

Raw file.
October 28, 2016.
9:00 a.m.
ITU.
World Telecommunication Standardization
Assembly.
Hammamet, Tunisia.

Services Provided By:

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

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

***.

(standing by).

(standing by).

>> Ladies and gentlemen, please take your seats.

We are going to start at 9:00. Ladies and gentlemen,
please take your seats. We start at 9:00. Thank you.

(sound of gavel).

>> CHAIR: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

Welcome to the third session of Committee 4 of WTSA
16. Committee 4 is on the ITU-T work programme and
organisation. I will refer you to the agenda for today,
which is available as ADM 17.

This is currently being projected on the screen.

To take you through the agenda for today, the plan is that we will define the number of Study Groups this morning as part of the Study Groups restructuring. We will decide on the allocation of blocks. We will discuss issues concerning the work in SG 20, and SG 3 and define the way forward.

Again, we will define the way forward concerning revision of resolution 2, and then we will attempt two resolutions with the available time. With this loaded agenda, I will plead with you that for all contributions that have already been presented, will no longer be presented, but for those, especially for the ones that we missed out yesterday on, they will be given the opportunity to be presented this morning, and to lead us into the discussions as well.

However, the time for presentations and interventions will be limited to two minutes. Please help us observe the timing for this agenda, so that we could be able to achieve our goals for this session.

With this, the agenda ADM 17 is for your approval. I see no objection to this agenda.

(sound of gavel).

Thank you. This agenda is adopted.

Now, we will proceed on to the approval and report of the previous com 4 session which is available as DT26, which is currently projected on the screen. Page 1. Page 2. Page 3. I see no one asking for the floor. Thank you very much.

(sound of gavel).

The report for our last meeting, okay, just before the gavel went, I see Egypt asking for the floor. Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, everybody. Can we have a look at the section in the report which demonstrates our contribution yesterday, regarding the Arab counterproposal. Okay, thank you. We would kindly ask that our requests present in the document to be reflected in your meeting report, please.

If you open the document itself, allow me a minute, please, to open the document on my screen. If we open the regional contribution, please.

>> CHAIR: Egypt, you may want to proceed.

>> EGYPT: If you can open it, please, on the screen, I would appreciate it.

>> CHAIR: Egypt, be clear on which of the Arab proposals. We are having technical difficulties opening it, but if you can point us to which of the two --

>> Egypt: Capturing of Study Group 20.

>> CHAIR: The document number.

>> A32, it's 43A addendum 32.

>> CHAIR: Right. Please proceed.

>> EGYPT: Thank you. At the very last summary of the proposal, we under section, under item 5, we requested the Assembly to instruct Study Group 20 at its first meeting after the WTSA 2016 to finalize the structure and develop the appropriate text for the remaining questions taking into account the outcomes on this Assembly. We request this text to be reflected in your meeting report, please, Chair. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Right, thank you, we will include proposal number 5 in the meeting report. Thank you. United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair, good morning colleagues. On the, just a point of clarification, under the agenda item topic, yesterday the United States requested that DT19 be reclassified as an information document, rather than as a DT, after your explanation that it was provided for information. We were wondering what the status of that was, and whether that request and that action can be included in the report. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well. We will revise that as a information document. Thank you. Is there any other concern?

Okay. I see no one asking for the floor. Thank you very much.

(sound of gavel).

So we have the meeting report of yesterday's session approved. Thank you very much.

So we will proceed on to agenda item 3, feedback from CPT on its proposal to disband Study Group 11. CEPT, you have the floor. Turkey. Turkey, you have the floor. Turkey? You have the floor.

>> TURKEY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Please continue the study and then we are going to make our contributions. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Turkey. France, you have the floor.

>> FRANCE: Chair, I'm sorry, I've just arrived at meeting. I'm coming to another Study Group, another ad hoc group regarding restructuring. If you could perhaps leave us a few minutes to get my things in order, and then we will come back to the question which was, so we understand everything that had been put forward.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, France. We are now on agenda

item number 3, for our first session, there was the consideration of retaining or disbanding Study Group 11. All regions except CEPT asked for Study Group 11 to be retained. CEPT asked for time to consult and state the opposition on Study Group 11. So we are asking for CEPT what their decision is now on Study Group 11, whether it should be disbanded or it should continue its work. France, you have the floor.

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chair. As you know, there is a lengthy discussion with regards to the different topics which address the issue of restructuring of Study Groups, in particularly Study Group 11. We have committed as you requested to a number of consultations from the beginning of this conference, these took place. With these consultations, with all of delegations which were concerned with this, these discussions had some progress, some important progress, and are quite encouraging. However, at this moment, we have not completely completed our discussions. Other consultations will take place, and I think that perhaps after the coffee break during this meeting these discussions can continue, and later on today.

We hope therefore to come back to you as soon as possible with a consolidated proposal which is also

consensual one. Therefore, Mr. Chair, to make our outmost efforts so the question of restructuring of Study Groups is not a blockage in this conference. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, France, for your submission. Unfortunately, we need to start working on resolution 2, and this is a requirement for us to know the number of Study Groups, as they are to be so that everything else can be added on. That is why this is a major decision for this meeting, and we need this decision before we proceed.

So if other members will agree with my proposal, we will take a decision on this to be able to go forward, because if you remember, in our first meeting as was captured in the minutes of the report, we were expecting the feedback from CEPT yesterday, we didn't get that decision, and it was deferred to today. And there is no decision. And we don't have a coffee break to come back to, to make a decision on this.

With this said, I see no one asking for the floor. And so my proposal is, considering the proposals of all other countries and regions to retain Study Group 11, without agreement that it should be disbanded, Study Group 11 should continue its work. I see France asking for the floor.

>> FRANCE: Chair, it is not only about France, but it's a proposal from all of the European countries, and at this stages we cannot align ourselves with the conclusion you have put forward. Thank you. I said there were proposals and consultations which took place, some delegations have requested more time to come back to us. I'm in their hands. I hope to give you a response as soon as possible, Chair, on this.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, France, on behalf of CEPT. Unfortunately, we don't have that time.

So, dear delegates, it's decision time. Swiss asking for the floor. Swiss.

>> SWITZERLAND: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, good morning, everybody. I'm wondering, I think I understand your position, I know it's difficult to Chair this meeting, and you are under pressure. However, I think it was clearly stated as it's a proposal from not only from France, from the European state, and the way you ignore this at least it's very strange for me, thank you. And I support you, France, in keeping here in the request, to keep this issue open.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I see Germany asking for the floor. I see Egypt asking for the floor. I have a different proposal.

Because we do not have a coffee break to return from to take this decision, and we need this decision which affects other agenda items going forward, can we have the members of CEPT who can take decision on this in the next five minutes to decide and return to us with a feedback. Is it possible for the European states, please? Because we need this decision. Germany.

>> GERMANY: Chairman, very brief and we appreciate your efforts. However, we believe that the whole structure of the Study Groups is not only the number of the Study Groups, it's over the distribution of questions, so there is a package. And I believe that the way you want to get forward quickly is very difficult to accept for us, and we would like to urge you to take a more, say, diplomatic decision in probably the sense that you leave more time for the exact package, and probably if we discuss this resolution, we are going to discuss later, it provisionally for example you can assume that this Study Group is going to be retained, but to ask a decision now which is a decision on a package in five minutes, it's not appropriate, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. Just to clarify, there is no standing allocation of work as of now that

is a package with a decision on whether Study Group 11 should be retained or disbanded. The decision on whether Study Group 11 should be disbanded or retained is a stand alone, as was requested from CEPT to make a decision on. The allocation of work which is between Study Group 11 and Study Group 12 as are the different ad hoc, so they are not tied to each other. If you be kind enough, I want to know what time, considering that we have 10:30 to close, will you be able to give us a decision on Study Group 11 continuing, or being disbanded. From the European states, can you possibly give us the time before 10:30 that you will be available to give us this decision, considering that today we have just this morning session and it closes at 10:30. We need this as a feed into resolution 2, because when we are talking resolution 2, we have to know how many Study Groups we are working with. That is the basis, before we can do allocation of work. France, you have asked for the floor.

>> FRANCE: Chair, I'm not sure if I was clear enough before in my proposal. It is explained that this question on Study Group 11 was not a stand alone question of Study Groups for resolution 2 were made, you had agenda for this Committee 4, but the question and the discussions are very advanced. Perhaps we are working really in the

spirit of consensus, some delegations have asked for time and they consulted at night, and we hope to be able to make a consultation this morning, but it was not possible to do this. Normally we would like to do this during coffee break at 10:00. So I'm really in the hands of other delegations here, in order to move forward, at this stage it's very little, really believe me, just a few points to move forward. I think with the discussions on the right path and I hope to be able to come back to you with good news. But at this stage it is not quite possible. The discussions are linked to the other discussions on the Study Group, we need to take this as a whole on the final structure which will take place on Study Group 11. Thank you. I ask you to take this into consideration in order to move forward on that point. Thank you.

>>CHAIR: Thank you very much. We will move forward, that there is agreement to retain Study Group 11, with reservation of CEPT countries. We will hope that as you have asked for time, you can remove this reservation later at WTSA.

So ladies and gentlemen, as of now, we have Study Group 11 retained, reservation from CEPT countries. Thank you very much.

(sound of gavel).

We move on to agenda item 4, and we will take reports from com 4 ad hoc groups and drafting groups, and we will take our decisions concerning the structure and allocation of work.

Firstly, we will look at ad hoc group on Study Group 9 restructuring, and I invite the Chair from United States, Mr. Greg Ratta, to give his report. U.S., you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Temporary document or DT30 contains the brief report of the ad hoc group. We did meet on two occasions for close to four hours. I regret, Mr. Chairman, I get to report that we did not reach consensus on any of the tasks that were placed before this group. We did spend a great deal of effort at discussing particular aspects of the collection of work, dealing with quality of service issues, the affinity of that work with other work, the video broadcasting activities, home networking aspects, but none of that discussion seems to move the participants closer to a decision on any of the points that were put before the ad hoc.

