs is here and so we feel to suppress that as it's done through ITU-T Study Group 2 meeting reports on a normal basis. I think that concludes my presentation. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Last is 47 from RCC. Someone from RCC will present the document. Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair. We would like to note the importance of this resolution for our region, which is facing a large number of misuse of its networks as regards calling party, number delivery and calling line identification, origin and identification. This has an economic impact of operators and is of great concern.

Thus, we would propose some clarifications to this resolution 65. They would, they regard the reflecting the experience of countries in the region which are implementing national laws, if the number delivery is not carried out, we would like to share the other side of the coin that many countries are making efforts with their national legislation, as regards ensuring

confidence in origin identification, and calling party numbers, and also taking into account the networks and services. We would recommend including Study Group 11 in this work, and as part of the work, with networks for the fourth and later generations.

Also our proposal contains a call on Member States which is based on voluntary approach of course, to consider the possibility of developing in their national legislations standards which are set out for in the recommendation. As regards calling line identification, and other aspects linked to fulfilling this resolution, I suggest a invitation, it is not mandatory, and we believe that the information as regards which states on a national level are putting these requirements in their national legislation will improve trust in operators in these states where the call is coming from. Thank you very much, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Now I will ask the, show the compile three proposal in a document and ask if there are requests for clarification, comments, or whatever.

You can put the combined three proposal? Yes. So, there is I understand the proposal from CITELE to, is to delete 3 from African SEC to add Study Group 11 and after there is some more detailed proposal from African

on information point and so on.

Any requests for clarification? United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Just a couple of questions of clarification to colleague from Africa, on their additional text in resolves 4 in addendum 29 to contribution 42.

It talks very specifically about an identifier registered by the subscriber and authorized by the originating service provider. The question I have is, in some countries, it's not authorized by the originating service provider, and therefore I would be interested to hear how the change in the resolves would address that specific case.

I know at least one instance where the authorization is actually done by the national regulator. Further, it says or be replaced by a default identifier by the originating provider. Again, that is something that may be under the remit and control of the regulator, rather than the originating provider and subject to national rules and regulations. Specifically here I think about privacy, and whether or not a originated caller would want that information provided.

So just some questions of clarification for the colleague, as to whether or not those two points have

been identified and thought through with this possible insertion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Before giving the floor to the United States, I have to ask interpreters if they are willing to stay with us five more minutes.

>> Granted, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. After everyone else have to leave we will have as prime for that sponsored coffee break by United Arab Emirates gold sponsor, silver sponsor South Korea and bronze sponsor Rohde Schwarz. So if you are concise we can enjoy the coffee break. United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Chair. Just to add a few questions for clarification on the RCC proposal. First we would note that the addition in noting further recognizes steps that Member States are already taking, and the proposed addition of, invites Member States, invites members to do things that the noting further addition says they are already doing. So it appears to be unnecessary.

The proposed reference to Study Group 11 is not objectionable, if they are doing relevant work. However, we recognize that Study Group 2 is the lead Study Group on these issues and they do liaise with other Study Groups

when appropriate.

We would also recognize the work that Study Group 2 has been and is doing with regard to revisions to recommendation E .157. I think the purpose of some of these revisions is to, the proposed revisions in these resolutions is to get that work going, and it already is.

Then finally, there is a proposal in the RCC contribution to add a reference to including fourth and later generation networks.

I think that this is a reference to existing and future mobile networks, which are already included in the language of the resolution. So just for clarification, if that was their intention, perhaps the existing language already covers that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I have Mexico and Japan. After that, I think we have to conclude and make it my conclusion. Mexico and Japan, please.

>> MEXICO: Yes, thank you, Chair. Thank you for the different proposals that have been introduced. I wanted to refer to 46.32. It is not really clear to me why we are going to eliminate origin identification. I'd like some further explanations on that. Thank you.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman, from Japan, we have

some concern to the contribution from RCC contribution 47S17. This contribution proposed to advance. Second section means possibility of developing as part of the national regulatory undertake frameworks, something. In this sentence seems to request up to each country to make national regulation. But this is not out of scope from ITU-T so we believe ITU-T do not include such a sentence in the resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the clear statement. I can offer only two minutes each from, if you want to respond, and after that, we have to conclude because I say five minutes.

Is anyone from either region willing to respond or is left to informal consultation during the coffee break, and solution at the next session. Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes, thank you, Chair. We are ready to very briefly answer, because part of the answer is in our report that when we presented this document.

In noting further, we just offer the second point of view, so here are the simple position. If the U.S. is saying that this is superfluous, then we can delete it.

If this is a consensus, then we agree on this.

As regards note Japan and the U.S. yes, there is a invitation and it is a invitation, all Member States here are here and it is voluntary invitation from each other to make efforts on a national level, there is no consequences or obligations of this. It is just voluntary, and nothing more. So therefore, we are not going outside of the ITU mandate which shows us at every stage its regulates telecommunications on a national level itself.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: I offer the floor to Kenya.

