Raw file.

October 28, 2016.

1430.

ITU.

World Telecommunication Standardization Assembly.

Hammamet, Tunisia.

   (standing by).

   (standing by).

   >> CHAIR: Good afternoon, everyone. We are a bit

late. Welcome back to this third 4B session. Thank you

all for joining us. First I must make the usual reminder

on how to use the microphone. If you wish to take the

floor, press the button once. If you wish to withdraw

your request for the floor, press it again.

     Our agenda is posted as ADM 20. There you can see

the items of our day. You see approval of the agenda,

the report, a note, results of resolution 44, and then

we will start 54 today and maybe have decisions also on 75.

Can we have this agenda approved? Any comments on the agenda? I see none. Thank you. Our next item is number 3 of the agenda, which is the approval of the report of previous meeting. You see this in the DT18, DT/18R2 revision 2.

We will update this document with the report of each meeting so that we can all, so that we can find all the reports easily in only one place. We publish revision 1 to reflect the comments of the, for the commission, for the Chairman of the commission 2, and you will see that the note from the Chair of Committee 2 in this regard is also on our agenda.

Since then we published revision 2 with the report of yesterday's 4B session. Let's open DT18 so that everyone can see the revision 2. I'm opening mine as well.

Can we have the report approved? If you don't have comments, okay, thank you, so it's approved.

Okay, thank you very much. We now move to resolution 44. After this meeting, we only have one meeting scheduled, which will be on Tuesday, formally scheduled. In the interest of time, I would like to make an appeal,

an appeal to you to keep your intervention as brief as possible, please. I would like to thank you for your brief intervention at the last meetings. And congratulate you all for reaching consensus on three resolutions that we discussed. Now I'd like to draw your attention to the note by the Chairman of Committee 2 which is in our agenda, in the report, so that we can start on resolution 44.

So the revised resolution 44 we agreed was posted as the DT39. It's here on the screen. We will submit it to com 4 for approval and forwarding to the Editorial Committee to the com 5. We will also inform regarding any financial implications that will resolution may have.

I'd like you to have a quick look, and final look, on resolution 44, which is on DT39, please. We had the last interventions made this morning, so with the last contributions this morning, we could finally publish this DT. Okay.

Any comments? I see none. So resolution 44 is approved as DT39.

(sound of gavel).

Thank you all.

Now we are on resolution 54, regional groups, resolution 54 covers the creation and assistance to

regional groups of ITU-T regional groups. We have a number of contributions received on this resolution, four contributions in fact. I would like to give the floor to the countries in the following order, RCC document, USA, Zambia, and Africa common proposal. Given the lack of time I've allocated to us, I'd like to make a request to limit interventions to three minutes each as we have already of course read the documents before coming to the Assembly. 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 you may have. After the presentations, rather than discussing these one by one, what I propose is that after all contributions are presented, I will reopen the floor on some of the main issues that have been raised by the contributors, as we did in the previous, with the previous documents.

    If we still have time maybe we can work on some text here, but I hope we can do that. I hope the meeting is okay with the way we are proceeding. Okay. Thank you.

    I would like to invite so the presentation of the contributions in the following order, RCC, USA and Zambia, let's start with RCC. RCC, please, you have the floor.

Please, as RCC's document, RCC/47 addendum 8. Please, you have the floor.

>> Thank you, Chair. Could we possibly ask you to postpone our presentation for about five minutes? Our expert is rushing towards us from another meeting as we speak. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. No problem. Then we go to the second presentation, United States, document 48 addendum 14. Please, U.S., you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Chair. Good afternoon, friends.

In this contribution the United States proposes edits to resolution 54 entitled creation of and assistance to regional groups. The purpose of these edits is to remind all of us of the importance of ensuring that the work of ITU groups is consistent with the mandates of the ITU, the ITU sectors, and for regional Study Groups, the parent Study Groups.

We also emphasize the importance of avoiding duplication of work among ITU Study Groups, sectors or other organisations. The United States also proposes edits that would invite all ITU members to participate in regional group of ITU-T Study Group meetings.

This would give all ITU members the opportunity

to assist developing countries, would implement section 233 of resolution 1, and will contribute to the meaningful participation in the work of ITU-T by developing countries. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States, also for this brief presentation of your document. I'd like now to pass the word to the, the floor to Zambia, Zambia's document 57.

>> Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Good afternoon to you all. This contribution provides comments on document 47, addendum 8 as well as document 48 addendum 14 which are both on the proposed modification of resolution 54, creation of and assistance to regional groups.

It concludes by proposing that no changes are made to resolution 54, with specific regard and particular emphasis on the following two modifications. Under resolves point number 1 of the proposed modified text of resolution 54, which is contained in document 47 ad 8 and calls for the consolidation of regional groups created individually into single unified regional groups of the ITU-T standardization sector, and under resolves point number 3 of the proposed modified text of resolution 54 which is contained in document 48, addendum 14, and

calls for the invitation of all Member States and T Sector Members to participate in all regional groups of ITU-T Study Group meetings.

It is our considered view that these two modifications go against the initial spirit of resolution 54 as regional groups are established with a view to ensuring that the distinctive needs and concerns of a particular region are taken into account from the perspective of, from the specific perspective of Member States of that region.

These views are then presented to the parent Study Group where all Member States and T Sector Members are present. Further consolidating the regional groups under ITU-T Study Groups into single unified regional groups would inadvertently create not only a administrative burden in terms of scheduling meetings and mobilizing all the relevant ITU personnel and delegates across such a wide spectrum of expertise but would also result in certain groups being overshadowed by the more active and prominent groups. The contribution further highlights the diverse and widespread mandates of the Study Groups as well as differing levels of maturity and activity of the regional groups under ITU-T, as some of the additional points

in opposition to the proposed modifications. In conclusion we propose that no changes are made to resolution 54, in respect of the two modifications proposed in the respective documents mentioned. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Zambia. I would now like to ask if RCC is ready to present its document.

>> Yes, Chair. Thank you very much for your indulgence. We apologize for the delay. There are many ad hoc meetings going on. We suggest drawing your attention to the proposal to amend resolution 54, having considered the activity of the regional groups, we noted in such activity significant and important results achieved by these groups, in the completed study period.

So we propose norms aimed at strengthening cooperation with regional organisations. Our proposals also concern strengthening interaction between regional groups and organisations with the different sectors of ITU which are manifest in looking at the possibility of regional groups meeting together with the standardization meetings of the regional organisations and also other events and meetings which could be held together with and outside the ITU.

We also note issues related to resource deficits,

both financial resources and expertise in the regions, are sometimes short at hand, and therefore our proposals are mainly aimed at strengthening cooperation and integration with regional organisations. We are generally not suggesting any merger between groups. Our suggestions are focused mainly on strengthening cooperation between regional organisations and with them. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, RCC. Our next document is African common proposal, 42 addendum 26. May I have the delegate from Africa, Burundi, you have the floor.

>> Good afternoon, everybody, on behalf of the Africa Group, I have the pleasure of presenting to you 42/26, addendum proposed modification to resolution 54, creation of and assistance to regional groups. For the African Group we consider that these groups are very important. The considering part refers us to part 14 of the constitution, with references to the constitution supporting regional conferences being held with regional organisations, building connections with regional organisations, and encouraging the growth of these regional groups.

We also consider that regional groups have been very important in the past, because they have helped

resolve and pose specific regional questions. There are clear examples of this. In the past we have worked closely with some of these groups, when such regional groups are created, there is a benefit in terms of efficacy for the ITU. We receive more proposals due to broader and deeper cooperation with the regional groups.

So we propose encouraging more participation by Member States and associated members, as well as strengthening such cooperation with regional groups. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Burundi for your presentation. I can see Japan in my list. I would ask Japan if it is any kind of point of order. Is this a point of order, Japan?

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Japan thinks this resolution is quite important.

>> CHAIR: Sorry, sir. I'm asking if it's a point of order. If it's not a point of order --

>> JAPAN: Sorry.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you very much for this presentations and your cooperation in limiting the time of your interventions. It was really quite fast. Well, taking bird's-eye view I believe if I were to try to summarize or highlight a number of key issues that we

have on the table, I would say that two in particular lie at the core of these proposals. I'd like to start with these two exactly the same way that we did in our previous documents. Then move on to some other issues that stand out.

I would like to do this before we move on to looking at the specifics on the text. These two core issues are, one, merging all regional groups into a unified regional group. The RCC region and the document 47A8 addendum 8 proposes to merge all regional groups of the Study Groups into a unified regional group per region. As I understand, this would mean that a single regional group would exist per region.

By this all current regional groups, all current regional groups there would be a conversion of those groups, all regional groups into only one unified ITU-T regional groups. The second issue, the core issue of our discussion maybe would be the participation in regional groups of all members, also from outside the region.

The second core issue, you will see in the document from the United States, proposing to add a provision to the resolves section that says, in the view of assisting developing countries all Member States in T Sector

Members shall be invited to participate in all regional groups. It further proposes to add a new section which also invites all members in general to participate in all meetings of regional groups of ITU-T.

And these in order to maximize the ability of our members to assist developing countries, that I think those are the main ideas of the proposal.

There are also a few other proposed modifications that have received some expressions of concern, in my opinion, that may rise some concerns, which is, and we have to deal with it I think, and it would be the WTO reference. Another one would be the reference to the mandate of ITU-T. Another one will be the reference to available resources, and another one maybe the addition of regional bodies and their relationship to ITU-T regional groups, which may need to be clarified.

Ladies and gentlemen, let's start with the first two core issues, and then we will treat the other issues directly in the text maybe, if we still have time. Regarding conversion of the current regional groups, that now operate by Study Group such as SG 3, SG 5 and so on, into unified regional groups, encompassing all Study Groups, may I now hear more views especially from RCC, what is your intention by this new provision, so

that I can open as to your comments to the floor, so and after that, after receiving comments from all, I will pass the floor again for you so that you can respond to those questions. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Chairman, thank you. We are very grateful to you for the opportunity to give additional clarifications on the substance of our proposal. The proposal is as follows. Our region is of a modest size in terms of the number of countries.

This means that we regularly confront various difficulties when it comes to holding several meetings and conferences one after the other, and so to ameliorate interaction within the framework of the RCC a special standardization Committee was created under the RCC.

Our proposal or at least this declaration was to invite possible suggestions for the ideal solution of this problem. We adopted a terms of reference, created regional groupings in several Study Groups, and we speak out in favor of deepening cooperation of RCC standardization Committee, with the Study Groups, in which we have formed our regional groups.

So, the question is, that we would like at the same time to hold meetings of the regional groups with sessions of the RCC on standardization.