I would like to draw your attention though, Mr. Chairman, that through the discussion, a couple of

aspects did come to light that may be of value to you as you continue to elaborate on these points. It may be advantageous, if one were to consider to move the work of the current Study Group 9 to another Study Group enhancing the title of whatever the receiving Study Group to emphasize the valuable work related to broadcast video that is, would be part of that Study Group. Secondly, the Study Group, the discussion observed that the work that is currently in Study Group 9 originally came from ITU-R, as was proposed in a contribution to TSAG document 109, the reference is included in the report. There was some suggestion that possibly returning that work to ITU-R Study Group 6 may be a path forward.

Now, we did not discuss in detail that, a formal proposal was not on the table for this meeting. Certainly, the details of how to do that would require some additional discussion and analysis.

But that possibility was laid out. And again, Mr. Chairman, I apologize for not reaching a real consensus on a path forward. But that is the status of the work. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your work. No apologies. It is a difficult one. As for you and for those who participated, no agreements, everybody will

decide on this going forward. So the first item was to either continue the work of Study Group 9, or to disband it. Before we set up this ad hoc Committee, we had a most regional organisation supporting that Study Group 9 be retained. Or it was a split decision as of that point of certain, really we came into this Assembly with proposals which were more towards Study Group 9 being disbanded.

But after discussions, there was a split on it being retained. Considering that there is no consensus, on Study Group 9 to be disbanded, as it has been the ITU tradition, the status quo will remain. With this, I propose to you that Study Group 9 continue its work.

I see no one asking for the floor. So.

(sound of gavel.)

Thank you, we will have Study Group 9 continue its work. On the allocation of work, Mr. Ratta, I will want you to continue work on that. Now that we know that Study Group 9 will continue its work, to come back with explicit results on home networking being proposed to Study Group 15 and video quality work Q29 and Q212 being moved to Study Group 12. These are your advice to bring your results on these for our next meeting.

If this is fine with you, thank you very much. So

the work of the Arab group on SG 9 restructuring will continue to discuss on home networking and video quality work and give us their results in our next meeting. Thank you very much to you all for your understanding.

We move on to the ad hoc group on allocation of block of work, management work, Working Party 2.2 and I'll ask, it was cochaired by Study Group 2 and Study Group 13 Chairmen. I will ask for the chairman of Study Group 13 to give us their report which is available as TD 29. Swiss, you have the floor.

>> SWITZERLAND: Okay, thank you very much, once again good morning everybody.

Study Group -- Study Group -- (chuckles) ad hoc group on this issue was meeting yesterday, and all participants worked very seriously and very hard in identifying all the details to be considered in order to come to some, try to come to some decision. And indeed, there was strong agreement of the importance of the work of Working Party 2 of Study Group 2 in ITU-T.

However, there was no agreement to move the management work from Working Party 2 to Study Group 13. There were no convincing arguments for those in the part of keeping Working Party 2 in Study Group 2 to be potentially more open to allocation of management work

to Study Group 13, and there was although in the discussion, the agreement is no possibility for let's say move part, so for instance move just question 4, 5 and 6 and keep question 7, within Study Group 2. In the end the conclusion was that we keep the status quo, so that is the result of the meeting.

Giving just a very short addendum, I got this morning, just before the meeting, and feedback regarding an editorial update, just clarify here position of CEPT, I guess it's not reflected so far here in the document, but indeed it's not changing here, the outcome. I would ask the interested delegates here to look in the posted document later, that all include this small editorial correction.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Lehman and please provide to the Secretariat the correction so it can be well captured in there. Thank you very much for your work and your report together with Dr. Gunen for this report and I think that you put it the status quo, the agreement was that the status quo remain.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is the results of the ad hoc group that Working Party 2.2 on Telecom management and network and service operations remain with Study

Group 2. I see no one asking for the floor. We have an agreement.

(gavel).

Thank you. Moving on, we look at the ad hoc group on allocation of Q111. I invite Uganda to give this report on the ad hoc group. You have the floor.

>> Uganda: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, good morning, ladies and gentlemen. The ad hoc had three meetings, the last one being this morning just before com 4. Our observations on the TORs that were given to us, we observed that the text of QI/11 as had been proposed in document 10 included aspects that were deemed applicable to the scope of Study Group 12. We then proceeded to look in the constraints of the time we had, we reviewed the questions indicated within the proposed document, and were able to achieve alignment of the scope of work to Study Group 11. Consensus was reached on the questions, on the proposed questions, except for one which remained in square brackets, which we were not able to resolve in the interest of time.

Again, in the interest of time, we were only able to address the questions part of the set of the document, and not the rest of the document.

However, Mr. Chairman, we are pleased with the

progress we made, and with that we submit the text, the revised text. Unfortunately, because of our late meeting, our document has not yet been uploaded to the temporary documents. But we have submitted revised text towards QI/11. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Madam, for your concise report and your good work and for everybody who was participating in this ad hoc group progress. You will only need time and my proposal is that you continue with your work and report to the next meeting. Thank you very much. Keep up the good work.

We proceed on to the drafting session on revision to resolution 72 and 73. We will take resolution 72 first, which is available as DT33. I invite Mr. Ahmed Zadam Study Group 5 Chair who was generous to lead us on this to report. You have the floor.

>> Yes, good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you, chairman. The drafting group on resolution 72 and 73 met yesterday, twice. Firstly during lunch break, and secondly during the evening. I'm pleased to announce that we made good progress, and we are able to submit to you two amended resolutions.

So I'll begin as you propose, Chairman, with resolution 72, which you can see in DT33. For this

resolution, we received four proposals which came from four regions, from CITEEL, from the African countries and African states -- and Arab States rather, and from the Asia Pacific region.

I would like to acknowledge that these four proposals had some points in common, but there were some differences. We worked on the basis of these four proposals to seek a consensus, a consensus text that is, on the various parts of this resolution. I'm not going to go into too much detail, but the first part, First Amendment was amendment to that of the title of this resolution. We added in the word, assessment here. The rest was more of an updating of the content given the development of recent work in Study Group 5. There are a number of deliverables which need to be mentioned in this resolution. Evidently there are also developments which have taken place in the standards and regulatory ecosystem which need to be taken into account. You have before you this text which found consensus across all of the participants in the drafting group. The amendments were done in the recognizing and recognizing further section for the most part, and also in the noting section, there were a few additions made. In the resolves part we also introduced a few more aspects.

And as regards the instructs section to the Director of the TSB we had a few amendments to make. The same goes for the invites Member States and Sector Members section. There were some proposals under that section.

So there you have it, Chairman, in brief, this is the text which we are proposing to you and which once again was the subject of consensus during our work.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. And thank you to everybody for achieving this consensus and this text, which is now available for transmission to com5 Editorial Committee for editorial refinement of the text and forwarding to WTSA plenary, hopefully, this afternoon for approval.

With this, thank you very much.

(sound of gavel).

We move to resolution 73 which is available as DT28. Again, kindly give us your results on this.

>> Thank you, Chairman. Once again, this is a resolution we were considering. We had one proposal from the Asia Pacific region during our discussion. We didn't have too much difficulty in coming to a consensus. In addition to the amendments of an editorial nature, which you can see on the first page, we also introduced a small extra paragraph in the considering further section, in

the noting section, and also at the very end in the section on instruct ITU-T Study Groups, we did make some additions to with regard to the nature of the work to be promoted and to be undertaken.

Finally there were a few points which were added in the section on inviting the Director of the TSB. So as I said, this met with complete consensus. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you again, Mr. Zadan. So ladies and gentlemen, thank you as well for your consensus on this. So this text is to be transmitted to com 5, Editorial Committee, for editorial refinement of the text and forward to WTSA plenary this afternoon for approval.

(gavel).

Thank you very much. So we will proceed to drafting session on revision of resolution 72 -- 76, sorry. I invite Dr. Ramyamet who was generous to lead. Egypt, you have the floor.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yesterday two drafting sessions were held to the revision of resolution 76, one in the early morning and another late at night. I'm pleased to announce that we have made good progress, we have engaged in very fruitful and consensual interactions in combining all the received contributions.

There are still, however, a few more articles that needs to be discussed in details which might need more time to be finalized.

We therefore expect to present the finalized consented final text to our next com 4 meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Dr. Arami for your work and for everyone who is helping to make progress on resolution 76. Keep up the work. So you have more time, and we look forward to your report in the next session. Thank you.

We will proceed and we will go on to the draft new resolution on consumer protection, which we had a lady from Japan, Miss Momiko who led this drafting session. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, thank you for giving me this great opportunity to handle this important issue.

The meeting before has been positive as J A3 2 but here I'm going to briefly explain what we had after yesterday's meeting. As instructed, group met as a drafting group to consider the new draft resolution proposed by RCC on the protection of telecommunications ICT users. The meeting was held yesterday at 1:30 p.m.

for one hour, and about 30 people from 17 different countries attended. At the very beginning of the meeting, some delegates were confused about the purpose of the ad hoc meeting. Their understanding was that ad hoc group is a place for discussion, including whether we need a new resolution on this issue.

On the other hand, other delegates mentioned that the report of the last Committee 4 meeting has been adopted, which says that ad hoc group is established as a drafting group. So because of this confusion, drafting has been slow and challenging, given the lack of agreement in the group.

Mr. Chairman, I apologize to report that we couldn't finish our work. But given this circumstance, I would like to seek kind advice from you whether we should continue drafting, and it may be more productive if you could allow us to discuss the need for creating a new resolution at this meeting Committee 4, as there does not seem to be agreement. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for the results of your meeting. This was created as a drafting session, considering the discussions that were held when the draft new recommendation was presented.

There were considerable support for the new draft

resolution on consumer protection. However, there were also a number of concerns with the text. With this, it was decided that the new draft resolution be accepted because other members preferred it, and then in the drafting session, the concerns will be raised with the text as the way they were going into specifics and decisions will be made on the text.

So to clarify again, this is a drafting group to look at the text of the draft new resolution on consumer protection. I hope this is very clear to all of us, and with this, I will grant the drafting group more time to be able to now proceed faster, clear in your minds that there is considerable support for this draft resolution, whereas there are concerns and the concerns are supposed to be addressed in the text.

Thank you very much. Again to emphasize continue working, Miss Momiko with all other delegates and I hope you will get a faster progress with our next meeting.