>> Kenya: Thank you very much, Chair. Just to address the query from the United Kingdom regarding resolve 5, indeed we recognize that there are many variations of registration of identifiers. And it's for these reasons that the text contains the word, where technically possible.

However, having said this, we are quite amenable to discuss further the possible changes that will make all of us comfortable with the proposed text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. My way out is again during coffee break, or this evening reception or whatever you want, try to solve the pending item, and come up with a common text from the different proposals.

So we have only one text to consider and not several proposals. With that, I think I can say for today thank you for your patience, also thank you for prepared and enjoy the coffee break.

(applause).

(break).

(standing by).

>> CHAIR: Good afternoon, everyone.

Please be seated. I'd like to start our session 4B.

Welcome, everyone, first I'd like to check the interpretation. Channel 1, English.

>> Good afternoon, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Channel 2, French. 3, Spanish. Russian, 4. 5, Chinese. Arabic in 6.

(pause).

So, thank you very much, I'd like to start the session on Committee 4, Working Group 4B. I would like to ask the technicians to display on the screen the document DT8, which is the general agenda for Committee 4. Since we started, I would like you to see document DT8, this is general agenda for Committee 4. As you can see, we will start, we will have four meetings. This meeting Wednesday, we have another meeting Thursday, Friday,

and Tuesday.

So as you can see, we don't have a lot of time to discuss all the issues that we have in our agenda items. Now I would like you to ask your indulgence to be very fast on your contributions, and so that we can have a good discussion and a good outcomes of our 4B.

So I will ask you to approve the agenda for the Working Group 4B as it is. This is the agenda for our first meeting. In this first agenda, in this first day, we will discuss the draft new resolution on SMEs, which is the IAP 7. Then I hope we can start the discussion on resolution 44, on bridging the standardization gap. Maybe if we have time, or maybe we can do both 44 and the proposal to suppress resolution 59.

We shall start, if it's approved. Okay.

I shall ask CITELE to present -- I'd like to ask CITELE to present 46 addendum 18. You have the floor.

>> Thank you, Chair. Let me now proceed with the introduction of this new resolution. On behalf of CITELE --

>> CHAIR: Please just a moment. I'd like to ask the technicians to display the document 46. Okay. Thank you. Please go ahead.

>> Thank you. Let me also take this opportunity

to wish you all success as Chair. As you said we are going to introduce this new resolution on behalf of CITELE which has to do with the admission of small and medium enterprises in the sector of ITU. We hope that everyone had time to read this thoroughly. I'll try to be brief. It mentions all of the existing standard here dealing with effective partnerships of stakeholders in telecommunications, ICT environment, the reduction of the standardization gap between developing and developed countries, with initiatives that ITU has been undertaking to promote the participation of SMEs in its activities. For example, the 2016 Council meeting, designated information society and the social impact of ICT and especially the initiatives taken by the ICT Secretariat, the IPM platform and other antecedents here.

We have seen more innovation from micro, small and even micro enterprises in this environment, and for a long time we have been trying to promote the participation of small and medium sized enterprises, and especially in the standardization sector. We think that they have a very useful contribution to make.

Hence, in this Assembly, we propose that we think about the possibility of setting up a kind of trial period for SMEs on commissions and in Study Groups of the ITU.

We would ask that we look at the other possibilities that we would have here. We would ask the Director of the TSB to, on the basis of the advice of the Council, that in terms of which studies, which Study Groups, the SMEs should be able to participate in for a limited period of time, so that we can see the information they bring forth to see if it's advisable to see if their participation is of interest both to them and to the ITU.

And limiting ourselves to the Council since they will have to consider this process that the ITU present a report on this to the next Plenipotentiary Conference. This is just a trial period. Let me emphasize that, to see whether or not there are SMEs that are interested in participating in the ITU's work, and in this sector in particular, and to see whether this will give us additional tools and to see with the Council whether it might be worthwhile to have their participation during the next PP. We are all talking about with other specialized offices, for example, the legal department to see what kind of measures will have to be taken to be able to do this, and we are fully willing to help them do that.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Argentina on behalf of CITELE.

Now I'd like to open the floor for comments, suggestions and opinion in this regard. I'd like to give the floor to Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Thank you very much, Chair. I would like to congratulate you for Chairing this working party group. I have a clarification question. Can we use this terminology SME, has this been used in previous reports? And have Member States of the ITU asked for the use of this terminology, and have, will nonmembers have the opportunity to participate in these meetings?

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jordan. I would like that Argentina present their comments after all the positions of the floor. Now we have United States, please, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We believe that introducing new categories of the membership is beyond the scope of WTSA. This is a matter that can only be considered at the Plenipotentiary Conference or Council, after suitable consideration of the impacts on participation in budget. The associate category of membership has been very successful in enabling participation of many smaller companies, for example, component manufacturers, now participate directly in the work of the relevant Study Groups as

associates.