Ideally, we would like a mechanism to be created to make this possible. We are against participation in regional groups, by representatives of areas outside the region, that is, groups created specifically to represent areas outside the group, and we are not in favor of disbanding regional groups. Something has been said about that being a possibility by us, but we aren't in favor of it.

What is most important for us is strengthening cooperation, cooperation by our RCC standardization Committee with the Study Groups. We would be grateful to participants if they could suggest to us the right approach within the framework of resolution 54. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. After your comments and further clarification, I would pass the floor to Australia. If you have more questions, opinions, suggestions, the floor is yours regarding this proposal from RCC. Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Just on the proposal from the RCC then, not on the other proposals, for this one, we just wonder about the practical difficulties of instituting a unified regional group. I think all regions have their own special

particularities, so I think it would need careful consideration according to the circumstances of each of the regions.

Thank you, Chair.

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

>> Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Also following Australia's example I will only be speaking about the topic of unified regional groups. I will hold my comments on the rest of the document for later. With regards to this, speaking in our behalf I believe we would have trouble accepting this, this text, if it were obligatory on all regions. We could accept text to allow each region to make their own decision whether or not they want to have a unified group or separate groups. But it has been our experience that separate regional groups have been very effective because they have had a very focused mandate, passed down from their parent Study Group. Unifying it in our opinion would dilute that. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, to reiterate, if it were optional on the regional, the groups and the decision made by those regions, then we have no issue. If it were obligatory we would not be able to accept this. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. The next speaker is Mexico. Mexico, you have the floor.

>> MEXICO: Thank you very much, Chair. As regards the proposal from RCC particularly the implementation of a mix, a unified regional group, we share the point of view expressed by Bahrain and by Australia. We also believe that this is a decision that should be taken by the region, given its own context and its own needs.

In our view, this is the discretionary power of each region, so we do not agree to have an obligation made upon us to have a unified regional group. We believe that each Study Group has the opportunity to set out its own mandate, and be able to count on experts, that aren't necessarily the same experts for different regional groups.

So this is something we should be bearing in mind. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mexico. We have now Argentina, then Brazil and then United States. If I may, I can close the list, and Egypt, and then I close the list. Okay? Thank you. Argentina, you have the floor.

>> ARGENTINA: Like what was said by Mexican and colleague from Bahrain, as regards this proposal for creating a unified regional group, we believe that we

should have the necessary flexibility to set out the mandate of each of the groups so we can then determine if we can bring them together and hold the same meetings, or if they should meet separately.

In our region, we have these unified regional groups from different Study Groups, given that we can set out their mandate, but we also have separate Study Group meetings. So it would be useful to be able to continue to enjoy such flexibility.

Also now I'd like to share my concern as the delegate -- only as regards the RCC proposal.

>> Thank you, Chairman, I'd like to agree with the previous speakers and especially in relation to the unification of Study Group, the regional groups, because there are Study Groups with their own matters, and I think the kind of expertise to be, to discuss in one Study Group is quite different to discuss in other. I think that this decision should be taken in the region, not as a monetary one. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Chair. Simply to join with colleagues who have expressed concerns about this proposal, we share them. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for being brief. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We second our colleague from Bahrain on his view on this issue. And also we see that this might dilute the efforts of the particular Study Groups each in its area. We see that if it's left to the region and to decide whether to have a combined Study Group for all, regional Study Group for all Study Groups that would be better, and we can accept this. But if it's mandatory, I don't think it's, I don't think it would be accepted.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Egypt. Having heard the comments on, what I propose is that we don't add these modifications that would apply to all Study Groups. It seems that many countries, maybe the majority would not have to need it apply to all Study Groups, with the understanding that regions and Member States are of course free to organise their own regional groups meetings as they see fit.

Do we have any objections on not including the proposals from RCC, just regarding the proposal of conversion in the text? Any more comments? Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair. We are very grateful to all the speakers, and we would

like to note that the essence of our proposal was this, but we are very pleased to see that you have understood our concerns, and what I've heard from the speakers as regards proposals would suit us. So thank you very much for that.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, RCC. I would like to remind you there is another question you mention in your document which is the relation among the Study Groups in all the standardization organisation. We will deal with this later on.

Okay, so thank you very much. I would like to move to the second core issue that I have found, would be the participation in regional groups by members outside the region. Before opening the door on this, the floor on this topic, I'd like to note that there is a contribution which proposes to modify the relevant sections of resolution 1, concerning participation in regional groups that will be considered by Committee 3.

What we are debating here now on resolution 54 is closely related to resolution 1, and you should all take care of it.

I have discussed this with the 3A Chair and they have agreed to postpone their discussions on this topic until we have concluded our deliberations in this 4B.

On this proposal then, participation in regional groups by members outside the region, may I now hear views from the meeting. We have already heard from the submitter of the proposal and contributions from Africa and Zambia. Before we can even start the discussion, I would have to follow the general rules of procedure that govern us, governs the Assemblies and conferences. I'd like to first ask if there is any support for the proposal from the United States contained in document 48 addendum 14.

We need support from all the members so that we can open the document for debate. Australia, you have the floor.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chairman. Australia would support this proposal. We certainly encourage collaboration, cooperation and the exchange of views. Regions may face similar issues and changes, and we think that it would be useful to exchange experiences and lessons learned by such an approach.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Only one support is enough. So I would request you all that we start the discussion, discussing the proposals from the United States. I would now open the floor for questions,

clarifications, opinions regarding the proposal from the United States, and then I would like the U.S. to respond to the comments. Okay? The floor is open. First to Brazil, you have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chairman. The regional group meetings are very specific with the agenda, and especially because the similarities that exist between the Member States who participate in this regional group. I think the current resolution 54 status read allows other participants by invitation. We think this autonomy should be considered by the regional group. I think it would be a little contradictory to say that if they have the ability to maintain or to join with other group, and don't have the autonomy to decide who is the participants.

I think that the obligation to authorize different members to participate in the regional groups, I think it could create some contradiction with the sense of the regional group, and the proposal of Brazil is maintain by the participation of others members by invitation. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your comments. Now we will have Ivory Coast, Cote d'Ivoire, you have the floor.

>> Cote d'Ivoire: Thank you very much, Chair. I would like to ask for clarification from the United States as regards their proposal. They refer the necessary, necessity for active participation of all members of the union in the work of the regional groups. So what is this active participation, in what capacity will members participate for members outside of the region. Do they have a decision-making power? What will their status be as regards these ITU members who are working in areas outside of their region. On that I would like some clarification before I can offer a position on this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I'd like to pass the floor to Bahrain. You have the floor, Bahrain.

>> Bahrain: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. To begin with, Mr. Chairman, and I'll be speaking about our opinion on the proposal submitted by our colleagues from the United States, we have a very serious reservations regarding this. I do not believe we can accept this text included into resolution 54 at this time.

I believe the core of it seems to be a potential perhaps, potential misunderstanding of context with relation to some of the justifications for the arguments

raised in the document. We note in particular that some

of the arguments raised for the inclusion of nonregional

members or nonregional participants in the work of the

regional groups is the WTO document, the section

regarding the ITU-T mandates in the PP resolution 71,

as well as arguments regarding duplication of work and

allocation of financial resources. Having read through

both the U.S. contribution and through the documents

referenced, I note that the documents starting with the

WTO document, it makes reference to membership of

international standardization body or international

standardizing body. The regional groups are not an

international standardizing body.

They are either, you can either treat them as a

subunit of the ITU as a focused group under the ITU,

or at best a regional standardization body.

>> CHAIR: Sorry, Bahrain.

>> Yes.

>> CHAIR: I appreciate your comments on the aspects

of the contribution, but I would like to just keep on

opening the groups to all ITU members. Then we can come

back to the question of the WTO. I think that, sorry,

it may take some time but it's your views on each aspect

is very important, so that it can have a clear view on

what can be our final text. Do I have your understanding

on that? We will come back to other aspects of the text,

okay? Bahrain, you have the floor.

>> Bahrain: Very well, Mr. Chairman. In order to

assist you and colleagues in reaching consensus on this,

I will hold the remainder of my comments. At this time

while I do have further comments regarding specifically

the inclusion of nonregional participants, I will

elaborate on them further, allowing other members to

view their comments. I will summarize by saying at this

time we cannot accept that position. Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Argentina, you have

the floor. Please let's try to keep us in this moment

just in this respect, respecting to open the groups,

regional groups to all ITU members. Argentina, you have

the floor.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. Argentina believes

that it would be a good idea that as regards this topic

resolution 54 could be kept as it is. We know that for

all regional group meetings the agenda is available for,

to all ITU members on the Web Page of the regional groups.

In other words, if other groups or other members from

other regions would like to participate, they have the

opportunity to consult the agenda.

If they are interested in a particular topic, they can always ask to be able to participate specifically in that meeting.   This is why we agree with what was said by Brazil.   That is to say, we could manage this through an invitation and leave the resolution as it is. Therefore, we do not agree with the proposal where anyone can participate in any meeting with the regional group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Argentina.   I still have four more speakers on the list.   Mexico, Bangladesh, Russia, Egypt.   I would like to -- and Saudi Arabia.   I'd like then to close the list.   Saudi Arabia, you will be the last.   I'll pass the floor to Mexico.   Mexico, you have the floor.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chair.   Just to say that we agree with comments made by Brazil, Argentina and Bahrain. For our part we believe that the agendas for regional meetings are available to everyone, and if there are aspects that are of interest to the administration of another region, they have the opportunity already to be able to ask to participate in these meetings, and if the region decides that there is a topic that it would be ideal for inviting someone in particular, then they

can always send an invitation.

This is why we believe that, we do not support the U.S. proposal. We think it would be preferable to be able to use the invitation approach for this resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mexico. Now I'd like to have Bangladesh on the floor, Bangladesh, you have the floor.

>> Bangladesh: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me the floor. I'd like to emphasize the work of regional groups is transparent to all ITU members. Every ITU-T members can access at any time to all the contributions coming to the regional group meeting, the TDs as well as the discussion with the regional meeting.

In fact, the reports of these meetings are accessible to any ITU-T members. From our experience in the Asia regional group we have seen how the work in the regional groups helped exchange views, determine priorities and build consensus for the overall success of the parent meeting.

This group helps make member from all over the world be heard, especially those that don't have the means to attend every parent meeting in Geneva. In conclusion, I'd like to emphasize on how transparent is the work in the regional meeting, and I would like to add my voice

to our colleague from Africa region maintaining the
participation in this meetings for regional members in
order to focus on our priorities.

My proposal is in line with Mexico's proposal, it
is working well, and there is no need to change it. In
my region for example, the Asian regional group has been
running very well for half a century. Thank you.