So thank you very much. We are done with agenda item 4. So we move on to 5. 5 is on refinement of the mandates of Study Groups and across Study Groups.

Firstly, we will take Study Group 20 matters. The Study Group 20 matters is on IoT, privacy, security, and infrastructure studies. There was the Arab proposal

which was presented on Wednesday on the mandate and the guidance for Study Group 20, that was presented.

Yesterday there was a presentation again from the Arab group on new question 320 on security, privacy, trust and identification. So we have these presentations done. This morning, we want to take the U.S. proposal 48A15, get clarifications from the United States, and then we discuss together with the proposals that were from the two previous presentations from Wednesday and yesterday.

United States, you have the floor to present 48A15.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are pleased to present our contribution document A15, contribution 48A15, which reflects our views on various aspects of ITU-T Study Group 20's future work. In this contribution, we offer some views primarily in response to document 22 of this conference which is the report of the ITU-T Study Group 20 to the WTSA, as well as document 21, which is the report of Study Group 20 to the WTSA part 1. So parts 1 and 2. In this document we specifically call out two of our concerns, which are related to the topics of privacy and infrastructure, which we are seeking clarification from WTSA.

Additionally, because this is the first opportunity that WTSA has had to consider the matter of Study Group

20's mandate and terms of reference as well, it is important that we take this time to consider the various work items that may be considered and updated.

On the issue of privacy, as we have stated multiple times during the proceedings of Study Group 20 itself, the United States believes that further clarity is needed to ensure a clear separation between international technical standards work and national matters that govern privacy and data protection.

On the topic of infrastructure, we want to clarify that it's our understanding that the physical infrastructure that is referenced in questions E20 and F20 do not include critical infrastructure protection as it's a matter of national rather than international policy to determine characterizations of critical infrastructure.

The United States in our proposal makes a number of proposals that are related to documents 20 and 21, and those are reflected in our contribution, and I won't go over them for the sake of time. But we note that the principles that are reflected here are very relevant in the discussion related to the questions of Study Group 20's mandate at large as we are considering other proposals including the new contribution from the Arab

region, A3 2. We look forward to discussing this with delegates.

Thank you for the time.

>>CHAIR: Thank you as well, United States. Is there any requests for clarification from United States? I see China asking for the floor and Egypt as well. China, you have the floor.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. SG 20, yes, formulating smart city recommendations, as for smarter cities it can improve the infrastructure of a city. We are of the view that ITU is in charge of the ICT as a specialized agency. Therefore, we wish to seek America's collaboration that why -- clarification that why SG 20 can only focus on infrastructure status. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I take it that China is seeking clarification from the United States. But Egypt, you have the floor. This is just for seeking clarification, not to start a debate.

>> EGYPT: We are well aware of that, Mr. Chairman, thank you. Just a question for clarification for our dear delegates from the United States. We share also the same inquiry with why Study Group 20 cannot engage in issues related to infrastructure given the fact that

Internet of Things and its potential applications in the industrial sector can be thought to have great applicability in managing infrastructures like smart grids and the like.

We see great benefits to our societies and to our nations in that particular domain, and we were wondering why the ITU-T in their views cannot work on aspects related to the infrastructure. This is the first point.

The second point for clarification also, it is not clear whether the delegates from the United States wish to stop using the word, privacy at all, in all the ITU-T recommendations, and replace it with confidence. Is that the intention? Because we simply, we don't understand the rationale behind it. Thank you.

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

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chairman. Firstly, I'd like to thank the USA for presenting this document and I'd like to say that we agree that this kind of international standard also has its national component.

However, we would also like to find out a little more about the views presented that these are not international issues. We are aware that there are ISO and IEC standards relating to these terms, privacy and

infrastructure protection, critical infrastructure protection that is.

In this regard, we believe that it is possible to come to a consensus on the use of these terms in ITU-T. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mexico. I see Jordan, is it asking for clarification? I want to close the list on clarifications. Then I will take the response from the United States. I have Jordan seeking clarifications. The list is closed. United, I see United Arab Emirates as well asking for, so the list is closed, Jordan and United Arab Emirates. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> Jordan: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, everybody.

I have a question. It pertains to the document which was introduced by the United States. I would firstly like to thank them for having raised some issues with regard to the work of Study Group 20. Now, as regards privacy and trust, are these two equivalent terms, are they synonyms? I do not believe so, sir.

Why are we replacing one with the, with a different word? Is there a legal issue linked to the use of these terms? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. United Arab Emirates.

>> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, all colleagues. I think maybe we seek clarification from U.S. whether maybe the terminologies in U.S. are the same or not. Our understanding that in many countries the trust confidence and privacy has bit different meaning. Maybe U.S. can clarify the meaning used in national matter, in national basis in U.S.

Then we can also get some idea from other countries as well. The second one, Mr. Chairman, that we seek clarification for is the infrastructure. I think the issue of harmonization and standardization has been very important for developing countries in particular, for a long time. This is why the standardization of relevant aspects of infrastructure is important. Accordingly I would seek clarification from U.S. on how standardization of infrastructure might not be required considering the importance of such type of requirement for developing countries.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well, United Arab Emirates. United States, you have the floor to respond to all the queries. Thank you.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chairman. Thank you to our colleagues for the questions. We

appreciate the good consideration of our proposal. First on the question of infrastructure, I'm glad for the opportunity to clarify. Our issue is not with the study of infrastructure in and of itself. It is with the classification of designating something critical infrastructure.

In the United States, for example, we have 16 critical, we have 16 sectors that have been designated critical infrastructure, and when you designate something critical infrastructure, there is a certain, there are certain national laws that govern how you protect that type of infrastructure.

We note that it is, that is the aspect that we believe is national rather than international. While we recognize the potential value of IoT applications and services in managing different types of infrastructure, that there may be aspects that we can standardize to facilitate that work, the systems are operated in ways that preclude international standardization due to the degree of physical and national specificity and how that infrastructure is built and regulated.

We are making a distinction between critical infrastructure and the designation of what is critical and infrastructure itself.

On the questions that we received related to our position on privacy, again we are trying to distinguish between the policy aspects of privacy, which again we believe are for individual countries to determine, and the technical aspects of what can support on a technical level the policies that individual nations choose to implement, in coordination with their domestic policies.

With respect to the language of privacy and trust, I think that this is worth a bit more conversation, and as I understand it, this has been a topic of conversation in Study Group 20. To us, the terms privacy and trust, they don't have sufficient, they are not well defined terms. Therefore, it is difficult for us to envision how based on that terminology without having some further discussion we study it more technically.

The reason for choosing the words confidence and security instead of privacy and trust is that there is some understanding within the ITU and within the U.N. at large on the terms confidence and security because of the WSIS action line C5. We thought that using that terminology was a potential way of bringing us forward because there is some understanding.

However, we are open to the discussion surrounding these terms. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well, United States. We have Saudi Arabia. You have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. I'd also like to thank the delegation from the United States for all of the clarifications which they have just shared with us.

On this topic we would like to remind you of what can be found in the introduction of the preamble of the statute which stipulates there is to be total recognition of the sovereign rights of each state to organise its communications, and as ITU works to produce recommendations to Member States, this does not mean that the states are necessarily committed to implement the standards of ITU as they are set out. I'd also like to remind you that what can be found in resolution 133 of the plenipot conference says that plenipot is aware of the fact that ITU and other international organisations through different activities, studies the ways in which to ensure security and privacy in communication, while protecting the privacy aspects of such as private data, and this really has to be taken into account whilst we are discussing this proposal. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well, and thank you to United

States. I see Korea asking for the floor.

>> KOREA: Thank you. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Korea supports the proposal made by United States. According to our interpretation, for the ITU-T plenipot 130, growth to build security and confidence in the use of ICT, major ITU-T activity should be focused on the technical works including technical recommendation and documents. In addition, use of the words of privacy may give some misunderstanding that ITU-T is focused on activities beyond the developing technical works.

In addition, ITU-T in Study Group 17, terms under privacy yet. Our consensus of ITU-T Study Group 17 is to consider security, consider privacy as useful security to protect personally identifiable information.

In addition, Study Group 17 has terms on PII which is personally identifiable information, it has been defined in ITU-T 1254. Actually, there is our good partner on ISO, IEC, 27, also, 27 also has terms on PII rather than privacy.

Therefore, Korea supports the proposal suggested by United States to change word privacy by confidence, and words privacy and slash or privacy and trust with confidence and security, to follow the spirit of the

ITU-T Plenipotentiary resolution 130.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We moved beyond the debate, Korea supporting the United States. Let me ask formally, is that is there any other support for the United States proposal as presented? I see Canada asking for the floor. Canada.

>> CANADA: Yes, thank you, Chair and good morning everyone. With respect to our position, we will be brief. Korea and the U.S. have raised important issues, privacy and trust are generic terms. Within Canada we have various laws and aspects related to privacy, and we also have aspects of national significance on personally identifiable information. To that end, and with respect to the work in the ITU-T, I think it's better to, as Korea delegate had mention that had we focus on confidence, security, terms that relate more to the technical debate and specifications defined within the ITU-T. To that end, the terms confidence and security are favorable.

On infrastructure, Canada also has published a national strategy on critical infrastructure protection, and have similar concerns to the U.S., in the use of that term. With that, we just would like to also support Korea and the U.S.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I see Egypt and Jordan asking for the floor. I want to close this list. I see United Arab Emirates as well. I see Bahrain. This list is closed. Egypt, Jordan, United Arab Emirates and Bahrain. Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a question of clarification. I thought we were simply opening up the discussion for clarifications. We were not stating positions, arguments and counter-arguments, if you wish, Chair, to open that debate right now, we are more than happy to engage in more details to address all the issues raised by our dear delegates from the United States and from Korea.

>> CHAIR: To clarify before you proceed on, we were at the stage where it was for clarifications, United States responded. Then we had Saudi Arabia making a comment on the clarification. Then Korea came in with support. So I formally ask for support for the U.S. proposal, and we have Canada joining in to say they support this proposal as well as asking for other members who support this proposal. But I don't see, or I see Egypt, I see Jordan, I see UAE and I see Bahrain. So that is why the floor was given to you.

>> Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Is it for support of the proposal?