The final contribution for associates is modest compared with many other industry groups, for example, comparable to that of the optical Internet working forum and about half that of ME F or Ethernet alliance. The qualification criteria to participate as a small or medium size enterprise are not clear. In deciding whether to participate as a Sector Member or as an associate, the application for membership makes the decision as to the amount of financial contribution as compared to the amount of work in the sector they wish to participate in. For small or medium size enterprises, there would presumably be some qualification criteria that TSB needs to evaluate to determine whether a applicant for membership qualifies for the new category of membership with a lower financial contribution and would need to periodically re-evaluate whether an enterprise still qualifies as the business grows.

Since smaller enterprises are privately held rather than publicly traded, information on number of employees or revenues may not be publicly available and judgment may be based on a assertion of the applicant for membership, rather than independently verifiable information. There may be a negative impact on revenue if smaller

enterprises who currently participate as Sector Members or associates elect to change to a new category of membership with a reduced financial contribution.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. I would ask Russia for the floor, please. Then I go back to Argentina to clarify some of the positions.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair. We would also like to thank Argentina for this interesting document. We have, we are aware of this in the region, the main parts of it. We also have some questions which we would like to express. We are concerned about terminology. SMEs, we would like to know where we can define this, what it's going to refer to, who is going to fall into this category.

We also are interested to know about the scale of contributions. Will this be considered or not? In the document we also talk about the test period. We would like to know what is set out for in this test period, will be it paid, will we have to pay for it? Or it will be free for participants? Also, I'd like to share some thoughts as regards the spirit of SMEs, as we know this is a category that is more spread in developing countries, in telecommunications, that is, than in developing

countries.

Probably in developing countries, there are successful enterprises, yes, but not as many as in developed countries. Therefore, we would like to point this out. What use will this be for developing countries. If it will have an effect for already developed countries, then we will also look at how fair the contributions will be.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russia. Argentina, you have the floor.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair, for giving me the floor again. Okay, let me see if I can clarify and allay some of the concerns expressed by some of the other Member States.

I hope I will, have fully understood all of the concerns. If I haven't, please correct me.

Now, concerning the definition of SMEs, well, we would use the usual definition of the organisation here. There is a platform that addresses this. This is what we refer to in the document. There is, of course, we can have a footnote that, here, that identifies what we would include under the category SMEs. This is footnote 1 on page 2. We would like to point out that

in this proposal, we are not talking about a new category.

We are not talking about establishing a new category for SMEs. We just want to acknowledge their existence, and have a pilot project that allows to evaluate whether or not these enterprises would have a contribution to make to ITU.

The question concerning SMEs in developing countries is that, well, indeed in developing countries, the majority of companies are SMEs, in Argentina in particular we have got many criteria to identify them. There are also international criteria that can be used established by the IMF, or OECD.

So in Argentina, over 80 percent of the enterprises here are SMEs. The larger ones being a very small minority and there are in fact branches of multi nationals, and I'm sure this is the situation for most of Latin America and most of the developing world. Hence, the interest we think that this would represent in having this sector of industry participate in these standardization efforts of ITU, I hope this answers the questions. But we stipulate that they would, Council would have the final word on this, and that we are just asking for this trial period or this probationary period, where they could participate in the work of standardization, and where

we would be able to see how well they would be able to use the tools here. We will be able to then judge whether or not they were benefiting ITU with their contributions and vice versa.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Argentina for your clarifications, but I think there are still on the floor some questions and some need to clarify all the aspects of your proposed resolution. I would kindly ask you to join Jordan, United States, Russia after this meeting and try to clarify your positions, and try to rephrase some paragraphs, try to make a new proposal, resolution, together with your colleagues, so that we can have tomorrow morning, we have a meeting at 11 :15 tomorrow morning, I would like to have in our next session a final proposal for this resolution.

Otherwise, we will have to propose alternatives for the addition. Is it okay, can we proceed this way? Thank you.

We still have some requests for the floor. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair. Apologies. We heard a question that we would like to have a response to, it was whether the participation

is paid or is it free participation. Thank you very much. Because if you have to pay for it, well, the issue of there is financial consequences, and then we should have a wider discussion on these financial consequences. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Well, thank you very much. I think that in the spirit of the resolution will be that there would be no payment for the participation of SMEs. But again, I would like you, all interested parties that are interested in this resolution that could join in a meeting with Argentina, so that all those questions can be further clarified, and then you come back tomorrow for a final position. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. Congratulations to you on your appointment as Chair of this Working Group.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking as the Vice-Chair of CITELE's Working Group in preparation for the WTSA. This is simply to invite all CITELE colleagues to participate in our daily meetings at the amphitheater Caesar between 1 and 2:00 p.m. where we can certainly raise any issues on any IAPs or concerns that other administrations from other regional telecommunication organisations may have to that effect. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. So I have to close

this debate. Please join Argentina in this informal, for these informal consultation so that we can have this, all those questions clarified, and then we can meet tomorrow for a final settling maybe, final decision.