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

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. Yes, we
would like to note that regional groups is the very
instrument that was given specifically to regions to
solve their local issues and consider local issues. Also
we note that currently, all regional groups have all
instruments are available to ensure cooperation with
experts and other regional groups, if any interests arise
at all they share.

Additionally, all information is available on the
ITU portal, in line with requirements on electronic
working methods.

Therefore, we do not support the proposal as
regarding involving experts from other regions in the
work of regional groups. Thank you very much.

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

floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, we
would like to note that Egypt would like to maintain
the text of resolution 54. We think that the regional
groups are established to serve the specific needs and
efforts of and concerns of the region. We think that
opening the room for all members to attend will dilute
the concentrations on these regional issues.

Another issue is the cost implications on the host
country. Due to the regional nature of this regional
meetings, usually have limited number of attendees or
Member States attending. By opening the door and
increasing the number of attendees, that would have cost
implications on the host country, keeping into
consideration that most of the, these regional groups
are hosted in developing countries.

Another thing is that we see that the current text
in resolution 54 is quite flexible, as it invites experts,
allow the regional group to invite experts to attend
the meeting. So there is flexibility for the regional
group to invite experts if there is a need. And it's
left to the regional group to decide.

Another thing regarding transparency, we see that
the transparency is achieved since the regional group

documents, the meeting documents are all on line, so that and they can be accessed and accessible by any Member State or Sector Member. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Saudi Arabia, you are the last on my list. Then I'll pass the floor to the United States for responses and comments.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you very much, Chair. Briefly, all the proposals that we wanted to submit have already been presented by delegates from Bahrain, Russia and Egypt. We support all that those delegations have to say. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. United States, will you wish to respond, comments? Okay, I see. You have the floor to respond to all the questions and comments.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Chair. In the interest of time, let me simply say that our intention with this proposal was to implement the numerous times that resolutions and the basic instruments of the ITU call for all countries to assist developing countries. We are of the view that the best way to do that is to be present.

We also think that if ITU members are able to participate in regional group meetings, it will give them an opportunity to learn firsthand what issues are

important to the regional group participants and to help work through possible solutions. We took good note of the many comments that suggest the existing language in resolution 54 would allow for the invitation of any ITU member.

We would certainly welcome those invitations. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States for your responses and comments. Thank you also for your interventions. If I may I would like to summarize our discussion. It seems that there is a significant concern about opening the regional groups to members outside the region. Hearing also that to make regional groups by default without invitation open to members from outside the region is not being viewed favorably by those regions where most of the regional groups operate. Furthermore on the questions of transparency it has been emphasized that all documents of the regional groups are posted on-line including contributions and reports, and thank you all for your comments. All the comments and suggestion can give us a very good glimpse on the way we can proceed. We still have some other issues.

Reminding that we are discussing on principles, and then if we have time, we will present the consolidated

text that we have. Those three or four other issues,
Canada, would you like to have the floor? Sorry.

>> CANADA: Yes, thank you very much, Chair. In kind
of going over how we have progressed to this point, I
understand there was question for clarification and then
you were asking for specific points where in countries
were opposed, but I'm not sure if we fully understood
the degree of support here.

Canada does support this proposal from the U.S.
and furthermore, I think it's very important for us to
consider that all members can participate in the regional
groups. This improves information sharing, allows us
to discuss issues that are contentious, potentially
earlier in the process so we don't resolve them every
four years. These things help. I think that is
important that support is more than two countries. Thank
you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. We are not taking
decision right now. As I said before, we are just taking
your views and comments on the basic principles of the
main areas of concern that may arise from the proposals.
We will collect all of them, and then come back for you
with a text that may be a kind of, maybe a proposal for
consensus in the room. But we are not discussing if it

will or will not at this time be accepted or not, just
principle and make comments and respond to the comments.

Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. In the
spirit of cooperation, we would simply like to clarify
this contribution, well, we would like to cite what
problem is it intended to resolve, if regional
organisations or regional group has confronted with the
fact that it is unable to invite experts to its meeting
if the contribution was presented by the U.S. and
supported by Australia and Canada, then we would like
to hear whether they have encountered such problems in
the past. Perhaps together we could find a solution.
Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, yes, I'm sure that
together we can find a solution. I also acknowledge that
there are some that oppose to the opening to all. On
the other hand, we have some others that support opening
ITU regional groups. I appreciate again for your
positions. I'm sure that we will come up very soon with
a proposal that may accommodate all of your views.

But I would like now to pass to the other point
of our agenda, there are three or four more references
in your proposals that I would like to further discuss

here. The first one would be the reference to WTO. There is one reference in the document of the United States, I think it is important for us to debate this. I would like now also to open the floor in the same way, regarding WTO, I will listen to your proposals and comments and then I would have United States to respond to those opinions expressed regarding WTO reference in the text.

Can I have comments on this reference, please? That is important for the Chair to have a picture on what would be the better, the best way to proceed and to propose a Chair's text for you in the next meeting. Do we have comments regarding WTO reference? Bahrain.

>> Bahrain: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman for giving me the floor once again, speaking only on the point of the WTO reference in our opinion we don't believe this is appropriate for this document. The WTO text talks about the principles that apply to an international standardizing body. Therefore, any reference to this text should be at a much higher level whereby it applies to the ITU-T sector and/or the larger Study Groups. This however was talking about the regional Study Groups. Furthermore some of the arguments that talk about the openness and transparency that we would actually challenge, because the regional Study Groups are actually

one part of the entire process by which we issue these recommendations. To say that this is the one element that causes a problem, we believe to be a fallacious argument without substance. For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, we do not support the inclusion of the WTO reference in this resolution, although it may be put in other resolutions. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Thank you also for a possible way to proceed in this regard.

The floor is open for any other comments regarding WTO reference in the text. If I see no more comments or questions, I would like to pass to the United States to respond, if you wish. United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Chair. I thank Bahrain for its comments. I would note that the reference to the WTO that we have added to the resolution 54 is included in the recognizing section of this resolution, and not the operative section of the resolution. It was simply added to suggest that there are views in other international standards bodies, regarding the importance of transparency. It is certainly not the only problem. That was the only reason for the inclusion of that particular reference. Thank

you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Yes, thank you very much, United States.
Can we have the screen, please? Can we have the text
on the screen, so that people can see also where it's
been, okay, thank you.

So, I see no more comments regarding the WTO
reference. I'd like now to pass to the other reference
that we have from the United States, I see three references
to avoiding self duplication and within the available
resources. For me as Chairman I'd like to have
clarifications on that, and comments. If we do not have
any comments, do we have comments? Questions to be
clarified? Maybe I'll call it from the United States
can clarify something, if questions may arise from the
floor. I see none. Bahrain, you have the floor.

>> Bahrain: My apologies, Mr. Chairman, but thank
you very much for giving us the floor once again. Again
with the references to duplication, we have some concerns.
When we are talking about the work of the ITU-T as a
whole, when we are talking about the work of the Study
Groups, the parent Study Groups, we understand the need
to make references to avoid duplication. However, what
we are talking about here, Mr. Chairman, is regional
Study Groups.

Prior to the new text where we may or may not have unified Study Groups, it was clear that the regional Study Groups would fall under a parent Study Group. Therefore, the mandate of that parent Study Group would dictate the work of the associated regional group. Therefore, the issue of duplication or nonduplication has already been addressed. It is addressed at a much higher level from the parent Study Group and on up.

Therefore, we don't believe that this is the appropriate place to put this in. We could make reference to the general resolutions and articles of the ITU, but in principle, we don't see that this is the right place for it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I'd like now to pass the floor to Russia, regarding avoidance of duplication, the reference in text, please, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I am also grateful to the previous speaker who explained very clearly the substance of our opinion also. We fully support this position. We also consider that all issues of duplication of the work with other Study Groups within the framework of regional groups at the current time are resolved, because regional groups work in compliance with the parent Study Group, and its

approved mandate. Therefore, each higher standing Study Group works in line with the mandate, including the mandate that we will adopt here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russia. I'd like now to pass the floor again to the United States, so that it can explain us and make your comments after Bahrain and Russia had comments on that. You have the floor, United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Chair. And I thank Bahrain and Russia for their comments. I think that there are numerous resolutions in the ITU that recognize the importance of avoiding duplication and the costs that such duplication incur. If my colleagues believe that the regional groups by complying with the mandates of their parent group will avoid duplication, I think that would be very helpful.

I don't think that a simple reminder in this resolution that avoiding duplication is important wherever it might occur at an ITU meeting would be inappropriate, however. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States. I think that regarding those two items that there is in your document regarding the reference to the WTO and the avoidance of duplication, you can sit United States

with Russian Federation and Bahrain and I'm sure you will together find a proper solution for those two items.

I would ask you to see those delegates and come back to me with a possible solution for those two items.

Well, there is one more item that I think it's, it would be good for us to comment, to analyze here before we go to the text which is the reference in the RCC document to standardization bodies and their relationship to ITU-T regional groups.

I would like, just like before, to take your comments from the floor, take comments from the floor, regarding this reference, to standardization bodies and the cooperation as RCC said between these bodies and the ITU-T regional groups.

Is there any request for the floor, comments, opinions in this regard, so that Russia can afterwards explain for us? Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Could it be possible to just --

>> CHAIR: Sure, we will put it on the screen.

>> EGYPT: Could it be possible to change, avoid duplication to, increase synergies?

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the suggestion. But we are not changing anything in the text right now. If this

is a suggestion, I would like you to look for your colleague from the United States, and then try to make this suggestion and come back to me with your suggestion in this regard.

>> Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Regarding the relation between the standardization bodies and ITU-T regional groups, I see no requests for further clarification. I see none.

Russia, would you like still to have the floor in this regard? Yes? Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. We simply wanted to emphasize that the RCC countries are proposing in this reference cooperation of specific standardization groups in which our regional group works and for which we were created.

So this is not a cooperation with standardizing organisations, between them and other regions. It is within our region, within the framework of the commonwealth of independent states, the CIS. There is an interstate Council on methodological issues and standardization. What we mean is cooperation within the framework of that. Thank.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So thank you very much for all your presentations, for your comments. They were all very

fruitful for me as Chairman to get your views and to proceed.

So the way forward on this now, we have posted the Chairman's consolidated document in WD4 so working document number 4. You can take a look. It is just a consolidation of the proposals received. It includes all the proposals. Where there have been two proposals that cover the same original text we have included both proposals in a box. We will show the exercise that we have done. WD, working document number 4. It's good to show the way so that people can see where it is, if you have it opened. Just a minute, and we will have the document.

It seems that we can't have the access to Internet here and open the documents. We will try to solve it another way. I'd like to have the document open and I will pass through it very fastly because we don't have time actually to discuss point by point.