>> EGYPT: No, actually, it's for raising a technical point that there is a wide difference between the term privacy and confidence. We think security as a whole includes many aspects, many services like confidence sharety, nonrepudiation, availability, access control and other main services.

It is very crucial, we understand of course the rationale of the proposal of our dear delegates from the United States and we thank them for their explanation. We think that indeed, we see indeed the proposal that they have mentioned could be a way forward for further discussions.

But we don't believe that right now it is possible to support this. I think it's too early. So thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. For those asking for the floor I close the list, Jordan, United Arab Emirates and Bahrain. Whether it is support or not, please, let us know so we can go on with the decision, considering that we have to look at agenda item 6 on resolution 2, which we are all interested in because it's about Study Groups, the point of guidance, recommendation and study areas. We should be able to

finish this agenda item this morning. So I will plead with you, Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chair. Chair, I'm a little bit concerned. There seem to be some contradictions from the United States because they said that the use of the words that Saudi Arabia said that the statute and the convention also have, use the same terms. Therefore, we need to study very closely all of the terms to ensure that we use terms that are understood by all. It is for that reason that we cannot at this stage support this proposal, before we have had a closer look at all the terminology used for this concept. Perhaps you might be able to use other terms to, in order to facilitate our task. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. United Arab Emirates.

>> United Arab Emirates: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I'm speaking, Mr. Chairman, as the Chairman of Study Group 20, not as UAE.

Mr. Chairman, with regards to the contributions from the Distinguished Delegates from the United States and the interventions from distinguished colleagues from Korea and Canada, I would like to highlight, Mr. Chairman, that in Study Group 20, we had this discussion. It was

a very long debate. We reached really sort of a conclusion that in relation between Study Group 20 and Study Group 17, Study Group 17 uses the term privacy as protection of PII. However, we have reached almost a conclusion in Study Group 20 that privacy in the context of Study Group 20 goes beyond that.

I'd just like to intervene, Mr. Chairman, to say that this matter is very important for Study Group 20. We look forward, Mr. Chairman, for the discussions. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well, Study Group 20 Chairman. Bahrain, you have the floor.

>> Bahrain: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good afternoon. I'd like to thank the delegates from the United States, Korea and Canada on the proposals and clarifying a few points. But I still do have a concern, Mr. Chair.

Yes, we are talking about ITU-T. ITU-T as we have seen in the past couple of days discussing the mandates of Study Groups and all that, does look at technical and nontechnical aspects. ITU-T is not only concerned with technical issues. We have seen that in the work of certain Study Groups particularly Study Group 3 and Study Group 20.

In relation to the words that are used, English

is not my first language, but considering that privacy deals with the trust of the users in something, we are in this WTSA 16 talking about concerns of users in telecommunication services, so I do still see that privacy, however you may pronounce it, is related to the discussion that we have at hand. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Bahrain. So that was the list for support, as we have it, we have considerable positions on this. I see Australia and United Kingdom asking for the floor. But I'll beg of you to come up with a proposal, and if you insist on having the floor, you could take it up again.

I see that you are interested in, to go into a debate. And that debate, as I hear from Study Group 20 Chairman, a lot has gone on at his Study Group. And there are almost, they are almost at a consensus.

With this, I want and I will encourage that we complete that agreement, and hopefully, it will not be before 10:30 here because I want to give the time for everyone to express themselves fully and understand themselves fully and agree on the position which is implementable, as per the guidelines agreed for restructuring. With this said, I propose an ad hoc group on Study Group 20 matters, that will be related to IoT

privacy, security and infrastructure.

This is to discuss how to handle IoT security, privacy and infrastructure studies in Study Group 20, by one, determining the use of the term privacy or confidence. 2, determine the appropriate terminology for infrastructure. 3, determine the necessary changes of the chosen terms, as in points 1 and 2, in Study Groups 20, points of guidance, proposed new and revised questions.

So I will take it again, three points to look at, determine the use of the term privacy or confidence, determine appropriate terminology for infrastructure, and then identify the necessary changes of the terms that you choose, when you go to resolution 2, for Study Group 20 points of guidance propose new question as well as revise question.

If this is clear to us, are we in agreement with this proposal? I see Australia asking for the floor, is it to accept my proposal? Australia, you have the floor.

>> AUSTRALIA: Yes, Chairman, but just to note and thank you for giving me the floor that I was a bit slow on my button before, but to note for the record that Australia did support the U.S. proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well. This will go into the ad hoc group for, and also my proposal as well, so I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you very much. We will have this ad hoc group, and then we will have the Chair, with Mr. Mylo from Brazil to lead this ad hoc group.

So, we will give you time to discuss all over the weekend. And report to the session on Monday.

So, I know there are some tours going on, and over the weekend, so you could take it formally and informally, to be able to come to a very good result for Monday morning.

So thank you very much for your understanding. I see Brazil asking for the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Although I'm not Mylo on behalf of Brazil I will say we will try to fulfill your request. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Brazil for your kind acceptance. We will move on to agenda item 6 which is on Study Group titles, mandates and responsibilities. Oh. Sorry about that. I'm already jumping 5.2 which is on Study Group 3 matters. Yesterday, what happened was that we had proposal from Bangladesh which was for aspects of quality of service to be done in Study Group 3. In the proposals of the Arab CITELE and RCC, there

are considerable proposals for regulatory work for Study Group 3. So these proposals have all been presented. What was not clear to me yesterday was the support for the Bangladesh proposal. I'll ask for the floor that is there any support for the Bangladesh proposal for regulatory aspects of quality of service to be done at Study Group 3. I see Jordan asking for the floor. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Yes, we support, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. I see Egypt asking for the floor.

>> EGYPT: Also we support the same proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. I see Rwanda and I like the responses, yes, no. Rwanda, if you can follow the trend.

>> Rwanda: We don't support the proposal, because this work is being discussed in Study Group 12, especially in question 12. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Rwanda. United Arab Emirates. Zambia, Gambia, I see the list growing. I will want to close the list. Russia. Thank you. The list is closed. Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates -- United States, Zambia, Gambia and U.S., so Saudi Arabia, you have the

floor, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. Saudi Arabia supports the proposal made by Bangladesh, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi. United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Chair. The United States supports Rwanda.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Zambia.

>> ZAMBIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, we would like to register our support for the proposal from Bangladesh. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Zambia. We will look at Gambia. From Zam to Gam. Gambia.

>> Thank you, this is just to register our support for the proposal made by Rwanda.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Gambia. Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. We support the proposal of, made by Bangladesh, naturally bearing in mind that Study Groups should not look at technical aspects of quality. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Canada.

>> CANADA: Canada wants to raise the point we don't support the proposal made by Bangladesh.

>> CHAIR: United Kingdom.

>> Thank you. We don't support the proposal, I think

there is a generic issue here. There is a number of proposals extending, proposing to expand the scope of Study Group 3, into areas which are currently covered by the D sector. I wonder if there ought to be a generic discussion about how appropriate it is for Study Group 3 to deal with matters of general economic and regulatory policy. If we can address that, and see the extent to which it's appropriate that Study Group 3 deals with these and appropriate for the D sector deal with it. I think that would help the debate considerably. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So there is a good sense of yes, we support and no, we don't support. I see Indonesia, Portugal and Brazil asking for the floor. If your proposal is to either support or not to support, kindly withdraw your request. If your proposal is either to support or not to support, kindly withdraw your request.

Okay. I see Portugal and Brazil insistent. Portugal, you have the floor.

>> Portugal: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, good morning to all of you. I would like to support the intervention made by my colleague United Kingdom on the need to have a general discussion on the intervention

of Study Group 3 on regulatory issues, and vis-a-vis what the development sector is doing. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well, Portugal. I see Brazil and Japan now. I will take these two countries and then I will give a decision on this. Brazil, you have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, regarding the discussion for regulatory issues we believe that we in fact also should discuss that, how we should engage that on Study Group 3. Specifically regarding the proposal from the Bangladesh, we believe this topic should be discussed but better place would be Study Group 12.

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

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Japan also believes this proposal from Bangladesh have, we request Study Group 12 and we need more discussion, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So there is support and no support and then there is a suggestion that considering the other proposals on the general work of Study Group 3, there will be need for more discussions. My proposal is and from your proposals, we have a ad hoc group to deal with the regulatory work in Study Group

3, and a singular point or mandate is to identify the appropriate wording of the title, mandate, lead Study Group roles and points of guidance for Study Group 3. We will have an ad hoc group on regulatory work in Study Group 3 which is to identify the appropriate wording for the title, mandate, lead Study Group roles and points of guidance for Study Group 3. We are looking up to, if this is acceptable. I see Russia asking for the floor. Russia, you have the floor.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman for your reasonable and flexible approach. However, we would like to request your assistance. Perhaps we need assistance from a legal advisor. Throughout the conference, we have heard about an overlap with the work of the D sector, development sector. However, we are aware that the development sector does not develop recommendations.

But before we begin such large scale work, we would like to find out if the Secretariat or legal advisor could clarify what the framework is within which we should work, we should be guided by. Perhaps the scope of the T sector's work in our proposals considered at this conference, in fact touches on the interests of D sector. As far as we understand it, the T sector works on

standardization and consideration of new issues or questions and the D development sector assists in implementing them.

And the broad scale use of deployment in developing countries. So we would like assistance with understanding this issue, this question. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well, Russia. We have three minutes to coffee break, meaning that we are not willing to go on coffee break because I see Egypt asking for the floor and we have not dealt with resolution 2 which by every means will have to be dealt with in this meeting before it closes. Interpreters I beg of you that we continue and delegates as well that we will continue and be able to finish at least on resolution 2.

So I see the list growing. So if you be kind enough to withdraw for me to give my proposal on this, and to respond to Russia directly, for now, your consideration of the legal advisor has been noted, and we will see how it can respond to the ad hoc group. But what is my proposal now is for general discussion on SG 3 matters, title, mandate, lead Study Group roles, points of guidance for your work all this is going into an ad hoc group.