Any other requests for the floor on this subject?

Okay, thank you. Now I'd like to move to resolution 44 on bridging the standardization gap.

Is the point, is the item 6 of our agenda, on resolution 44, on bridging standardization gap, we have five proposals from APT and IAP, EF CP, ARB and RCC.

I'd like to give the floor to the contributors in the following order, Africa proposal, Arab proposal, Asia Pacific proposal, the Americas proposal and RCC proposal. I would like to make a request that speakers limit their interventions to three minutes each. This is a long resolution. Please do not read any modifications you may have proposed, but rather emphasize the key points and rationale behind the modifications you have proposed, or any comments that you have.

So given the time constraints we have, I propose that after all contributions are presented, I will open the floor on some of the main issues that have been raised by the contributors. And then see how much progress we make before moving on to any drafting.

I hope the meeting is okay with this way of proceeding. So I would like to ask the African representative to present AFCP42 addendum 21. Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Allow me first to congratulate you for Chairing this Committee. We are sure that you will lead it in a proper way and an excellent way. Now I'm going to present document number C42 addendum 21 of the African Group, which is a proposed modification on resolution 44 on bridging the standardization gap between developing and developed countries.

Aiming to achieve the desired goals of bridging the standardization gap and to enhance the participation and effective involvement of developing countries in the standardization activities in the ITU, also to study as a possibility of generating additional revenue for the ITU-T to support such activities. Drawing the attention of the importance of the use of the six official languages on an equal footing, will contribute in bringing the standardization gap and interpretation in meetings is essential to help all delegates especially those from developing countries to be fully aware and engage on standardization decisions. We should be aware that the developing countries are still encountering

difficulties in ensuring their effective participation in the work of the ITU-T, especially the budgetary limitations, thus the actual participation by developing countries is hugely limited to the final approval and implementation stages, rather than in the preparation of proposals prepared in the various Working Groups.

Resolving to study the possibility of generating additional revenues for the ITU-T, and that the interpretations that shall be provided based on the requests of participants, at the opening plenary of the Study Groups, closing plenary of Working Parties, and closing plenary of Study Groups and the whole meeting of the TSAG.

And that ITU regional offices provide the necessary assistance to the regional groups of the ITU-T Study Groups, and close the work with the ITU members in the region in order to mobilize them to participate in the ITU standardization activities, prepare and submit a mobilization programme for the regions that they present at the first meeting of TSAG or Study Group and send a report to TSAG. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt, on behalf of Africa countries. I would like now to call the Arab region to present 43, document 43 addendum 3. Thank you, Saudi

Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you very much, Chair. And congratulations for Chairing our session. We wish you every success in this responsibility. On behalf of the Arab countries, I'm honored to present to you addendum 3 to document 43. This document concerns the reduction or the bridging the standardization gap between developing and developed countries. This proposal takes into account the update of decisions from the plenipotentiary conference of 2014. One of the most important elements that explains this gap, the standardization gap that is, is the effective participation in the preparatory work for decisions made in terms of standardization.

One of the hindrances is the absence of interpretation in regional meetings which we think is important in terms of international standard setting.

With this as our starting point, the meetings that are held on a regional and international level, and particularly preparatory meetings which have an impact on Study Groups and Working Parties, we know that interpretation is an essential element to have all delegates, particularly delegates from developing countries, it helps them to be well-informed as regards

the different preparation phases for standardization.

It allows them to participate in decision-making, knowing the whole issue.

President, Chair, we have stated that participation from developing countries is limited to the adoption phase of standards. This can be explained by the fact that the previous stages don't have interpretation provided and this therefore limits the effective participation in the preparation of these standardization proposals that are then adopted at the final stage.

It is in this context that the Arab countries are making a proposal to modify resolution 44, and to ask for simultaneous interpretation to be provided at all preparatory meetings, and not only at the plenary and final meetings.

Chair, delegates, this proposal that you find set out in document 43 addendum 3 is in line with proposals that have been made for the 2016-2019 plan. This calls for the reduction of the bridging of this standardization gap between developing and developed countries. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Saudi Arabia. I'd like to, document 44 addendum 17 from APT be presented

now. Representative from APT, you have the floor, please.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, colleagues. On behalf of APT I would like to present the proposal to revise the resolution 44 bridging the standardization gap between developed and developing countries. It is in the document C44 addendum 17.

As we may know the WTSA 12 revise and strengthened the resolution 44 regarding bridging standardization gap. This includes the 30 action items to implement for reducing the gap. Over the recent years, ITU-T has implemented various programmes and action from the resolution 44.

However, there are still some difficulties for the developing countries on how to utilize or apply ITU standards for their countries. ITU developed the guidelines on establishment of the national standardization Secretariat for ITU-T, and that really helped some developing countries in setting up their national standardization Secretariat.