Just to present you the framework that we will have to work on, on document resolution 54, please, okay. It's on the screen. Working document number 4, this is the consolidated text. As I told you, this is just the compilation. It will serve as a basis in your discussion, the discussion we had here will serve me as a base to

provide modifications, if it's needed, and if we find any controversies yet. This is the box that I told before. This box is where we found basically the same ideas for the two text for the same idea. So we would have to choose one or another.

Resolves as well, we will have this, 3, again. Okay, so that's the document. So do we, I think -- the best way to work on this document is, well, we have some consensus, regarding merger of groups, for instance, we saw many views, opposing to the idea of merging groups, so I think there is a possibility of striking this proposal from RCC, just in principle. Then I will present to you the text after our discussion. I'm just trying to summarize what we decided now. Regarding the opening the groups, ITU-T regional groups to all ITU members, it's clear that we don't have still a consensus. There are many countries opposing this idea, and all the countries that is in favor to open to all ITU members, and in this regard I would like further clarification from the United States, because actually it seems to be there is a contradiction between the resolve and invites, because in resolves you say to assist all developing countries, all Member States in T Sector Members shall be invited. In the resolves, is for all

Member States and T Sector Members. So limiting to governments and to T Sector Members. But when we go to invites, all ITU members, it seems that you open it even more.

There is it, it seems to me, and I would like to hear from you, there is a contradiction between the resolves and invites. Maybe I misunderstood, but it seems to me that there is a contradiction here and I would like to hear from you. So first United States and then Russia. Okay, United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Chair, for that question. I think it would be our intention to use the broadest possible classification for opening the regional groups. So I hope that helps. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, it helped. Thank you. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair. We after clarifying the question, we would like to ask what is the reason for this proposal? Has Canada, America, Australia, been, encountered problems in inviting such persons? Everyone has spoken, saying that they have all the tools for regional groups to invite such experts. But perhaps there are problems of which we are unaware.

Perhaps the United States could illustrate them for us. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you very much, Russia. Unfortunately, we don't have more time to improve this debate, improve your comments in this regard and I would like to have more time to debate this important issue.

But I'm afraid we are running out of time. I know that you asked this. Maybe if you could have just this clarification, I think it will help me also on the exercise of trying to accommodate all your views. So if I could listen just one, one opinion regarding opening the groups would be from the United States, Canada or Australia, that are the countries that are in favor at least from what we heard here, on opening the two groups, would be very good for me so that I could try to exercise accommodation of views.

Can I have more views on that from those countries? If you don't think it's necessary, we can work on the text. Well, thank you very much for the session. It was very helpful for me. And I hope that it was fruitful for you as well.

I would like to collect all your views. I'll be ready for these, I'll be very open to listen to you. You can find me. I'll be in this room for the plenary,

and for the rest of the meeting. I would like to collect

your views and I will try to accommodate all of them,

and come back to you with a revised working document.

If it's okay for you? That's the way I want to proceed.

I hope it's comfortable for everyone. Regarding

WTO and the reference to the duplication, I would like

the United States, Bahrain and Russia get together and

try to find a solution for this, for those two aspects.

So, thank you very much for your comprehension,

for your cooperation, the meeting is adjourned. Sorry,

regarding the agenda we have resolution 75 in the agenda,

but of course it will not be possible for us to deal

with resolution 75. The weekend is coming. I would like

to ask you what are your opinions regarding how we can

proceed it. We have only Tuesday to deal with all the

75. If I may propose a way to proceed would be to invite

Mr. Professor Vladimir Minkin which is very experienced

in the resolutions on the WSIS issues, to try to meet

all the colleagues, to meet all the regions that made

proposals, and make an exercise before our final meeting

on Tuesday, try to find a solution for us and try to

accommodate views, try to listen to all of them, and

I'm sure that your experience will serve as well on

collecting ideas on 75.

It will be very fast for us if you can do this before Tuesday, and then present the results for us on Tuesday meeting of 4B. Can I interest you, Mr. Minkin to deal with 75, please? You have the floor.

>> Thank you very much, Chairman. It is a great honor for me to lead these efforts, and I would like to ask the colleagues representing the regional organisations, those who have presented contributions, to approach me, so that we could work as intensely as possible on this issue. And then with your assistance, I can put together a preliminary document list, which can then be opened for discussion. Thank you again, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I will give you the preliminary text that we have been working on, that is the same that I presented before, just a compilation of the proposals, and this is an informal group, so please those who are interested on resolution 75 on WSIS please look for Professor Minkin, and I'm sure we will have a good result to see on Tuesday meeting of 4B.

Thank you very much, Mr. Minkin.

(session adjourned).

>> Good afternoon.

>> Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We are

starting plenary in one minute.   Please take your seats.

Thank you.   We are going to start plenary in one minute.

Thank you.

        >> CHAIR: Welcome to the second session of the

plenary of WTSA 16.   Everyone has the agenda that I would

like you to approve. Thank you. We resume with the

presentation of the ITU-T Study Groups.   We have finished

during our first session Study Group 2 and 3. And now

we will move to Study Group 5.   I ask Mr. Ahmed Zeddam

Chairman of Study Group 5 to present his report.   Ahmed.

Where is Ahmed? Okay. If Ahmed is not ready, we move

on to Study Group 9. Ah. (chuckles) go ahead, please.

        >> Thank you very much, Chair. Allow me, Chair,

to allocate a few seconds of my presentation to

congratulate you on your election as Chair of this

Assembly, and express all my wishes of success to Tunisia

for organizing this Assembly.

        Now, I'm going to go back to my presentation of

the activities of Study Group 5. Ah, yes, it does work.

As you know SG 5 is a leading Study Group as regards

environment and climate change, also we are leading Study

Group as regards electromagnetic effects, and more

generally all topics under electromagnetic

compatibility.   During the study period we have worked

hard because we have approved 48 new recommendations, and we have revised 27. We have also produced 42 new supplements, and some technical papers and tutorials as well. So the study period was a prolific one, and I'll be able to now shed some spotlight on some of these achievements.

As regards Sustainable Development Goals now there are five of these goals that are more or less within the mandate of the Study Group 5, you can see them on the screen. So Study Group 5 started to work and draw up recommendations and standards, and we will continue to do so. This is so that we can implement these Sustainable Development Goals.

In terms of our competency, the SG 5, we have many of them. There were three areas, first being damage prevention and safety of ICT equipment protection, so that we can avoid any damage. The second is that of electromagnetic compatibility, so ensuring that the quality of service of all ICTs is ensured and is not disrupted by this electromagnetic environment. An important aspect in our field is exposure to EMF. We have a lot of work in this area as well.

The third area of our work is everything under ICT and climate change. We work in reducing eWaste,

evaluating environmental impact of ICTs, producing solutions to make this more efficient, and so it consumes less energy, and then everything under the circular economy. So the main key, the key part of this we can, is our management team. You can see the workhorses of the Study Group 5 in this photo.

Now, a few achievements over the Study Group, study period. Firstly in terms of electromagnetic protection we have drawn up a series of recommendations for protection of radio base stations, and everything around these radio base stations, mainly protection against lightning, and these recommendations are very useful for countries, countries who are vulnerable, very much affected by lightning. So we can ensure a good quality of service, we need to respect these rules.

In terms of electromagnetic compatibility, and human exposure, we have produced a recommendation which is K100. This defines the measures to be taken to set up a base, radio base station before it is launched. We need to verify through appropriate measures that it is in conformity or compliance with this recommendation.

In the same field, so human exposure, the cherry on the cake is that we have developed a guide, and this is also available as a mobile app, so it works on tablets,

mobile phones and computers, and this gives everything,
all the information we have in terms of ways and health
and this guide has been translated into six U.N. languages,
and the most recent version is in Malaysian. We held
a meeting in Malaysia and that allowed us to have this
version in Malaysian. This was April this year.

In terms of ICT and climate change, here the Director
of TSB mentioned this, we recently approved, less than
two weeks ago, recommendation L1002. This deals with
universal power adapter solutions for portable devices.
This is very important. We spent four years working on
this and we are delighted to have achieved this
recommendation.

It is in addition to the series of recommendations
on universal chargers that we already produced which
is the L1000 series for mobile series and L1001 for
stationary devices such as X DSL modems. We are pleased
with this result, because this means we have been able
to drastically reduce the amount of eWaste. Also
reducing consumption of these charges, so there is less
reduced greenhouse gas emissions.

Looking forward, we have a few topics for the study
period that is coming up. We are going to continue to
work in SG 5, and we are currently the super heroes for

defending, protecting the environment and preventing climate change. That is our main mission. We are going to continue with ICT protection against various disturbances. There is new technology coming out on the market, the Internet of Things for example is something we should be bearing in mind. We need this to work well, so it doesn't create disturbances. This is part of SG 5's role. And we will continue to work on this.

Also, these new, this new technology will also pose problems of human exposure to waves and this is something that we are going to discuss, energy efficiency, the circle economy, all of these topics under the, in this sphere of climate change and this will be part of SG 5's work. There is some work to do still, as you can see.

SG 5 is also the parent Study Group for some groups. Two specialized groups, two focus groups on smart and sustainable cities, one of them, this focus group has produced 21 technical specifications, and the other focus group which deals with smart water management has produced four technical specifications. We have also been parent Study Group for a JCA, Joint Coordination Activity on ICT and climate change, where we worked as a coordinator, then finally the regional groups. They

have done a considerable amount of work. We have four regional groups, one for Africa, one for the Arab region, and then for the Americas, and Asia Pacific.

Now, beyond the recommendations which is our day-to-day area of work, we also produced some publications. These are reports, and there are some examples of this on the slide. They have a significant impact on members of the union. We have also organized some events, so seminars, workshops and symposia on the topics that we deal with in Study Group 5.

So that's all, Chair. And if you also allow me, I will make the most of being here at this rostrum and I'm coming to the end of my second mandate as Chair of Study Group 5. After 28 years of loyal service within the ITU, I'm moving towards retirement which is well deserved. So I will take this opportunity to thank all members of the TSB that I've been honored to work with over these 28 years.   TSB Director at one point who brought me on board, Malcolm Johnson, Chaesub Lee who is currently TSB Director, obviously those who are here on the stage have supported me. Cristina, my counselor, advisor, she is really, she's given me a lot of support over the study period, all members of the Study Group as well, the management team and all delegates as well. I've been

honored to work with you all over these last 28 years.
Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Ahmed for the presentation.

(applause).

Thank you. I notice that you thanked all the people
on the stage except me (chuckles).

So let's move on, ah, France is requesting the floor.
Sorry, France.