If you accept this proposal, if I have the acceptance

of you, then we can move on to continue our discussions there. I still see Sweden asking for the floor. Sweden, you have the floor.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. I have a short question for clarification in relation to the question and intervention from Russia. There is a formal proposal on expanding the mandate of Study Group 3 from Russia. There is, so will the ad hoc address every issue in relation to the mandate of Study Group 3, or only the ones that you had on your list? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for this as well, Sweden. If you look at the agenda 5.2 now, we have three, four proposals which are linked to it. In all these four proposals, they tend to either address the title, mandate, lead Study Group roles, points of guidance for Study Group 3, so all these proposals will be considered at the ad hoc, so that it will address everything fully for Study Group 3 to be an input for resolution 2. This is what the ad hoc group will be about. I hope this clarifies it. I see no one asking for the floor. Thank you very much. I take it that that is an agreement for the setting up of the ad hoc group. Now I propose a Chairman from Zambia, Mr. Luando Boko. Is this something that Zambia can accept to Chair?

>> Yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much. We will try our best.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Zambia. Please do your best to give us a good result on Monday. Thank you very much for accepting this. Thank you all for agreeing to this, and to be able to complete agenda item 5.

We move on to agenda item 6. That is on Study Group titles, mandates and responsibilities related to resolution 2.

Here there is a baseline document of changes to resolution 2 as proposed by Study Groups and TSAG.

There is also a table which maps proposals of resolution 2 clauses. Then there is, if you look at 6.3, there is the proposal from Canada which has to be presented now on resolution 2 and next with principles. The African proposal on principles has already been presented. Canada, if you are ready, we can take your proposal.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning to all.

The Canadian proposal, we can see in every meeting there will be discussion about principles for Study Group restructuring, so based on our experience, perhaps it will be a good idea to capture some sort of guidelines for the Study Group structure in principle in the annex

D of the resolution 2. That will be, provide a much convenient way for us to, for future meetings to do restructuring that we can have some guidance which are principle to base on, discussion on the subject of restructuring. I think it would be more efficient way for us to proceed. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Canada.

Is there a request for any clarifications on the proposal from Canada? I see no one asking for the floor. Support. Is there support for the proposal from Canada to add the principles as an annex to resolution 2? I see Mexico asking for the floor. Mexico, you have the floor.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chairman. I merely wish to support the proposal made by Canada.

>> CHAIR: Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Japan generally supports this addition of annex to resolution 2. However, we want to clarify, what is actual text to be added.

>> CHAIR: That is seeking clarification, with support attached. I see France asking for the floor. France, you have the floor.

>> FRANCE: Thank you very much, Chairman. I think that we can support the proposal made by Canada on behalf

of CEPT. However, we have the same request for clarification as the Japanese delegation. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, France. Canada, you may want to clarify.

>> CANADA: Mr. Chairman, you can see in this particular meeting we have a number of contribution identified the principle for restructuring. Perhaps the meeting can form a ad hoc group for, or editing group to agree on a set of principles based on the contribution given the administration providing this particular meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I see Saudi Arabia asking for the floor. I see Jordan, I see France. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. We would like to thank the Distinguished Delegate of Canada. In fact, we have the same questions as were already posed. It seems to me that this issue was already discussed in the meeting of the TSAG and at RevCom. Now as regards various resolutions, particularly resolution 1, there is certain criteria mentioned which need to be taken into account, when restructuring Study Groups.

These principles or factors or elements are sufficient in our opinion, and of course we need to recall

that there are some regional meetings which are held to determine priorities, which serve as a basis for the restructuring of Study Groups.

We prefer to keep these mechanisms in place, without adding this annex D. Thank you, Chairman.

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

>> Jordan: Thank you, Chairman. This proposal from Canada requests us to introduce an annex to resolution 2 on general principles underlying ITU-T Study Group restructuring. In our opinion, agreeing on these principles would be quite difficult, quite complicated, as we are well aware, Study Groups have the responsibility for questions, they have a mandate and guidance which is all provided on the basis of contributions of Member States and we take into account issues such as technological progress.

In our opinion, we cannot support these principles, and therefore, we do not support this proposal. We would prefer to keep the current mechanism that we have. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. We have Japan and we have Russia asking for the floor. I want to close the list on this. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As Saudi Arabia already mentioned, Committee already produces restructuring principle, to be efficient, Japan believes text added to this new annex should be already agreed text from other Committee.

>> CHAIR: Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. We also recall in fact actively participated in the work of the RevCom and TSAG on this issue, a great deal was done. We have a large number of instruments which Saudi Arabia and Jordan in fact mentioned in their interventions. We would like to align ourselves with delegates who were not in favor of the proposal of Canada. We would also like to note that under current conditions, we cannot make enough progress on this issue, given that we have an awful lot of proposals which need to be resolved at this conference and in com 4. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So with this, there is considerable support for this to be added, and I hear there are difficulties in this as well, which means we need to discuss it some more to agree. However, I want us to know about the African proposal, if it can be reflected now, which also has been presented already, but suggests an additional principle to these guiding

principles that we agreed at TSAG.

The African common proposal introduces principle G which is to support region standardization gap, with this together with the proposal received from Canada, began I want to propose to you that we use the agreed principle which is A to F from TSAG as the baseline. First of all to decide whether to add on the new principle proposed by Africa G to these high level principles, so that is one.

2, we have to discuss how to publish this annex, whether with the options of it being part of this WTSA proceedings or as annex of resolution 2 or even referring it to resolution 1. We have to look at these three options.

With this proposal I'm looking forward to your agreement. I see no one asking for the floor. I take it that this proposal is agreed to have an ad hoc group which will use the TSAG agreement as a baseline to decide on adding on the new proposal for the African Group G as additional principle and then to discuss how to publish this, and any other refinements that we can put on this. I see Saudi Arabia asking for the floor and I see Russia asking for the floor. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. Well, these

principles were already adopted at the TSAG meeting. I think that if we content ourselves with working from that basis this will be sufficient. We will not have any need to add an annex to this resolution.

Of course, we support these principles. They are the result of work and debate in the work of the TSAG. I believe that if we add an annex, we do risk introducing modifications and that will take a great deal of time. It will require a great deal of time. I think we need to be very cautious with regard to adding or making the least modification. We would like to thank the TSAG for having established these principles which are a solid basis for our work. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, I see Russia asking for the floor. But I see Jordan and I see Bahrain and United Arab Emirates joining in. Russia, you have the floor.

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. I would like to thank my colleague from Saudi Arabia. He said what I wished to in fact say. I would like to express concern. There are delegations who are not so numerous and for us, it's really quite difficult to work in all the groups and successfully. So I would like to echo what was said by Saudi Arabia, it's in our general interest. We can continue this work in the future.

Today, we can stop at the progress we have achieved on the principles which we already have worked on, and then continue with the work in the TSAG. That is our proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. We will take Jordan, Bahrain and United Arab Emirates. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chairman. We do of course respect your proposal and your invitation on coming to a consensus. But as was indicated by Saudi Arabia and Russia, we do have various tasks planned for this weekend. So please take into account our determination to cooperate and collaborate. However, we do risk facing difficulties if we wish to come to a consensus here.

TSAG has already set a series of principles which could serve as a basis. I would invite you to take into account this intervention. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. United Arab Emirates.

>> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Chairman. Again we would like to thank the proponent for their contribution, we would like to thank Canada definitely for their contribution.

However, we would like also to associate ourselves with Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and Russia. I think adding

the principles to the resolution definitely will take a long time to agree on some of the text, maybe to review it, we agree with it in principle definitely, as it in the TSAG documents. I think I would associate ourselves to make it short with other colleagues that we keep it at TSAG as they are, and not to consider it within the resolution at this stage. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well, United Arab Emirates. The sense I get is that this needs time to be concluded.

I understand the concerns and constraints of delegations, especially with the number of ad hoc groups and informal groups that have been created during our sessions.

However, considering the support for this principle to be published, we will need that agreement. And we have options, one of them being as Canada proposed, and other options available as well, and again, the proposal from the African Group on adding bridging the standardization gap, so if you be kind enough to me, again, I will appeal to you that with the terms of reference that are used in the TSAG agreement, as a baseline, let's discuss at the ad hoc group whether to include the new principle, bridging the standardization gap, and also to determine where it is appropriate to publish these

principles. Should it be annex to resolution 2? Should it be part of the WTSA proceedings? Or should it be part of resolution 1? With that said, I see no one asking for the floor. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. We support your proposal, for this to appear in the report of the WTSA without the need to form an ad hoc group, and without a need to annex this to resolution 2. We support your proposal for these principles to feature in the report of this session, without these principles being annexed to resolution 2, and without the need to create a new special group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. You are proposing something else which is in variation with my proposal. My proposal is for an ad hoc group to also consider your option. If the two countries who are asking for the floor will withdraw, again, I'm seeking support for my proposal.

My proposal is that we have agreed at TSAG high level principles for restructuring. The proposal from Canada is to publish it as an annex to resolution 2. There is also the proposal from the African Group to add a new principle on bridging the standardization gap. Now, the task of this ad hoc group is that using the

TSAG arrangement, will the new principle be added, so that is one. Two, where is it appropriate to publish this principle? Is it part of WTSA 16 proceedings as an annex to resolution 2? Or even part of resolution 1?

This will be the task of the ad hoc group, so that when we go into it we can all determine as we want it to be. There will be time for this ad hoc group, as it feeds into, it feeds into resolution 2. But if ad hoc group is too formal, then I will ask of Canada to lead informal consultations with the various interested parties to bring us a report on Monday. If ad hoc is too formal we can have informal consultations with this guidance of new principle and where to publish the principles as a tasks to decide on. Japan, United Arab Emirates. Is it in agreement for my proposal, informal consultations? If it's in agreement, can you please withdraw your requests.

Informal consultations. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Japan generally supports the inclusion to annex and Japan also, if we need to discuss something about this, we are happy with having, however, Japan would like to clarify what is actual discussion item in this ad hoc, because we already

have 7 agreed principles, agreed at TSAG and RevCom. Item G supporting bridge standardization gap also included in this agreed principle. Japan would like to clarify what is actual discussion point during the ad hoc. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan. The discussion point is to decide whether to include the proposal from Africa on the new principle to the agreed principles and also to determine where to publish this. I have Egypt, I have UAE and Russia. I have Cote d'Ivoire. If you be kind enough, we have 7 minutes, just a minute to say your position and we can move on to finish with resolution 2, because we have another session starting from 11.