In moving forward, the guidelines on how to adopt the ITU recommendation at the national level would be useful also. Regarding the issue of applying ITU-T recommendation, it will be very helpful that each Study

Group could develop the implementation guidelines for the new ITU-T recommendations. And by the BSG original standardization forum these guidelines should be developed, delivered and presented to ensure that those documents can be reached by the new participants.

Last but not least, the BSG is an issue that requires the close coordination and collaboration between all three sectors of the ITU. It is therefore critical that the three ITU sectors work together towards to achieve this objective of BSG. We propose resolution 44, we add editorial change to make the preamble of the resolution more concise. With this I submit the document for your consideration. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much on behalf of Asia Pacific countries. I would like now to ask representative of CITEEL to present IAP document number 46, addendum 16. Argentina, you have the floor.

>> ARGENTINA: Yes, thank you, Chair. First of all, congratulations on being appointed to the Chairmanship here, and CITEEL and Argentina in particular wishes you all full success.

On behalf of CITEEL we would like to introduce the proposed modification of resolution 44, which is an updating of the resolution which were adopted or approved

rather in Dubai and in the last PP in Busan.

We could cite 166, 169. These resolutions have to do with the participation of academic institutions and of developing countries And the three sectors of the union. We propose that we develop mechanisms to ensure the effective participation of Telecom operators in developing countries, in developing standardization, and in fostering awareness of the benefits of participation in those countries, participation of the countries. It is important to point out this proposal is linked to our proposal on resolution 59 which we will be introducing a bit later.

Lastly, a few changes have been made to the plan to resolution, implementation of resolution 123 on these, strengthening mechanisms for allowing participation of developing countries in the work.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, CITELE. May I ask a representative from RCC to present document 47 addendum 21, please, RCC.

>> Thank you, Chair. We have a proposal which is in two parts. The first is the formal one, where we propose to add references to resolutions from the plenipotentiary conference. The second part is specific proposal as regards, under decides, where we propose

to add the following. Cooperation with developing countries for creating international and national testing laboratories, including for testing for compatibility into working and identification.

First of all, for the Internet of Things, and its application, what, well, in 2014, in St. Petersburg our organisation held a meeting Kaleidoscope 2014 with more than 40 countries participating. We already have a lab for IoT testing and everyone liked it. So we would like to share our experience. As in terms of the resolution 123, we set out carrying out consultation and assistance like I have just mentioned. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Well, we have finished all the presentations. Having looked at the various proposals, we have work to be done. But I don't see many significant areas of diversion which is the good news for us.

We have posted the working document to display the changes which provides you with a column view of the five proposals. You can see this document which is contained in the working, as a working document number 1.

Yes, okay. This will be a reference document, just

for reference. We had to post in .pdf as we tried to group the session by section, to show you each section in one area. With the .pdf it helps documents look the same regardless of margin settings.

This is a long resolution. There is a lot of text in it. So we will be focusing first on the operative sections of the resolution, so resolves, invites, and instructs.

In these sections, I have observed a number of key issues which I think we should now try to examine. Please note that the idea here is to resolve issues more generally, rather than doing a paragraph by paragraph analysis of what is a very long document.

I will then work to come up with a document that reflects the outcomes of this exercise we are doing here, and expect to come with a document for you tomorrow.

So I would like now first to open the floor to discuss test laboratories. The first issue is addition of text by RCC in 3, on assist developing countries in establishing national/international test laboratories including systems for testing into working telecommunication and identification, especially for the Internet of Things and its enablers.

As I think this is a correlation in our text, I

would like to hear your comments, the comments from the floor, so that we can gather all your views in this regard, only in this aspect, please. I would like to listen to the floor in this regard. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We thank the RCC for their proposed modifications to resolution 44.

We do have some comments and concerns relating to this particular proposed modification in this section. It's not clear to us what expertise the standardization Bureau has in establishing national and international test laboratories, including systems for testing interworking, intercommunication and identification.

Additionally we would like to note that work relating to the establishment of test specifications is already under way as part of Study Group 11 activities. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any other comments? Jordan, please.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chair. We really support this resolution, because when we talk about this kind of lab, we are talking about something that is have useful, very necessary. Everyone knows that the ITU through the BDT

has participated in setting up several centers, for example, in harmonization, and so on. The idea is to make sure that we are abreast of new evolutions, new developments here. That is to be expected.

So we are invited to, the organisation is invited to cooperate in this demand and we reiterate our support for this proposal.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jordan. I pass the floor to Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Egypt also seconds what have been raised by Jordan, and we think that there is a very direct relationship between Internet of Things and its potential applications, and creating development, actually sustainable development.

In that regard, developing a laboratory for testing interoperability aspects or interworking aspects and identification aspects for IoT, we think it's important. We could go add to the proposed text for the Internet of Things and its applications possibly. But we will leave that to the detailed discussion afterwards, but in principle we support it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your comments, Egypt. I pass the floor to Japan. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. Thank you for the RCC for this interesting proposal. We would like to ask to clarify what is the meaning of assist. What kind of assistance is expected for the TSB. That is our, we would like to clarify this. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Okay, so thank you very much. I would like to maybe ask representative from RCC if he wishes to explain some of the questions to clarify some of the questions that our colleagues have just posted.