>> FRANCE: Thank you very much, Chair. Just again
we would like to thank Mr. Ahmed Zeddam who has just
explained his finishing leading Study Group 5 over the
last eight years and thank you to him and we will take
this opportunity to express our gratitude to him for
having led SG 5 in the right direction over such a long
time, and particularly for having defined the parameters
for work which means that Study Group 5 is one of the
most important ones in ITU-T. Thank you very much to
him and good luck on behalf of the French delegation,
and probably from all delegations here at the Assembly,
for his retirement. Thank you.

(applause.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, France. Next on the agenda
of representation for Study Group 9 I see that Arthur
Webster is not with us and it will be Tae Kim who will

produce the report for Study Group 9, please.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Tae Tyoon Kim, on behalf of Mr. Arthur Webster, I would like to present the report.

Next, please. This slide shows the key areas of work, Study Group 9 is largely focused Study Group dedicated to study cable television technology, most of which are unique to cable television industry. SG 9 covers a wide range of technology, regarding television and sound transmission and integrated cable networks, for example in the access and security and high definition setup box.

The following two slides show the main achievement of SG 9 during this study period. SG 9 has developed quite a number of ITU-T recommendations on, ultra high definition cable television, scalable ultra high definition, IPvODDRM, hybrid perceptual bit stream, setup box, high-speed transmission over coaxial network, integrated broadcast and broadband digital TV systems also.

In this study period, SG 9 approved 59 recommendations, it means 132.5 percent increase. SG 9 also launched the focus group on smart cable television, and a set of deliverables, they were published as

technical reports.

The pilot trial of WTSA 12 resolution 80, expand this trial implementations to all Study Groups.

This slide shows the commercialization aspect of SG 9 recommendation. J .382 compliant moderator developed by Sony, J .382 is the broadband cable television transmission standard for K and AK related TV. Quality testing application software implementation, 3.1 developed by Rohde and Schwarz, video quality for IP video streaming, implementing J .247 and J .343 which is delivered by opti com. Cable television setup box developed by KDDI which provides the user's own integrated experience of cable TV and application services, synchronized with TV programmes. Integrated with broadcasting and broadband service based on J .526, 27, APVTV was started in 2010 in Germany and followed by other European countries, and hybrid casting was started in 2013 in Japan, the hybrid cast television sets are currently sold in Japan by the six television manufacturers. They are actually implemented by the industry and deployed internationally. As future work for the next study period SG 9 will focus on first telecommunication system for broadcasting over television and sound programme, including advanced

television services. Second, quality over video and
multi-media over cable networks. Third, user of cable
networks to provide interactive video and data services.
Fourth, transmission of latest DI and new services such
as HDR and AK UHDTV, fifth, exchange of cost.

Therefore, in order to demonstrate to you ITU-T's
significant role of cable TV standardization to all of
the world, thank you very much.

(applause).

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Kim. Now we move on Study
Group 11.

He is already there. Very good.

>> Okay, set the timer. I have 7 minutes. Good
afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'm very pleased to
introduce my presentation, it's report of Study Group
11. On behalf of Mr. Wei Feng, Chair of Study Group 11
and on behalf of management team of Study Group 11. This
is overview of the Study Group 11 activities, Study Group
11 is a home to the SS7. SS7 is a common channel signalling
system number 7. It was developed since 1980 around,
in Study Group 11 of CCITT and it still works and takes
a very important role to support the telephone network
and mobile network.

Since 2008, the new mission was given in the WTSA

08. It was a conformance and interoperate and testing specifications. There are very strong demand from the developing countries mainly to support implement and deployment of the IP based network. In this study period since 2012, in addition to these tasks, Study Group 11 studied combating counterfeit and Internet related performance measurement. These roles and duties of Study Group 11 is growing, and hopefully continue to the next study period.

This slide shows the statistics data indicating the current and past previous study period. The Study Group 11's activities, during the study period, in this study period Study Group 11 has doubled its number as compared to the previous study period. The number of total publication including the recommendation supplement, technical report, is 109 and it was 71. A total new recommendation is 88, and it was 47. The operation number of the participants to the Study Group meeting is 106 and it was 56.

The total number of the contributions to the SG meeting is 503, and it was 304.

The old key performance indicators are almost double, comparing with the previous study period.

It was clearly showing that Study Group 11 becomes

bigger than before, supported by the Member States, since the members from the developing country and developed country as well.

And followed by the achievements in the Study Group 11, in this study period, the first is SDN software networking. 11 collaborate with SG 13 on the development of requirement and protocols on software defined network.

First developed document is supplement 6C7 it's a framework of signalling for SDN. The other achievement of Study Group 11 listed here is IP v6, peer to peer communications and so on, and Study Group 11 developed 43 new recommendations on signalling and protocols in this study period. This works on the signalling and current protocols, by Korean delegation and Chinese delegation and two Vice-Chair, from Korea and China take the study on the signalling and protocols in the study period.

Sorry. I forgot ...

Okay. I'm sorry. Next, combating counterfeiting ICT equipment. PP resolution 188 was adopted in Busan, and Study Group 11 commenced study on combating counterfeiting under question 8. The Vice-Chair with Study Group 11 and 8 Rapporteur and Co-Rapporteur from Brazil made excellent work, made excellent progress in

the study period. We accomplish the first document

technical report on combating ICT equipment that is a

technical report, and first document, first achievement

under the question 8, in November 2004.

We have the several active work items under the

question 8, and they are very high interest issues,

interest items. They divide question 8 to Study Group

11.

Next is Internet performance measurements. That

is a very high interested and controversial maybe, in

this study period.

First draft was created in Study Group 11 in

November 2013 and the final document is approved in

June 2016. That is Q.3960 framework of Internet related

performance measurement. This document was created

collaborated with Study Group 12, and we have a plan

to develop the test methodologies based on this framework

document for that next study period.

Study Group 11 also challenged issue, we organise

a workshop in December 2015 and recognize that current

status and identifies current issues. We continue study

on this topic.

Study Group 11 also create the CASC -- sorry, I

spent my time, maybe -- Committee to study the laboratory

recognition procedure. Study Group 11 developed 65 new recommendations under testing specifications. Two Vice-Chair, from Austria and from Russian Federation take the study. They have a very strong leader, leadership, and made excellent achievement on the conformance and interoperability in the study period.

This is the final slide. I don't read out these items in this slide. But finally I would like to express my great thanks to TSV Rapporteur and greatly appreciate his excellent work in this study period.

Finally my message is please don't disband Study Group 11. I would like to continue for the next five years. Thank you very much.

(applause).

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Kenyoshi, I don't know if you will continue or not, we don't have the results yet regarding Study Group 11.

Well, let's move on to a group which is not that much challenged, Study Group 12, with Mr. Kwame Baah. Mr. Kwame, you have worked a lot today.

>> Thank you. Good afternoon, Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, at this point in time, my report as Study Group 12 Chairman and I hope that everything I say will not be used against me during this conference.

With that said, at WTSA 12, the mandate given to Study Group 12 was to be the least Study Group on performance, quality of service and quality of experience. So here it talks about three different scope, terminal characteristics, network performance as well as in-service quality management. So, when it comes to in-service quality management, when it's got to do with voice, video, video gaming, OTT, web browser and quality management, Study Group 12 is handling that. Again there are subjective tests and objective test models that are developed at Study Group 12.

For terminal characteristics, Study Group 12 looks at hands-free, E call, earphones, hearing aids and telepresence. For network performance, it looks at availability provisioning charging administration. And for the future, we are looking at network function, virtualization, 5G, going forward.

Our achievements for the past close to four years, has been that we have been able to produce the recommendation and the first one on voice over LTE in the ITU-T which is end-to-end quality of service for voice over 4G networks.

I'm happy to report that the recommendation and test methods for hands free and eCalls are widely used

and they are recommendations from SG 12, and I mention E call recommendation which was requested by a U.N. agency and this recommendation was produced in less than nine months. We don't just talk numbers, we also talk about speed and quality, as quality defines us. With the rapid progress of QOE assessment and all quality of service group SG 12 has been handling that together with a multiple of models that we deal with over the study period.

Again, there is the most recommendation which we have revised and improved, there is the adoption of subjective test methods for speech intelligibility and web browsing. When you go to the YouTube documentary when I was appointed as Study Group 12 Chair one of my promise was I will see to the development of the recommendation on telemeetings. Yes, we were able to do that in four years, with the expertise around the world contributing to this work. We are happy to inform this Assembly that there is now a new definition for quality of experience, the understanding of quality of experience especially relating to quality of service has been diverse around the world and it has been very confusing.

We are happy to say that for now quality of experience is defined as a degree of delight or annoyance.

Our challenges has been such that if you look at the numbering of Study Groups at ITU-T, Study Group 12 is the only one that has a number before it and a number after it. So we have neighbors, Study Group 11 and neighbors Study Group 13, the only one and we have a neighbor who gives us conflicts and that is Study Group 11. And just as he said the answer to the work that they may be doing that tends to be controversial. I think this has taken the toll on us and a strain on us over the last four years, and that is why that issue has even been brought to this Assembly for it to be settled once and for all, because we will prefer to use our energies to produce the work for the market and for the global community, rather than spend our time on internal strifeles.

The other consideration which has been a challenge for us is the limited participation of Sector Members from developing countries. It has so happened that over the four years Study Group 12 has used various mechanisms to improve participation of Member States at its meetings. We have used web nets, we have used summary of our results for every meeting. We have used websites around the world going to every region of the world through quality of service development group to touch base with people who

cannot travel to Geneva on quality of service. And as
it will reflect in people desiring to be Vice-Chairs
of Study Group 12 now, they are very new persons but
they have been participating especially at the regional
levels.

However, we don't have the Sector Members in
developing countries participating in our work. So that
continues to be a gap, we will look at the ways going
forward to address this.

With this, going forward, outlook for the future
is same that as we brought into this meeting, video quality
testing has been one which used to be with Study Group
12. When Study Group 9 was created, as a hand of
friendship it was given to them to relate and work to
it. Over the last study period we have realized that
as many as four questions in Study Group 12, as part
of the interRapporteur group on video testing
participates on the two questions at Study Group 9. And
we so ask this Assembly to consider that it's now four
questions against two questions. We want to bring back
our video quality testing home.

We are also looking to merge two of our questions,
as they stay with us into one to make us more efficient
and then introduce a new question on virtualized

deployment on network performance, QOS and QOE assessment.

There is a very strong interest of QOS and QOE from administrations and the regulators in developing countries, and as you hear in this conference there are various calls of quality of service studies in Study Groups and we assure everyone that there are two means of developing recommendations. The traditional, the top method and the AAP and the top method is for recommendations which are policy and regulatory implications, and so quality of service regulatory recommendations can be done at SG 12.