Egypt, you have the floor, briefly, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Egypt supports to keep the restructuring issues in the TSAG, and not to include it as an annex in that particular resolution and accordingly, I would kindly ask a question for clarification, whether that ad hoc would also consider as a potential option to keep these principles within the TSAG and not to add it in that, as a annex. That could be also a potential option to be discussed in the ad hoc, just I need a confirmation from you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>>CHAIR: Thank you. To, clarify, there is no ad hoc, this is informal consultations. It is not an ad hoc. Informal consultations led by Canada. If that is fine with everyone, can we withdraw our requests. UAE is asking for the floor.

>> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Definitely understand the proposed way forward, Mr. Chairman. It is important to discuss this. However, Mr. Chairman, the concern here that we have something agreed already in hand, we agree with this. Maybe we need to have somehow informal discussion with our African colleagues as well on their proposal to maybe to understand it further. However, Mr. Chairman, I think there is somehow an agreement that the baseline is the TSAG agreed principles. However, there is no other agreement to get this resolution 2, so Mr. Chairman, I think having the ad hoc or even the informal, I'm not sure if this really would help. Maybe the concerned can have further discussion together. Otherwise I mean the way forward can be just to stay with, to just move forward, retain the existing principles in the TSAG without adding it to the resolution 2. Thank you.

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

>>RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman.

We would also like to express our great gratitude to the interpreters, who we have held the discussion somewhat hostage, personally I'd like to express a great gratitude to them. I would like to say at the moment we have some points of light consensus with regard to this issue which we did achieve when working on this issue in the TSAG. The new proposal breaks with the approach that we have had thus far.

We will propose that we continue with this work in the TSAG, because we won't complete it in a single day. We would like to say that we are not in favor of including this in the, proposal in the resolution.

>> CHAIR: Cote d'Ivoire.

>> Thank you, Chairman. I would like to make a clarification, with regard to the African common proposal. As the delegate of Japan said before us, these were principles which were recommended by the RevCom which were adopted by the TSAG. There were 7 of them. These include support for bridging the standardization gap. The concern of the African Group was that the description given to the principles was not sufficient, not fully cover problems linked to reducing the standardization gap. We made a comment on this principle, principle G which was already adopted by TSAG, in order to finally

be able to review the wording, the formulation of principle G. It is not a question of a new principle. It is a question of better defining the principle itself and subsequently possibly reviewing its wording. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well, Cote d'Ivoire. I've heard all of you. I propose this. Considering the discussion, that the agreement was at TSAG and the principles are part of the TSAG report, there is no agreement to discuss whether formally or informally the proposal of Canada as an annex to resolution 2, and there is no agreement to either formally or informally discuss the suggested principle from Africa to the already agreed principles.

So with no agreement to discuss further whether formally or informally, the status quo remain, that the principles will stay in the TSAG report. Thank you very much. So we will move on. Sorry, we will move on and we will then finalize on the baseline text for resolution 2. I propose to you that for resolution 2, based on the proposal from Study Groups and TSAG which is available as 36.1 we can look at it with the terms of reference to consider all the proposals that were received to revise resolution 2 text, to consider com 4 decisions on the

results of the ad hoc groups on transfer of Working Party 2 to move to Study Group 13, Study Group 9 restructuring, allocation of Q1 work of 11, regulatory work in Study Group 3 as well as Study Group 20 privacy, security and infrastructure matters.

Then this ad hoc group are resolution 2 will provide a proposal to revise resolution 2 text to confer on Monday 31 October 2016. This is my proposal to you on the terms of reference for the revision of resolution 2. I see no one asking for the floor. So I take it and with appreciation that you agree to my proposal on resolution 2. The Chair for resolution 2 ad hoc group will be communicated to you later on, as we are still looking for a Chairman. It is quite lots of work and considering the amount of work which is already on delegates, we will look out for a Chairman, and then the information on the meeting times will be communicated as well.

So we cannot for now, because we are out of time deal with agenda item 7, by your kind agreement we suspend this for the next meeting. We will not be able to take reports of the Working Groups as well. But I want to am suggest to you for your kind consideration now our next steps. If you could go back to agenda item admin. 17, if you go back and reflect agenda document ADM17

you can go back to the annex, considering that we could not cover our agenda for today which is 7 and then we are going to the annex, if you can scroll through, we have many resolutions, new resolutions under com 4 and many others are matters to be able to at least take proposals or present the proposals, get the support and start working on them. We need all this by Monday.

With your kind consideration, I propose that we take tomorrow morning from 9:30, full com 4 meeting from 9:30 to 12:30 p.m. tomorrow to consider agenda item 7 as it was for today, and all the remaining items as listed as remaining items for com 4 for the agenda of this meeting. I see no one objecting to this. Thank you very much. Tomorrow at 9:30 we will have full com 4 to look at all these proposals. Thank you. Let's carry on.

(gavel).

(break).

>> Your attention, please, we must inform you that the ad hoc on the draft resolution on consumer protection will take place from 1:30 to 5:30 today, repeating, please note that the ad hoc on resolution, on the draft resolution on consumer protection will have a continuing session today from 1:30 to 5:30, the room will be announced on the screens.

Should I repeat just one more time? The ad hoc group on the resolution on consumer protection will hold an additional drafting session, 1:30 to 5:30 today. Sorry, to 3:30 today. So from 1:30 to 3:30 today. Thank you. (pause).

>> CHAIR: Ladies and gentlemen, please take your seats. We have limited time. We have a lot of work to do.

>> Ladies and gentlemen, can I have your attention, please? We are going to start the meeting now. If you could get back to your seats, we will be starting the meeting now. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Ladies and gentlemen, let's convene. I know there is no coffee break. But we have a lot of work to do and if we don't start we will never finish, we have to finish at noon. We have a little more than one hour for a lot of matters. Please be seated, and be silent.

(gavel).

Because in any other case we cannot proceed.

So now I ask to show the agenda on the screen. So we have the agenda, we have approval of the agenda. You see there is a lot of report on informal discussion, and after there is the part dealing with the new matters.

We have quite a long time, so the report on informal discussions should be very brief, so we can after take a decision.

Let's go to first one, approval report of previous meeting. This is in TD 23, revision 1. I ask to show the documents. The first part is up to point 1.9 we already approved yesterday. The new one is point 2. We have the report on informal consultation that is made by Mr. Reston, we have discussion of resolution 61.

I ask the one responsible for the informal consultation if there has been any progress in this resolution 61. United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. There has been no progress.

>> CHAIR: United Kingdom, you have the floor.

>> Thank you, Chair. There has been no progress at this time. We hope to continue and have some conversations this afternoon and hopefully have something to report at a later time. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. That is not good news. Resolution 60, with role of Study Group 20 and the Study Group 2, again there were informal discussion, as anyone to refer on informal discussion, have been progress on that? Resolution 60? United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair, again discussions have started but nothing formal to report at this stage. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Again, not very good news. But anyway, draft resolution RCC 4, and there I ask also if there has been resolution on this draft discussion. I think it was, United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair, that will be taken in tomorrow's ad hoc group. We have had some discussion about how a way forward could be done, and we are developing some text, thanks to colleagues from RCC who have proposed a way forward. So we will review that text tomorrow in the numbering ad hoc. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Informal discussion would also add for new resolution from APT and that's as adopted if possible resolution of relevant resolution 38 and 57. To display resolution 38, do you have any result of this informal discussion. China.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Chair. According to the discussion at yesterday, I just made a revision about new resolution about IMT 2020. I sent out to some delegates, I'm still waiting for further comments. There is no conclusion right now. So probably I will report it later.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Very likely later we will structure the discussion all together to avoid multiple groups.

Draft resolution from RCC 5, RCC continue informal discussion, can I ask if there are results? It seems no request for the floor. So there were no discussion informal? Okay. Take note. Resolution 49, the role of WIPO UNESCO, informal discussion on that? Algeria, please.

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Chair. Good morning. Yesterday following your instructions we carried out informal consultation discussions with the members of the American delegation. We managed to come to a consensual text, and also we proposed knowing that the delegates from Canada, they also made comments. We also consulted them, with regards to the outcome of these discussions, with the American delegates, they are also in agreement, and we are able to present on part of the African Group, we are going to present the text in which we discussed.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for this good news.

>> We are supporting what we have reached by Algeria as Arab group, we are agreed of what is reached. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So you are confirming good result. That is good. Now we can go on to the next one, resolution 48, where it was requested the Secretariat to make a brief report on the activity, you find that in TD 36. So please show TD 36. These are extra from the strategic plan, I understand is correct, and you see what has been reported.

Okay. That was in response to request. Now we have to see if these satisfy there and anyway we will also take the resolution in a package later on. Resolution 69, was decide to have editorial improvement to this resolution, and to report back to this meeting. Have you reached any conclusions, Sudan, please.

>> SUDAN: Yes, Chair, informal discussion has taken place but we did not come to conclusion yet.

>> CHAIR: Half good news let's say. Resolution 47, the work of the Committee of ICANN as proposed in African contribution, after discussion was agreed that informal consultation led by France on this aspect, France, can you refer, please?

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chair. We met in informal consultations yesterday evening and this morning. I'm afraid at this stage we don't have a consensual proposal to put forward to you. That is why we need to continue

our work probably in an ad hoc group to re-review the proposals that have been submitted. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: I think that you can continue informal discussion up to the time the formal group has been formed, very likely the formal group will start from tomorrow. What I encourage to continue informal discussion up to the creation of the ad hoc group on Saturday and Sunday.

Resolution 64, there was no objection, after discussion, agreed to conduct informal discussion led by Canada. Can Canada refer, please?

>> CANADA: Yes, thank you, Chair. We were able to meet within an informal group, after, immediately after your meeting yesterday from 5:30 until 6:00. Some of the delegates were not available. But we worked with them electronically. We have consolidated the APT and CEPT proposals and are working with our colleagues in the RCC to integrate theirs.

We hope to have consensus on our agreed text hopefully by the end of today. It is a matter of checking the text and potentially working some additional language.