>> Yes, thank you very much. If we look at the action plan for fulfilling resolution 123, then we can see that the first thing written is providing consultations, unlike laboratories that we created previously for next generation networks, when they were needed, and we needed a lot of expenditure on equipment, in the Internet of Things the main aspect is experience, because the costs are low as regards the models themselves.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russia, for responding to the questions. Thank you all for putting on your questions and suggestions to this text. I would like now since we don't have more time to discuss this question, I'll have to move to another one. The second that can be a core issue in this resolution is additional

revenue. The next proposed addition is by Africa and Arab together that follows on the resolves 6, 7. To study the possibility of generating additional revenue for ITU-T through identifying new financial resources not related to the voluntary contributory units mentioned above. Since this is a new proposal, I'd like to listen to the floor if there is any comment regarding this aspect of the proposal coming from Africa and Arabic countries. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Canada needs clarification on this particular proposal. It is unclear for us how there is no financial resource can be raised, maybe the contributor can raise, shed some light into this, what they expect in terms of new financial resources, how they would be raised. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Any other question, proposal from the floor? If there is none, I would like to ask the representative -- yes, sorry, Germany.

>> GERMANY: Thank you very much for giving us the floor, I will be very brief. Who is going to study this particular possibility of generating additional revenue? It's not clear for me who is going to study this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. Russian Federation,

please, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair. On behalf of the Russian Federation, and our region, we would like to express serious support to the proposal set out by African and Arab States, as regards searching for new sources of revenue, this has been many, considered many times both at the Council and in Working Groups of the Council on financial and economic resources.

It has been studied for quite a while, and all Member States support this area of activity. In our view, why the question, why is the question of finance so important for bridging the standardization gap? Well, because only with a stable budget and the means for carrying out our work can we achieve progress in drawing up recommendations. I thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russia, for your comments on that. It was quite clear. Bahrain, you have the floor.

>> Thank you very much, Chair.

Since this is the first time I have taken the floor, let me express my congratulations to you for being chosen for your position. You have all of the necessary qualities. We support this proposal concerning this assistance in the field of standardization. The idea

is to ask the standardization sector to study possibilities of obtaining additional revenue. The proposal is very clear, and as a representative of Bahrain we would like to express our support.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So I think I'll have two more comments, and I will have to close the list, because I think, yeah, I have five more additional items to discuss. We need to be brief and very fast in this regard. I'd like to close this discussion today. So Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Ghana are the last to speak. And I'll have to close the list.

>> Thank you very much, Chair. Since we have very little time to deal with this issue, let me be brief. The additional revenue for the standardization sector, the obtaining for funds in ITU in general are subjects that have been discussed by the Council, as you know. We have tasked the Secretary-General of ITU to kindly study this issue, and come up with a survey of additional revenue sources. In terms of standardization, we would ask that the Secretariat participate in that effort in order to obtain the new revenue sources for the ITU and the standardization sector.

This is something that's already being undertaken.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Now we have Jordan.

Ghana is the last one.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chair. Again briefly we wish to express our support for this proposal, we support what has been said by Jordan and Saudi Arabia. We agree with them. Each ITU sector knows, are in the best position to know how to obtain additional revenue sources, so carrying out the study will allow us to bring an answer to that question. This is an issue that was brought up by Member States, and the text is clear here. We need to run a survey of these possible sources of financing.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for comments. Ghana, you have the floor.

>> GHANA: Thank you, Chairman, for the opportunity. I think I'm just reading what text has been provided in this text, as a matter of fact it is actually in addition to an existing resolution, and the text is saying that the schedule of possible, possibility of generating additional revenue. In a resolution document like this I don't think we have to put details as to how the possibility of generating additional revenue will have to be in the resolution. It is during the implementation stage that we can actually figure out how the possibility of generating additional revenue could be figured out.

So I believe that text is well placed and we have

to support it as it is and thank you very much,
Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Ghana. Canada is
the last speaker, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. Very very briefly,
and it is a follow-up to intervention of Saudi Arabia,
this is a, correct that this is a matter being of course
addressed by Council and in particularly the issue of
revenue within the remit of the Council's Working Group
on finance and human resources.

To that effect, of course, any contributions towards
the issue of raising additional revenue for the union
should be in consultation and coordination among the
three sectors and bring all this information and
positions to the attention of the respective Working
Group of Council. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you all for your comments. They
will be valuable for our exercise. I would like now move
to the third item that I have identified, which is the
role of chairs and Vice-Chairs from developing countries.
This text is a proposal from APT on resolves that ITU-T
Chairman and Vice-Chairmen from developing countries
have responsibility to inform ITU members of ITU-D
programmes and initiatives that could bridge the

standardization gap. I'd like to ask the floor if this is okay for you. I think the rest of responsibilities from Chairs from developing countries has been kept intact in the proposals. Either in their original place or move it somewhere else in the document. I would like to listen to the floor your opinions on this proposal in respect to the roles of Chairman and Vice-Chairmen from developing countries. No comments, I move on.