With this, Mr. Chairman, I know my time is up. But I will want to give tribute to Mr. Paul Barrett of United Kingdom, Mr. Syed of Sudan, China, Morocco, Japan, Mr. Kim of Korea who is here who have finished their two terms and I thank them very much for being part of SG 12 and I know that you will continue to support us and finally, I want to thank my country Ghana for all the investment and resources and support for my term of office to Member States who also invested in their respects to participate in our meetings.

The TSD Director, fortunately I have two of them, Mr. Malcolm Johnson and Dr. Chaesub Lee who have been

very supported, head of Study Groups, Dr. Bilel Jamoussi and I have two counselors hard working, Mr. Hiroshi Ota and my new friend, Mr. Maltonado. I thank you for the success that we gained together. I know that Study Group 12 will strive and make the world not just connected but connected with quality. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you to Alice for your extension of time.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

(applause).

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Kwame, I would like to suggest to the next chairs of the Study Groups while presenting that we leave the expression of appreciation at the end at least for this stage and for people in the management of ITU-T.

Next is the future network Study Group 13 with Mr. Lehmann. The floor is yours, Leo.

>> Thank you very much. I switch on my counselor that I really keep in the time frame.

I was wondering what I can say about this group. I think the easiest way to describe it is it's all about networks. I don't know why, the type is correct here, it's just all about networks, it's a little behind.

I don't want to bore you now with any statistics.

Very shortly we have produced about 100 documents,
standards in the areas of future networks, NGN evolution,
IoT before we handed over this to Study Group 20, when
Study Group 20 was established, as well as all other
important areas of cloud computing, big data, and trust.

Our current work now is, with our newest activity,
is here reflected by 5G wireline, that we started by
initiating a focus group on IMT 2020 which is here in
a pioneering work in sorting out the areas of
standardization possible and suitable for Study Group
13, and to prepare first document that we can then use
in the next study period to make them to first ITU-T
standards 5G.

And this focus group was very successful in
identifying about 85 gaps, that suit to Study Groups
of ITU-T, many of them to Study Group 13, but indeed,
we have to be aware about, the world is not sleeping
and we cannot lay back, okay, fine, obviously we do one
by one. We have to hurry. Otherwise this gap, the number
of gaps will be shrinking, and be done by somebody else.

So I think the plan is here, based on our work,
we have already, we haven't called it 5G. But we did
a lot of work, essential work on virtualization, SDN
and based on this, I really am convinced that beside

definition of the roadmap we can deliver fast 5G standards related to wireline aspects in spring 2017.

Okay. Beside this other very important area for us is cloud computing and big data, well, our Working Party 2 produced very significant standards that are very well-known and very well aware outside ITU-T.

I would just like to mention that we had a great cooperation here together with IO, IEC JCT 1 on standards on cloud computing terminology and cloud computing architecture.

All the big data, we really developed a fundamental document on why 3600 which creates a lot of attention outside ITU-T, in other SDOs, and make, create an awareness about the cloud computing related aspects towards big data and the capabilities required by big data service providers.

I think if you are interested, this very well is described in the standard Y3600.

Like I said, it became focal point here for many organisations outside ITU.

Not to forget, another very important area we are working in now is trust in ICT. By the way, I love this left picture, because this picture describes much better the feelings that are associated with trust. This little

guy who is, let himself fall down, he really trusts to that adult guy that this person is not stepping back two steps and looking what happens when the guy is falling down.

I think that is all our challenge, we have not only in Study Group 13, but all the other Study Group, namely 20, 17, 11, that we really find technical terms that really reflect that feeling, given by the picture. You see here on the right the topics that we are working now in the next study period.

This brings me to the end. Just would like to mention, I have taken over Study Group 13, in the middle of the study period. And you know here the picture of the former Study Group Chairman who is now TSB Director. I would say even if we are from different cultures, we are absolutely different personalities, but we have a still very common commitment to serve ITU in bringing network standardization ahead, keep it on the top, and invite you here to keep it is relevance in this area. With this and thanks to my TSB counselor, Tatiana, I would like to thank you, and indeed, I also thank here the Chair of the meeting before he is complaining again (chuckles) for giving me the time to talk. Thank you very much.

(applause).

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Leo. Double thank you to you.

Now moving to one who has two heads, the Chairman of Study Group 15 but also the Chairman of com 3 of this WTSA, Mr. Steve Trowbridge.

>> Thank you, Moktar, thank you for giving me the opportunity to say a few words about Study Group 15 to this Assembly. Study Group 15 -- we have the slides? 15 is the largest Study Group. We average 290 participants. We get 360 contributions per meeting. We are divided into 18 Study Group questions and we are very productive.

People often ask me how I do it. And what makes it easier is I've got a very capable management team with a lot of experience and very capable experience Rapporteurs. We don't always agree on the proposals but by the time we do reach an agreement we tend to have very high quality things from the questions upward, as far as good recommendations with high consensus.

We are responsible for technology for transport, access and home. When people ask what Study Group 15 does largely it's a matter of getting a large number of bits from one place to another, whether it be across the house or from you to the network or across the country or around the world.

We deal with everything from metro reach through submarine cable systems in terms of these kinds of networks.

We have a number of lead Study Group responsibilities. We are responsible for access network transport, and coordinating with a number of other technologies in the space, in a variety of standards bodies. Optical technology, we take the lead. We also, because of our involvement in access networks and home networks do communications for smart grid and have lead Study Group responsibility in that area.

And for home networking, both ourselves and Study Group 9 have some activities in home networking, as well as coordination with some other outside groups that do this sort of technology.

In terms of the achievements, I won't read everything on every one of the slides, but many of these things you have probably heard about, G.fast is something that has received a lot of attention in the market. Every time we think we have run out of steam with these old twisted pair copper cable links from back in the days when all we had was voice telephones up to that copper infrastructure, we thought we were doing well when we would send a few megabits per second over those links

and now we are up to one gigabit.

This involves some exotic technology with digital signal processing. The links do get shorter and shorter. Normally this is fiber to the curb and then for what used to be called the last mile it's not the last couple hundred meters. But we still manage to reuse that infrastructure that's been there for a long time. We also are responsible for passive optical networks. A lot of recent work has been in the area of the, what's been called XGS PON or symmetrical ten gigabit PON and NG PON pushes networks to 40 gigabits per second.

Home networking we have done similar sorts of interfaces. The home networking work takes advantage not only of the copper kind of infrastructure, but there is power line communications interfaces and even some new work on visible light communications inside of the home.

Working Party 2 is what puts everything together. This is the group that deals with optical fibers and cables. Almost all of single mode fiber around the world, large majority is G652. That is among the ten most downloaded ITU-T recommendations for at least half of the last decade. This group does the cable specifications, but also optical components and optical

physical layer interfaces.

Optical networks recently have become much more sophisticated. Optical amplified line systems but also network happens in the optical layers today with multi degree splitters to allow routing and networks to happen optically rather than having to go through a digital device like a router or a switch. We have work in submarine cable systems and finally we have got work on going to try to work on some of the first multi-vendor interoperable coherent interfaces.

So the high bandwidth interfaces you find in optical networks today normally rely on some very advanced modulation formats, with polarization multiplexing of phase and amplitude modulated signals.

Working Party 3 looks at the digital aspects of transport networks, so the OTN hierarchy has been an important area of work, really since about 2000. Of course this has evolved considerably, as these networks have become more sophisticated. Once upon a time when the optical interfaces simply were sending 1s and 0 by turning the laser on and off we are now going to higher transmission rates with complex modulation formats. One side effect of that is that the way you structure the digital data over those wavelengths is a matter of

depending on how far you are going, selecting the

modulation format and a constellation if you will for

this complex modulation, for the reach you want to go,

and number of sub carriers for the amount of data you

want to carry. The hierarchy gets more sophisticated

when you are dealing with new kinds of modulation.

We have a lot of work on network resilience at the

network layers we work with. And a lot of work recently

as these networks move from being managed networks or

JSON G MPL S.control plain networks to applications of

software defined networking.

So a lot of work ongoing, now for the core information

management model for being able to manage optical

networks using software defined networking.

People can always ask aren't you done yet?

(chuckles) of course there is always more to do.

In terms of G.fast there is work ongoing to push

these interfaces beyond 2 gigabits per second, and also

to be able to deploy this not only on the traditional

copper access networks but over coaxial infrastructure.

There is a new dynamic time assignment activity in order

to have more dynamic upstream and downstream bit rates

that are responsive to the customer traffic.

Unfortunately, the captioning covers up some of

what is underneath, but home networking is having similar evolution beyond two gigabits per second.

Power line communication continues to be important in the home networking area. Working Party 2, dealing with the physical layer infrastructure, has work in terms of a lot of installation practices for cabling. There are, is work ongoing in some lower cost multi channel bidirectional WDM access sorts of interfaces. Then there will be work as IEEE moves some of their Ethernet rates from a hundred gig to 200 and 400 gigabits per second to do what we did at 100 gig and reuse the same components for the optical transport network client interfaces.

Working Party 2 does work in disaster management, have pioneered some work in terms of mobile disaster recovery units, things that can be deployed to the scene of a disaster to quickly restore network services.

Finally, Working Party 3, optical networks once upon a time were the core of what might have been considered teleco networks. They are not anymore. The primary clients of OTN are no longer the old services but we carry Ethernet, carry fibre channel, a lot of work for datacenter interconnect and then mobile front haul and back haul is a important application for us.

We have done some work in the front haul area, with sipri over OTN and as we move into 5G interface we will do the same sort of thing. And the other work you see indicated on this slide.

As the work in Working Party 2 progresses to give us some of the interoperable interface that is will be taken on board in terms of the digital frame formats and Working Party 3 to support it. We are happy to be working in this group, and in terms of what services it supports, it's simple. We get bits from one place to another. But in terms of the technology it takes to do that as we put more and more bits over fiber, it gets more and more interesting, in terms of the physics of the problems we are trying to solve.

There are more slides in the backup for this. So more information on our structure and our management team, the Rapporteurs who served us. I want to thank my management team, I want to thank all the Rapporteurs in the group. I want to thank the TSB. We started out with Greg Jones who has since retired, Hiroshi now supports us and our assistants who helped us through the period, Rob Clark and Emmanuel helped us to carry out this work efficiently. Thank you very much.

(applause).

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Steve. Steve is one of the pillar of WTSA structure as you may know, in charge of com 3.

Now we have three Study Groups left, sixteen, Mr. Maeda, Mr. Yoshi Naito.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Congratulations for your Chairmanship and thank you, Tunisia for hosting us.