With that, I would call interested members maybe to the front of the room at the close of the meeting,

so we can get together one last time and finalize the text. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Yes, I encourage you to complete as far as possible the informal discussion and to give us if there are result in, in form of documents that after will be analyzed by the other group we create later on.

Thanks, as I say encourage up to the creation of the formal group, continue informal discussion. Draft resolution African 3, recognize fundamental need to be discussed and studied in order to find a solution, but differing opinions were expressed in the meeting on the way forward, such as some support this new resolution, there was proposal to refer it to the policy forum or consider it in ITR. Some thought it was premature to have this resolution, since study need to be progressed. After discussion, it was agreed to conduct informal consultation, report back to our meeting. Has this informal discussion taken place? Someone has made some progress. I see no request for the floor. I'm afraid nothing has happened. That's anyway will be a question for other group.

With that, we can come back to the agenda, and see, is the report of the group on numbering resolution, we have working document 4A, resolution 65, resolution 29,

all in TD, resolution 40. Okay. So can we start with resolution 65, and give the floor to the Chair of this group. Phil, please.

>> Thank you, Chair and good morning.

The working document 01 on res 65 is the result of informal consultations and of the ad hoc meeting last evening.

We have made good progress, Chair. We have worked once through the document. There are some square brackets remaining, but I'm hopeful with a further ad hoc that we have scheduled and people have agreed to for tomorrow, starting probably at 8:30, to walk through that document and to get agreed text by the end of the weekend. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Good luck for that. Next one will be resolution 29. Can you show and Phil again introduce.

>> Thank you, Chair. Again, we have made good progress, based on informal discussions. We have, as with res 65 walked through the document once. I should say for both res 65 and res 29, people wanted time just to take text away and consult, before taking the work further. It's in the same position as for res 65, and res 29 I am intending to complete by the end of the weekend.

Good progress has been made, and it has been undertaken with good humor and good compromise by all parties. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Phil and lastly, resolution 40 that there, I understand you reach some agreement. Please go ahead.

>> Yes, Chair, we did indeed reach good agreement there. We propose to delete a word, and whilst that may not seem significant to many in the room, for those of us that are involved in numbering, it was a good discussion and a very interesting discussion around the issues of numbering.

So we present TD -- sorry, DT35 to your meeting for agreement and entering into the process for approval. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any objection to this text? So if you agree, we can be start of the procedure and go to for the Committee like that, I see no requests from the floor. So at least we approve something.

(gavel).

Go ahead, and the Committee will be pleased.

(off microphone).

Now we have today's food is resolution 52. And we have a contribution from several groups, and since we

have to finish at noon, I have to establish the group, I ask you very shortly to introduce the positions, starting for Africa, contribution 42, please. Go ahead. Some African representative. Africa is not ready. I will ask the next one, Arab, 43. Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chairman. Please allow me to introduce the amendment to resolution 52. This document number 43, addendum 22, I'm going to go directly to the amendment. It proposes changes to instruct, as regards this resolution we have also instructed Study Group 3 to continue its work on recommendations. There were also other indications with regard to economic and technical aspects. Thank you.

>> CHAIR:

(off microphone)

>> Thank you, Chairman. Just a question for clarification related to the item of agenda item 4.4, this resolution about roaming, are you returning to this item or not? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I forgot to ask it? We did the report it seems during the meeting report, quickly, it was reported already.

>> No, not yet. I was not asked to, the formal consultation report.

>> CHAIR: Something to say now, because it's better.

>> Okay, just to inform there was not conclusion yet related to the resolution IMR. We already had many discussions, but we didn't have a final text.

>> CHAIR: Sorry to have forgotten you. Keep in informal consultation. Africa, are you ready now to present 42 or not? Senegal, I'm pleased to see you.

>> Senegal: Yes, sir, thank you, Chairman. So what we are proposing in part 2 is a first point which instructs Study Group 17 to report regularly to the TS, to the TSAG on this issue. We are also requesting subgroup 3 to continue to work on development of a, on developing recommendations, technical papers and other publications regarding spam and interrelated issues. This is an instruction to Study Group 3. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Senegal, for that brief introduction. To the APT proposal 44, someone from APT can introduce the proposal. Yes, please, go ahead, you have the floor.

>> Thank you, Chair. Good morning, everyone. I am from China, and here I would like to on behalf of Asia Pacific countries, I'd like to say it is a pleasure and honor for me to present this document to every one of you. This proposal mainly targets modifications on

the resolution 52, considering the scale of spam, information from region to region based on development stages, on legal frameworks and legal systems, we see developing countries are particularly vulnerable due to their legal weaknesses. Therefore apart from regulatory policies, we consider technical measures to be critically important in combating this spam infos. Considering the resolution 45 for WTDC, which requires national and international efforts and activities in this regard, we would like to instruct Study Group 17 to collaborate with ITU-D in this regard, either through forms of trainings, workshops, or providing principles in combating spam, evaluating the implications, and weaknesses and vulnerabilities in this regard. We would also like to publicize the implementation status of Study Group 17 and the like, and based on the resolutions of PP 14 to report to ITU its roadmaps and the like in the future. That's all. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Next one will be document 45 from Europe. Someone from Europe can -- United Kingdom.

>> UNITEDKINGDOM: Thank you, Chair, Europe proposes amendments to resolution 52 to encourage the ITU-T to work in collaboration with all relevant stakeholders in order to help combat spam, including monitoring the

activities of other international organisations, in order to identify opportunities for ITU-T to support and raise awareness of such activities. Europe believes that spam is a problem which affects many stakeholders, and that in order to counter it effectively, we all need to work collaboratively together.

We also propose to invite Member States to work collaboratively with all relevant stakeholders to counter and combat spam in order to strengthen efforts to tackle this issue. Thank you.

>>CHAIR: At this time I ask if there are any questions for clarification, any remarks or anything like that. If not, I will see that there are -- yes, sorry, United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chairman. If it's okay with you, we would like to ask a question for clarification, so this question is for the proponents of both the Arab group contribution as well as the African Group contribution, as they make the same proposal to Study Group 3.

We note that the proposal in the further instructs Study Group 3 is to continue work in this area, and based on the United States' participation in Study Group 3 we are not aware of what work is currently under way

on this topic in Study Group 3. We would appreciate clarification on what work is requested to continue. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any response, we have the Chairman also of Study Group 3 with us, but I don't know if there is any response, about the work going on. There is no request for the floor.

As some of the proponents have an idea what is the kind of work already performed? Again no requests from the floor. I understand your yes raised a problem let's say. I see at the time there is a request from Study Group 7 to continue the activities in the normal forum but requesting also to collaborate with ITU-D in what is their really term of reference on providing training of workshop on this respect with the assistance of expert from Study Group 17, that is my understanding.

I think also for that, we need informal consultation, but maybe is not sufficient time. So we go directly to the other group tomorrow. But if you want to have informal consultation, willing to go up until tomorrow because I treat all in the same way.

Next one will be draft new resolution Arab 6, and is in contribution 43, can someone from Arab region introduce this proposal? Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. On behalf of the group of Arab States, I have the pleasure of introducing this draft new resolution, proposed in document 43/21. As regards continued efforts in this area, this progress has also met with challenges as regards Cybersecurity. These challenges are getting worse with IFD attacks, and with some technical developments such as the advent of the Internet of Things and i cloud.

United Nations General Assembly spoke of negative aspects accompanying certain technological developments and unanimously adopted a resolution on the respect of privacy and the right to information. We are one of the organisations working in the area of privacy or confidentiality in the information society, according to some of the basic text of the ITU resolution 130 reads that the ITU as well as other international organisations shall consider issues relating to building trust or confidence in ICTs while protecting security.

Chairman, we propose that privacy and trust be taken into account in the 2017 to 2020 period. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any request for clarification, question, comments? Japan.

>> JAPAN: Mr. Chairman, so I have a clarification

on the resolves section. Item 5, sought to instruct to ITU to Study Groups 20, but why this sentence only 20, Study Group 17 also studies about the privacy and security work. I would like to know the reason why Study Group 20 only. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. In fact, I know that there has been discussion going on to have the demarcation work between 20 and 17 and I think the result will be very likely reflected hopefully in resolution 2.

However, I can ask the proponents if they have any comments to give back. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. I would like to thank the delegate of Japan for his intervention. We do agree with him. We can also mention Study Group 17 together with Study Group 20, as relates to this issue. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chairman. A question we have for the proponents, and then we thank them for the contribution. One question is, we would like to know why they think that a new resolution is needed on this topic. We agree that the issues that they raise are significant issues, but we, once again, are concerned about having a brand-new resolution that has

not only financial implications on the union, but also does expand the scope of the T sector beyond what is provided by the 2014 Plenipotentiary Conference, in particular resolution 130 and others.

While we understand some of the issues that they are raising and the desire to undertake work in the various Study Groups, we are wondering what the purpose is for needing a brand-new resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Can Saudi Arabia respond to that?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. I thank the delegate of the United States of America for her intervention. As you are aware, Chairman, according to resolution 1 of the Assembly, the Assembly's resolutions are to study priorities for the following period, rather to set them. In fact, the progress in the area of technology and the difficulty of studying certain aspects of the issue of Internet of Things, have given rise to us presenting this proposal for a subject of study in the forthcoming study period. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: In any case, we have to have further discussion on this item, and we will create an ad hoc group on that.

And a link indirectly with that is next, hopefully

last one, resolution, Cybersecurity. We have quite a lot of contribution starting with Africa. Please, Africa. Africa is not ready. I will ask Arab state to introduce their contribution 42 -- 43, sorry, and after that come back to Africa. Arab States. Yes, Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, everyone. I have the pleasure on behalf of the group of Arab States to introduce addendum 21 to document 43. You will be aware, Chairman, as will other delegates, of the challenges posed by technology, in particular as regards Cybersecurity. The amendments that we in the Arab group are proposing are on provisions taking into account recent changes, developments and progress which has been made in the U.N. in general and the ITU in particular.

This seeks to benefit from what has been proposed recently to strengthen the scope of this resolution and its effectiveness. Moreover, Chairman, in this resolution, Study Group number 3 is called upon to adopt the necessary provisions, take necessary measures to draw up recommendations and technical documents on Cybersecurity policies and actions, relating to it as well.