Add interpretation shall be provided based on the requests of participants at the opening plenary of the Study Groups, closing plenary of Working Parties, closing plenary of Study Groups and whole meeting of TSAG. Do I have comments from the floor on this principle. This is a core issue in our document. I'd like to listen from the floor, comments regarding interpretation. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you very much, Chair. Very briefly, very quickly, to clarify things here, linguistic communication can be a barrier, preventing developing countries from participating in all standardization meetings. So we feel that each session of each meeting should be able to make this decision. It is during these meetings themselves that we should decide whether there should be interpretation, if interpreters are available.

That would give us a lot of flexibility, and this would, I think, help encourage participants to participate more fully. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your comments. Now we have Germany. Germany, you have the floor.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Acknowledging the importance of the ability to speak to each other and in particular to understand what is presented, the question is, we have to be very cautious with regard to any proposal that will potentially increase expenses. Why? Because the financial plan is already the platform at least fixed until 1990 so for almost the whole period of next four years of the standardization sector's work and the budget at the moment is already approved until 2017.

So we understand this request here. We are not against, but at least be reminded that the financial consequences of such an exercise may have, may lead to some difficulties to actually implement it during the next four years. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Egypt, you have the floor for comments.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chair. Sir, the fact is that during the preceding study period, we noticed that there

were many challenges to be faced, challenges, problems that we faced within the Study Groups themselves.

These really arose for nonEnglish speaking countries, countries that don't have English as a native language. And therefore, cannot fully understand what is going on.

We saw that there were several attempts that we decided to undertake standardization work. We saw that there were difficulties to go into the detail, the technical aspects, and the reasons for the work that was requested, in most cases, during technical discussions we ran into problems, even with an excellent presentation, even when we have content which is very good, we are not able to understand everything, because there is indeed a message that has to get across to everyone. There are some requests that were accepted, others were refused. And in order to improve our work to be more efficient, and more efficacious, I think we need to improve the situation in this respect.

We need interpretation, in all of the major meetings to facilitate communication and get the message across clearly to all.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Egypt. Next speaker is Russian Federation. You have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair. Delegates, we support the proposal as regards resolution 44 linked to interpretation, because we consider that for the ITU as a whole, this question has been solved, and is not up for discussion.

We have agreed a long time ago that we have interpretation at the, in the six official languages. This proposal is aimed at highlighting the importance of this aspect. The language barriers can hinder these idea of bridging the standardization gap, and also this proposal is focused on reducing perhaps accidental issues with translation into the six official languages. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your comments. We have very, we have to close the debate very soon, but we still have another speaker, which is Bahrain. I think you will be the last one, please. You have the floor.

>> Bahrain: Thank you very much. Very quickly, I was going to speak about interpretation. For us it's crucial to have good interpretation in all languages in order to achieve the expected results for Study Groups. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Well, thank you very much for your comments.

Unfortunately, we don't have more time for further discussion on this issue regarding interpretation. I note, and I know that this is a very important issue for the membership. But we do really have to close debate in this regard. We have three more issues to discuss in this meeting. I'd like to ask kindly the interpreters to give at least more ten minutes so that we can at least finish our agenda for today.

>> Yes, granted, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So please I would like to move to the next item, which is remote participation, and, okay, thank you for this list. Yes. Next there is a proposal from APT relating to the need for remote participation for more ITU-T events. Remote participation of ITU-T events, remote participation, it's very well and long discussion that we have in ITU, so I would like to listen from the floor any comments you may have in this regard.

Okay. Thank you. No comments. The next one, and this is the 6th is the reference to ITU-D global innovation platform. There is also a proposal from APT to add reference to the ITU-D global innovation platform, and that ITU-T should leverage this existing platform. Any comments or maybe comments from APT to clarify even more

the proposal? Maybe you can have this shown on the screen, please. Yes, okay, thank you. Any comments from the floor in this regard? I'll give you some seconds to read it.

If there are no comments, okay, no comments. Okay. So I'll now proceed to the 7th item, which is the additions relating to suppression of resolution 59 from the United States.

The next proposal is related to the suppression of this resolution, the 59, so I would like now to ask for the presentation of IAP proposal 46 addendum 29. Can I ask the -- yes, okay, United States, please. You have the floor.

>>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to clarify that this is a CITELE proposal. Good afternoon, colleagues. On behalf of CITELE I would like to introduce document 46, addendum 29 which proposes to suppress resolution 59. As my colleague from Argentina mentioned previously, when introducing the proposal on resolution 44, this current proposal to suppress resolution 59 is related to CITELE document 46 addendum 16.