I'm very happy to report to you the results and our expectation for next study period, and this is a area we are working multi-media from according to applications and related work areas. I don't go so much detail in this here, you can read it later.

This is also the result of the number of the meetings, but as you can see on the right bottom, we have started with 18 questions and now we are proposing 11 questions. This right side circle, we see that this is our output for the last four years. We have developed 268 recommendations, and 25 other text. So very close to 300, we should have developed 7, 8 more, then I can say that we have finished 300 texts.

We are very active in collaboration with other bodies, like ISO, JTC 1, IEEE and, I'm sorry, it is not my intention, but IEC is missing. And not only with those

ICT standardization bodies, we are also working together with WHO, U.N. CE and continue on, UNECE on transportation and WHO and continue on eHealth.

The trending, maturity in classical areas such as voice coding and traditional way works but increase clearly in eServices and video centric services, and this shows our, in the center, our core areas eService and video centric services in the next study period, and which should be supported by video compression, eHealth, eLearning, ITS and so on, immersive systems and so on, accessibility is also a very important area for us.

Regarding the eServices, we are making building blocks and delivery platforms, so that our output, using our output developing as people are able to make use of the applications in specific areas.

This is all the case of eHealth. We are currently working more on personal communication health devices. But we are also already started work together with medical people to share the brain information, that is a big data, but not shared by hospitals and doctors. So we are trying to standardize the sharing system for health information. And another important area is video content, and as has been already discussed in this meeting,

currently the video traffic, 50 percent of the Internet

traffic, but within two years, it will come up to

80 percent of the Internet traffic.

So higher demand comes to Study Group 16 to, more

efficient compression and transportation systems. And

the use of the digital video will cover from entertainment

to smart phones you are using, and IPTV. And future should

be IP based broadcasting, also to be used in accessibility,

artificial intelligence in video, and also the virtual

reality.

As a conclusion, Study Group 16 working in

multi-media continue to be very productive. We have been

productive in this study period, and we will keep on

to be productive in the next study period, and work close

in eServices and video centric services and components.

And growth of video compression drives newer codecs

systems and applications should be very important for

our work.

That is all from Study Group 16. And before ending

my presentation, I'd like to first thank to our great

staffs, and also to all my Vice-Chairs and Working Party

chairs and Rapporteurs and editors and all the

participants of Study Group 16. Without them we cannot

achieve such a big achievement. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

(applause).

Thank you, Mr. Naito. Now for group 17. Study Group 17, in less than 7 minutes, because we are running late. We have some other important topics to take. Thank you.

>> Thank you, my name is Heung Youm from Korea, in his absence, Dr. Kremer, current Study Group 17 Chairman, it is my great honor and pleasure to introduce you the results of the Study Group 17 activities during this study period.

Actually, my presentation is focusing on the future activities for the next study period. So I will start with the overview of the Study Group 17. And I will conclude my presentations. There are so many, so many slides, to complete this presentation. So if you are interested in details of the Study Group 17 activity, it is advised to report to the slide, in this presentation.

Actually Study Group 17, actually WTSA 12 mandate of the Study Group 17 is simply security. So we believe that security is a key enabler to implement WTSA 15 resolution, which is Cybersecurity, and also we have Plenipotentiary Conference resolution 130, ITU, confidence and security in the use of ICT. So to this

end, Study Group 17 activities covers many areas, for example, Cybersecurity, countering spam, you may know we have resolution and we have areas of activity in cloud computing security and also we have activities for IoT security, ITS security, SDN software defined network security, mobile security, smart grid security and identity management. Actually we have very famous, very well-known recommendation that is 1254, identity authentication security framework. I think that recommendation is widely used. We have telecommunication based information security managements, operational security and big data analytics security, and we have very, very best-seller recommendation in ITU-T that is X .509. PKI, public infrastructure and PMI and direct I is part of the X.509 recommendations.

     We have some activities in the area of telecommunication securities.

     Future prospect of Study Group 17. Actually, security as I mentioned is key enabler to implement a super connected network society. Study Group 17 has been a center of security competence for the global experts. So the number of participation of the Study Group 17 meeting, more than 115. So and Study Group 17 has a good

relationship with Study Group 13, to develop a recommendation in the area of cloud computing security, and recently TSAG agreed to task allocation between Study Group 17 and Study Group 20 in the area of IoT and ACC security.

So collaboration with Study Groups within the ITU-T and collaboration with the other standard development organisation, for example, SG 27, we have good relationships.

Cybersecurity, as you may know, we have X.1500 recommendation, that we call cybex. We have developed a series of recommendation in the area of the Cybersecurity. As I mentioned people, Study Group 17 has been a center of the security competence. And security by design and security by default is our main principle to develop a technical recommendation. We really focus on the implementable ITU-T recommendation in the area of the security, and we believe that strengthening the trust authentication frameworks and also authentications are key enabler and prerequisite to implement a information security. Actually, we have good relationship with ITU-T, the ITU-T in our area of the Cybersecurity culture.

I think probably key infrastructure should be a

good candidate, for application of the security in the area of smart grid, and as I mentioned, protection of the personally identifiable information, we have several work items in Study Group 17, and we have one Joint Coordination Activities for the protection of child on-line, and Study Group 17 has been a lead Study Group for security, and IoT security is our prioritized work areas.

As we are Study Group 17 is proposing twelve questions for the next study period, and we expect we will continue to our work for the next study period.

And Study Group 17 should be ideal Study Group responsible for security and language and description techniques, and identity management. As I mentioned, we have many work items in this area. And we have several joint coordination activities on identity management and child on-line protection, and also we have several products such as ASN .1 and OID. We will continue to our coordination activities in these areas.

Conclusion, so considering the increased participation for the Study Group 17, Study Group 17 has successfully involved to cover new security issues and new security challenges with security expert in core questions. So security, Study Group 17 achieved a

significant increase over the participation and energy in our area of identity management, Cybersecurity and cloud computing security and IoT security. So Study Group 17 has built a strong relationship with other key parties as well as other Study Groups in leading Study Group 17 working on security and conducted a number of collaborative efforts.

I think this is my last slide. So I need to thank all the people, who work, contribute to the work of Study Group 17, including management teams and Rapporteurs and editors and participants and TSB. Thank you. That will conclude my presentation.

(applause).

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Youm, I want to welcome to the stage and after Study Group 17 we move to Study Group 18, who is representing Study Group 18, just to be sure that you are following. Study Group 20, it is the last but not least, it is the youngest Study Group, it is two years old Study Group, not Nassar but Study Group. The floor is yours, Mr. Nassar.

>> Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Indeed I'm also the youngest Chairman I believe of the Study Groups.

Thank you, Chairman. I'm glad to be here, dear colleagues to represent to you the outcomes of the Study

Group 20. So WTSA 2016 is a very special to me, it coincides with the completion of the first year of Study Group 20, as the Chairman of this newly created Study Group, kindly allow me to share this happiness and success with you by elaborating on the activities conducted within Study Group 20, within the first year of its extension.

So on this slide, I'd like to say that in 2005, ITU put forward a vision for IoT in the landmark Internet of Things report, as part of series of ITU reports on Internet. The main work of Study Group 20 carried out through question 120 Working Party 120 and Working Party 220 as you can see from slides.

Question 1/20 on research and emerging technologies, including terminology and definitions, it tasks us to capture the development, it's task to capture and develop definitions, to contribute to the common terminology for IoT and Smart Cities and Communities. This question can also contribute the research and solutions for interoperability across different technologies, including identification and taking into account both end user and market needs.

Coming now to Working Party 1 on Internet of Things, which covers various questions, three questions,

including it has question 2, 3 and 4, question 2 is on requirements and use cases for IoT, question 3 on IoT functional architecture, including signalling requirements and protocols. Question 4 on IoT applications and services, including end user networks, and interworking. Working Party 1 currently has 28 ongoing work items under Working Party 1, which gives an indication of the work in Working Party 1, and interest in the work that Working Party 1 is currently doing.

Coming now to Working Party 2, which deals with topics related to Smart Cities and Communities, and of course when we talk about smart cities and communities, you cannot have smart cities and communities without IoT deployed, so we have two, so Working Party 2 has two questions, question 5, Smart Cities and Communities requirements, applications and services, question 6 on smart cities and communities infrastructure and framework.

And Working Party 2 currently has 20 work items under study. So given the life of this Study Group it is only one year since it was established by TSAG, we have 48 new work items under study, and number of recommendations, I will come to that in another slide.

And also in Study Group 20 was created TSAG also

decided to transfer the parent group of JCA on Internet of things to Study Group 20, and in light of this, the terms of reference of JCA, IoT was revised and agreed on. Additionally, the title was changed to Joint Coordination Activity on Internet of Things and Smart Cities and Communities. Moving on to the next slide, a few of the key topics with question 120, Working Party 1 and Working Party 2, Working Party 1 topics like common terminology for IoT and Smart Cities and Communities, consideration and end user adoption of IoT, IP v6, research and emerging technologies related to IoT, Smart Cities and Communities are to be covered. For Working Party 1, aspects are including general requirements and capabilities for IoT applications and services, frameworks and functional architecture for IoT to support networks and gateway, specific IoT services covering transportation, safety, safety services, eHealth services and so on. IoT based smart greenhouse smart farming, smart manufacturing and big data issues.

For Working Party 2, on smart topics are on Smart Cities and Communities related to ecosystem application, services and use cases, standards that are directly related to Smart Cities and Communities, open data, integrated sensing and management of smart cities, smart

sustainable cities.

So next slide, seems the clicker ... yes, so on this slide, I have the results of the first year of Study Group 20. Study Group 20 has been able to approve six new recommendations within merely a year, and nine new supplements. Additionally, we have been able to determine one new recommendation.

These results are amazing accomplishment of course, and if you need more information about them, there are supplement slides of this specific Power Point. You can go to that, to those slides and see more information about those achievements.

ITU-T future work, so the future work of ITU-T Study Group 20 may include a new or further studies in the following areas. Identification and addressing aspects in IoT, security, privacy and trust of IoT, Smart Cities, community systems, services and applications, accessibility of IoT, data centric capabilities for IoT including big data semantic and syntax aspects of IoT and the list is very long. And I see that I don't have that much time. So I would like to move to the next slide.

Here in Study Group 20 we have developed two flip box, the first one on shaping smarter and more sustainable cities, driving the Sustainable Development Goals and

the second one on unleashing the potential of Internet
of Things -- flip books.

This slide gives you an overview about the united
for smart sustainable city. This is a initiative which
there are more than 12 U.N. organisations are involved
in this initiative, and the work in this specific
initiatives, the main activities of the U4SSC are
conducted through three Working Parties.