So there you have it, sir, that summarizes more or less the scope of this amendment which we are proposing, and I stand ready to respond to any questions you may have on the subject, sir. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: We will ask the question at the end of presentation of all of the proposal. Africa, are you ready? Still not. APT, 44.

>> Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. On behalf of the Asia Pacific region I'm glad to introduce this proposed modification of the resolution 50 to the Assembly.

Since 2012, when WTC 12 took in Dubai ITU-T has made progress in Cybersecurity related activities. There has been some changes in the Cybersecurity landscape. We believe that the need for strengthening its activities and studying emerging new security issues for the next study period. For this reason, we propose WTSA 16 to update resolution 15, to reflect our changes and developments that we, that has occurred since 2012. Actually if you look at the recalling part we made several amendments to change the relevant documents. If you look at the considering parts, so we proposed several items to be added, for example, that number of the cyber threats and cyberattack is growing, so as well as our dependence

on the Internet and other networks, that are essential for accessing services and informations. And it looked at, we proposed several new items to be added, for example, A, ITU-T and other international organisations, through the activities examine issues relate to the building confidence and security in the use of ICT, something like that. And for the calling part, we propose some additional words and one items to be added. For recognize part, we propose improvement for several existing items to be amended. For the noting part, we propose additional one items, example item C, and for the results part 2 we propose several items for improvement and two items for addition.

For the instruct Director of TSB, we propose to add two, more than two items to be added. And for the invite Member States and Sector Members, associate, we propose to add three items to be added.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Sudan for African proposal, please go ahead.

>> SUDAN: On behalf of Africa Group, I will present modification of resolution 5. The importance of security continuity and stability of telecommunication ICT networks is clear. The need to protect

telecommunication ICT networks from threats, while ensuring respect for privacy and protection of personal information and data is highly desirable target.

Accordingly the proposed modification to resolution 50 addresses the issues discussed above, and invite ITU-T Study Group 3 to continue its work on developing recommendations, technical papers and other publications related to Cybersecurity policy, regulatory and economic issues, and their impact taking into account the emerging technologies including big data, cloud computing and the Internet of Things. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Now we have document 45 from Europe, someone from Europe can present. United Kingdom.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm speaking on behalf of CEPT. We have proposed a sensible updating of the existing resolution 50 to take account of some developments since 2012. Principally we have inserted some relevant text from the WSIS+10 outcome document, we have taken account of some changes which were agreed in the relevant WTDC Cybersecurity resolution, that is resolution 45.

We have reflected some changes which were made to

Plenipotentiary resolution 130 in Busan, we propose a deletion of a small amount of text so as to make the resolution more forward-looking. We believe our proposals represent a sensible way forward with resolution 50. We look forward to the forthcoming discussions. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Last is inter-American proposal. Contribution 46, you statements.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, the United States is presenting the resolution on behalf of CITELE. Our updates bring the text in line with resolution 130 which was updated at the Plenipotentiary Conference in 2014 and resolution 45 from WTDC-14 in Dubai, to ensure that the ITU-T's contribution on this topic is in alignment with memberships' agreed goals and priorities. As the ICT continues to grow, Cybersecurity is a priority among ITU membership especially in the Americas region. Over the last four years ITU-T Study Group 17 continued its work in this area as did many other organisations, in consortia at the national and international regional levels which is important to highlight and reflected in our contribution. We look forward to enable work in this area for the next four years. We are pleased to be

discussing this document in October as the organisation of American states recognizes October as Cybersecurity awareness month. On behalf of the United States and the Americas region, we hope everyone is having a very good month. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Now we have to ask interpreters if they allow us ten more minutes, because we have to finish the agenda. We will take care of that. Can you give ten extra minutes?

>> Yes, Chairman, ten more minutes is fine.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Also you, because we have to finish at noon, but if we finish the agenda it will be better.

Now any question to this proposal? Yes, Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. We would like to thank the various delegations for their presentations of these proposals. As regards the proposal from APT, Asia Pacific proposal, there are paragraphs in this proposal which come from resolution 130, while modifying some words.

For example, where has replaced, for example, the word privacy has been replaced by the concept of protection of identity, DPI. Of course understanding

the techniques pertaining to the Internet of Things, we would nevertheless like to seek a clarification of, from the APT group, as to why these words have been modified, Chairman.

During the workshop which preceded the WTSA that was the GSS of which I'm speaking, we recognized the importance of data and the need to protect this data. We would like to understand why this amendment has been made. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Korea, please.

>> KOREA: Thank you for this question for clarifications, indeed we discussed this issue very extensively at the APT preparation meetings, that we APT members agreed to use a privacy, to use protection of PII instead of the privacy, because we have agreed to terms on PII in ITU-T recommendations, and we believe that our privacy protection or PII is more appropriate term instead of the privacy. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any further questions? Not. In any case -- yes, I have several. United States and Russia, please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chairman. The United States would like to clarify a similar point that we did for res 52, in the Arab contribution they

are once again instruct Study Group 3 to continue work in this area and we would seek clarification as to what work has been done so far, as we are not aware of any. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. We would like to clarify the reasons why the text of the resolution 130 has been partly reproduced in this proposal. We would like some clarification on that. We are also not clear on the restrictions placed on the mandate of Study Group 17, to only technical issues, because as we know, there is a need for comprehensive solutions to security issues, including technical but also organisational issues. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We also share the same concern with that raised by our dear delegate from Russia. And we also share also a similar inquiry that was raised earlier by Saudi Arabia. We don't understand that insistence of using PII as the sole technical alternative to handle privacy issues. We think that there are other alternatives, and these can be discussed. We do not want issues related to privacy to indicate something which might be related to national

laws. This is not certainly the intention. However, we do not want to restrict only the discussions on privacy related issues to PII, since this has been already standardized in Study Group 17.

We are aware of that. However, given the new technological trends that we are currently witnessing in the Internet of Things domains and smart city communities technology domain we think that there are other possibilities which are worth further discussions. So we should not limit our future work to anything, I mean we should not limit the work of the Study Groups to only PII and say that this has been already standardized. We are aware of that. But that could also be handled in other ways, in other Study Groups. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I think that is now we have had several questions. Saudi Arabia, you want to respond to Study Group 3 question? Please go ahead. Short.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. I also would like to thank the honorable delegate from the United States for her question. Study Group 3 Chair covers within the framework of its mandate the questions linked to policy and regulation. It also covers questions linked to Cybersecurity, and we ask Study Group 3 to continue its work linked to these matters in particular.

Furthermore, we must remind Study Group 3 that it is necessary that it looks at these issues within framework of the Study Group. Furthermore, we ask Study Group 3 to ensure these matters are a priority for the upcoming study period. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I don't think we can solve the problem now, and we have very few minutes left. I want to give the task for the group, Arab group, so I ask Korea not to respond to the question that was repetition of the previous one. And go on with the further work, because just the time we have left allow us to give the further work. It is my intention to create a fired up group to work, informal consultation can continue after the creation of the group. The first one is on number of resolution 20, 29, 46, 61, 65 and new resolution RCC 4 under the Chairmanship of Mr. Reston, how many participants are envisaged in your group for the weekend activity. Phil.

>> Thank you, Chair. Last evening, when we met room E was full at the start, I have to say it didn't last all for the two hours. But there was a considerable number there last evening. I would say about ten or twelve people at most would come given the demands on other people's time for this meeting. May I indicate Chair, while you

put me down for Saturday working, the optimist in me says that should be sufficient. The pessimist in me says I may require Sunday but I'm very optimistic at this time.

>> CHAIR: Let's hope your optimism is well placed. Next I will create another group on resolution APT 1, resolution RCC 5, resolution 49. I ask Tunisia to Chair this ad hoc group. I think the name will be given, I don't know if now or later on, is there? Yes, is there. First, thanks Tunisia for accepting my request. Can I ask how many people intend to participate with this group, again for question of room reservation? Can you have a show of hands, how many? Nobody? At least one. Yes, few. Okay. You will have some colleague, Tunisia.

I ask the OTT to be dealt with by ad hoc group, initially can I ask, is Argentina there? Are you willing to have this task? I know that you are friends so it is not a good gift I give to you but -- (chuckles).

Are you willing to take this task?

Oh, you are really friend. (chuckles).

So we will have the group chaired by Argentina and we will put the name on the TD and I'm afraid that means that you have to meet tomorrow, if possible also the day after. So double burden to you. May I ask by show

of hands who is interested this group, it should be very interesting so I hope quite a lot, I am afraid quite a lot. Okay, so you will have nice time. Good luck (chuckles).

Thanks to you again.

Now we have ad hoc group on Internet resolution. I have to say for that, I was thinking to Brazil, but Brazil has already plenty of tasks. So to give this one, I will look for victim. If no victim, I am the victim. So that's not good. But what can I do, so volunteer are welcome. Come to me and say we are willing to Chair this group. And in the other case, without very pleasure but I will do. Finally, we have the ad hoc group on security related question, and there I understand that Brazil is willing to act. Can I have confirmation, please go ahead.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I will be the victim of this group. But I am afraid that we won't have too much time to deal with all the subjects. So I would, I ask all colleagues to participate in a very good mood. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: If you want exception since we have just finished, we can start already this evening, this afternoon, if you prefer.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This evening, this afternoon I'll have the 4B, I'm Chairing 4B. But maybe we can try to find a meeting time this evening, this night maybe. And Sunday morning or Sunday morning plus Sunday afternoon.

>>CHAIR: You prefer to Sunday. So if nothing happen, it will be Sunday. And that's what we will put in the final TD, Sunday for you. Any further question, requests for clarification? I forgot, show of hands who are interested in Internet resolution.

Quite a few. Okay. Security resolution? A little bit more. So we will have this group working the weekend. Good luck to all. I still look for some volunteer for the Internet. Please come to me, and show up, because I prefer to have a rest, if we can, let's say, to follow the group working, and if I have to Chair someone, I have not the possibility to go around watching all the group. With that, I think we have concluded. I think I thank -- I think it is time to close this session and see you on Monday. Good work during the weekend.

(applause).

(session adjourned at 1215)
Services Provided By:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132

800-825-5234

www.captionfirst.com

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