And that proposal moves the relevant operative language of resolution 59 into resolution 44 on bridging

standardization gap.

As my, as our proposal indicates, we are simply moving that language into 44, there is one, only one word has changed. You will note that the word, support, has been changed to encourage. Otherwise, the language has been moved verbatim.

The purpose of this modification to 44 is that the operative language in resolution 59 seems to be appropriate and more appropriate in resolution 44, because those activities are a vital component of broader efforts by ITU-T to bridge the standardization gap between developing and developed countries by including activities relating to enhanced participation by telecommunication operators.

Based on that modification to resolution 44, this proposal then seeks to suppress resolution 59 in accordance with the Director's goal of reducing the number and length of WTSA resolutions.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, and sorry for my mistake. It is a contribution from CITELE members, not from the United States.

I would like to open the floor for comments. Can we have the screen shown? Can we have the documents put

on the screen, please? Yes, thank you.

So I'd like now to open the floor in this regard, the suppression of resolution 59, and the opinion of the Chair it's always good when we try to absorb the operative session of a resolution in other resolutions. I think it's quite appropriate and it fits very well in 44. But since there is a new word I would like you to comment if there is any opinion regarding suppression of 59 and including the ideas on resolution 44.

Russian Federation, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair. We would like to understand what we would win in suppressing resolution 59. In the context of removing this resolution, why do we have this proposal? Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you very much, Chair. Resolution 59 is a resolution that deals with participation of operators from developing countries, undeveloped countries as well.

So, the aim is to draw attention to the existence of resolution 59. I don't know why we are asking then to suppress this resolution 59, and we would like to have some details as reducing the, while bridging the

standardization gap, is the main aim to reduce the number of resolutions from the Assembly, when as this resolution attracts operators who come and finance the activities of ITU. So let's keep the document as it is.

>> CHAIR: Comments from Egypt, you have the floor. And then Senegal.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We support also the opinion raised by Jordan. The aim of resolution 44 mainly is to bridge, to develop means to bridge the standardization gap. It is not clear to us how suppressing 59 and putting in there, we think there might be some sort of relationship, but we would prefer to keep it as a separate resolution, because it does not directly reflect or map to issues related to bridging the standardization gap. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Senegal, you have the floor.

>> SENEGAL: Thank you very much, Chair. It was just to speak in the same direction as Egypt and Jordan. What we have seen during our exchanges, there are many problems faced by developing countries. And we think that any text or resolution that is in detail that allows us to improve the involvement of developing countries in all sectors, from all sectors rather, whether they be

administrations or operators, they may be welcome, such allows us to better deal with the problems faced by developing countries.

So we believe that the resolution should be left as it is, and not subsumed into another one.

>> CHAIR: So, thank you very much, all colleagues, for your comments regarding the proposal of suppression of resolution 59.

Well, now I would like to move to the resolution itself, and to the, actually to the action plan of the resolution. But before going to the action plan, I think that we need more time to discuss on this suppression of 59, and see if the exercise of revising 44 will be still space for incorporating suppression, the operative parts of 59 into 44. If there is no space for that, then we would have to keep 59 as it is original. But this is the discussion that we will have to defer for a moment.

In order to move to the action plan, I suggest we look at the column document, as there are few changes proposed. As you can see on the screen, many of our proposals for cleaning up the language, come in mainly from IAP. But there is one important substantive proposed change which is the programme 2 from RCC regarding the establishment of national and

international test labs, and we are still discussing the issue.

Finally, there is a proposed change from Africa and Arab countries to provide guidance and so on, material for developing countries to assist them in developing and providing the graduate and postgraduate courses at universities -- well, actually, those are the main substantive issues that we have in this action plans, in terms of a problem as you can see in the resolution.

Colleagues, well, now that we have sorted out these key issues, I will sit down and come up with a Chair proposals for revised resolution for your consideration based on today's discussions. And we had, I think that we had a very good discussion on what I think are the core issues on resolution 44. I would like to ask you your indulgence and trust so that I can provide you tomorrow Chair's proposal. It will be I think shortly posted as a working document. And then we can discuss further in our next meeting which will be tomorrow.

Well, before we end this session, I have some announcement to make. This is regarding the anniversary, 60th anniversary gala reception we have today at the hotel Loryal, we leave Medina at Alibaba entrance at 7:15.

So we will have a gala reception today, tonight,
at hotel Royal and the buses will leave Medina at Alibaba
entrance at 7:15.

So thank you very much, everyone, this meeting is
adjourned. See you tomorrow. Have a good night.

(meeting adjourned).

>> Ladies and gentlemen, please don't go away. We
have now our session on artificial intelligence.

(session adjourned at 1737)

Services Provided By:

Caption First, Inc.

P.O. Box 3066

Monument, CO 80132

800-825-5234

www.captionfirst.com

This text is being provided in a realtime format.
Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or
captioning are provided in order to facilitate
communication accessibility and may not be a totally
verbatim record of the proceedings.