And members are free to sign up for any Working
Group of interest to them. The 4SSC also is in charge
of advisory board of smart sustainable cities, which
is tasked with responsibility of retaining existing ITU
KPIs for Smart Cities. So Mr. Chairman, I'm almost there.
This is the last slide. So given the progress made by
Study Group 20 within the first year, and the warm welcome
that it has received from ITU members, I anticipate that
this is just the beginning for Study Group 20. So please
be assured that Study Group 20 has a lot more to offer.
And we will continue to work towards that feat.
Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank, take this
opportunity to thank Study Group 20 Vice-Chairs,
Rapporteurs and associate Rapporteurs for their
dedication and support and I thank TSB Director and their
team, especially Cristina advisor of Study Group 20 and

her team for their dedication. I would like also to invite
you all to join us in the next Study Group 20 meeting
which will take place in my city Dubai in March next
year. With this I conclude my presentation,
Mr. Chairman and thank you very much for this opportunity.
Thanks.

(applause).

>> CHAIR: Thank you, I thought you were inviting
us for a party.

(chuckles).

Now as I said, we are running a bit late, and I
have two requests. First one is for ladies and gentlemen,
interpreters, if they allow us ten additional minutes.

>> Yes, granted, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. The second proposal
is for you, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to tackle
items 4 and 5 of the agenda with interpretation, and
3 and 4, good, 3 and 4 with interpretation. Then we will
do the following without interpretation. Is it okay for
you? Okay, thank you, I think English speaking are okay
for that. Thank you very much.

The next item which is item 3, the progress report
of com 5 which is globally the harvest of the few days
we have been working on the subject, and I would like

to, you to go to the document if unless you have already done it, on this 67, and I propose that you go through very quickly. While I am summarizing, what are the outcomes of the few days already of work of the committees, starting by the suppression with, of three resolutions, namely resolution 33, 38 and 81, that are now suppressed. Then we have the modification of resolution 32, and here we see for us here in Tunisia having made this very important because it's the first official document that will be released with named Hammamet, 2016. This is quite important for Tunisian guest hosts and last one is ITU-T A1 which is, which has also been modified and modification are presented here for your approval.

If there is no comment on this document, I propose that we approve all of them, unless there is someone who wants the floor and I see Canada. Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. Sorry to hold you up. But I see on page 4 of this document in relation to resolution 32 and resolves 2, it refers to TSAG electronic working methods Working Party. That Working Party doesn't exist anymore. As a housekeeping matter I would suggest deleting the reference. It would simply read, TSAG to continue to. Etcetera. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any additional comment? We

can consider this changed. I see no objection. We can
forward this to com 5. Okay. Thank you, Canada. We
consider your proposal and the change will be done by
com 5.

No other comments. I consider all this resolution
suppression modification approved. Thank you.

Let's move on, to the presentation of the progress
of report of com 2, 3, 4, but would I like it to be in
reverse order. I want to ask first com 4 Chair to present
the presentation in less than two minutes, please. Com
4, Mr. Kwame. Briefly, because your report is already
read but all these ladies and gentlemen. Briefly make
a short presentation. Kwame.

>> KWAME BAAH-ACHEAMFUOR: Thank you, Chair, for
com 4 report, we have met three times. Our main results
are as follows. We reviewed the Study Group structure
and agreed this morning to keep 12 Study Groups.
Concerning the work allocation to Study Group 9 and 11,
it is ongoing. But we have agreed to keep study, Working
Party 2.2 in Study Group 2 and also transfer the work
on human factors to SG 16. We have completed two
resolutions, resolution 72 and 73, that were sent to
com 5. We progress but we will need extra session to
be held tomorrow morning from 9:30 to 12:30 and for this

weekend there will be a number of ad hoc groups and drafting session as well, but most importantly on resolution 2.

Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Kwame. We take your request of additional session for com 4 tomorrow. We will discuss it within the com 1 this evening. France wants the floor.

>> FRANCE: Yes, thank you, Chair. Under your leadership, which has been very lucid, this conference has been unfolding in an excellent spirit of cooperation. We heard the report from the Chair of com 4. We may hear about some difficulties in the structure as regards the restructuring the Study Groups, in behalf of the CEPT we have engaged in discussions. The CEPT can now announce that Europe is lifting its reservation with respect to the future of the Committee 11, and I believe this will allow work on modification to resolution 2 to continue now in a stable predictable manner. Now we will continue to work smoothly with other regions to define the roles of the Study Groups, and to resolve the different issues within the framework of the Working Groups established for this weekend. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, thank you APT for that. This is a very good example. It is a real example

of cooperation. I was even, I will even take ten more minutes from the interpreters if it's possible if we have proposal like that. Maybe we can move on during this meeting. Maybe we can avoid many meetings during the weekend.

Thank you for that, Europe.

I want you to, I want to thank this kind of cooperation spirit, and I hope that we will have many examples of this type in the coming days.

Now there are any other comments on com 4 report? I don't see any. Let's move to com 3 report. Steve. Go ahead, Steve.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Excuse me. Com 3 has moved efficiently through our agenda. You have seen the first set of text that we have sent forward to com 5. We have also sent one of those toward Committee 2 to evaluate the financial implications of the additional features required in resolution 32. We have completed our work on a few other resolutions you don't see because the end result of the deliberations was no change. In particular, resolutions 31 and 66 are no change.

I think we have introduced the proposals on all but three documents so far, either in the main Committee or in one of Working Groups 3A or 3B. Work is ongoing.

We have a few ad hocs and draft groups over the weekend.

Apparently people are enjoying this experience so much

that they want to keep at it through the weekend to finish

their work.

But I think we have a number of items which are

very very close to completion, and a few things that

like resolution 1 where the work we will take into next

week. You have seen the work concluded so far in what

we have sent to the editorial Committee. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Steve. I give the floor now

to, for comments, if any. No? Let's move to com 2.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I prepared my report

in Chinese. But I do worry we will not have interpreters,

so thank god we have interpreters now. So I can continue

to speak in Chinese.

Committee 2 held a meeting in the morning of

Wednesday. That is our first meeting based on the meeting

agenda. We reviewed the mandate of the Committee. The

meeting considered the agreement between Tunisian

government and our view were expressed thanks to the

Tunisian government for all the facilities they provided.

We thank them for their considerate arrangement and

organisation. We reviewed the budget for this Assembly.

The expenses and contributions which can be listed in,

which can be seen in document 31, 32, will pay special attention to our responsibilities and we also noticed that before 2020, that is our next Assembly, the budget estimates and the expenses we had in the past four years are extremely important. The budgetary estimate actually is approved by the PP and the Council. Therefore, apart from the document 62 Committee 2, will in the name of the Chairman send a document, that is document 63 to all the other committees, reminding them any decisions they made, if the decisions have potential financial impact they do need to inform Committee 2. We plan to have our next meeting in the morning of next Tuesday. That concludes my presentation. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for this brief presentation, even if you did it in Chinese we all understood it.

So thank you for it. I would like on your behalf thank the four Chairmen of committees starting by Mrs. Wei from China, for com 2, our lady first, com 5, Ibrahim where is her, I don't see her, she is there, Mr. Kwame for com 4 and Mr. Steve for com 3. And this is, this ends the part with interpretation. Now he was reminding me that we have to thank the interpreters but I was about to do it. Thank you very much. Now I have learned that those ladies and gentlemen working behind

the scene have a real hard work, understanding all of

us in our, all other six languages, I can tell you it

is not an easy task. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

This is for you.

(applause).

Now without interpretation I would like to ask

people when speaking in English to speak slowly, because

many of us here don't understand easily English or and

also take care when they have the floor if any, we will

give them time to express themselves as they wish. Thank

you for that. Next point on the agenda is the schedule

of meetings for Saturday and Sunday. At the beginning

of this week we had in mind at least I had in mind a

schedule for Saturday and Sunday, two excursions. Now

luckily we have kept those excursions. We still have

those excursions, the first one is let us say cultural.

The second one is touristic it is to the north and to

museum Carthage and Bardo and the other is to the south

Berber village and things like that but you won't see

it on the schedule. It is out of the work of ITU. Now

we have also some session that is I hope will benefit

to most of us and this Assembly, related to the ad hoc

sessions that we were obliged to schedule for this

weekend.

It will be displayed on the screen, knowing that as Kwame requested, to have session for com 4 and we will discuss it in the com 1 this evening and probably agree, or we can maybe be sure that we should find the agreement to have this session for tomorrow morning with interpretation for com 4. And captioning. It looks like it goes together. Interpretation and captioning for the session on Saturday for com 4. About the ad hocs you have all the schedule, the document is released or not? This document is released. You have it. If you have any comment or something to add on that, no? Okay. Thank you for this.

I have here an item AOB. Any other business. Any other matter. No other matter. Okay. Thank you. We come to the end of this second session of the plenary. We will finish it with expression of appreciation to all Study Group officials. So it is let us say the funny part because we don't need any more document.

We just need to have the Study Group officials to join the stage. I should maybe, we should maybe give the names. I will give the floor to TSB Director who will manage this ceremony.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman, as we all recognize we had a good report from our Study Group leadership,

Study Group is our engine, without these Study Groups we couldn't produce such wonderful conclusion, products. So take a moment to appreciate their full years of effort, definitely their support of participants and Rapporteurs, all contribution from our members, this is also very important, all for operation of this Study Group. But on behalf of this all effort this great moment to appreciate our Study Group Chairmen. Start with Study Group 2 first, he is not available. In that case, someone from Egypt, represent Study Group Chairman will come to the post to receive this appreciation. (overlapping speakers). Yes, you are right. Sorry. Mr. Sharif, you are here. He is not here. In case of this, someone from the station will come to the podium to get this. Study Group 3, Mr. Sichi please come to the podium.

Study Group 5, Mr. Zeddam, Study Group 9 Mr. Webster is not here so someone from U.S.

Someone from U.S. to take this. Thank you. Study Group 11, has not joined us, someone from China. Study Group 12, Kwame. Study Group 13, Leo, then Study Group 15, Steve. Study Group 16. Mr. Naito. Study Group 17, Mr. Kremer, someone from Russia. And Study Group not 18, Study Group 20. Nasser.

You will be under me. As well as Chairman of TSAG

Chairman of TSAG, Bruce and last but not least, Chairman

of RevCom, Mr. Yoichi Maeda.

     (applause).

     >> CHAIR: I would like to remind you that the meeting

is not over yet.

     (clink of glass).

     Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to close

officially this second session of the plenary of WTSA

2016. I wish you a good evening to all. I don't know

if I can wish you a good week end but I hope between

work and some leisure I wish you a very good weekend

and for next week for most of you hopefully. Thank you

very much and have a nice evening.

     (applause).

     (session adjourned at 1806)