

Raw file.

October 29, 2016.

9:30 a.m.

ITU.

World Telecommunication Standardization
Assembly.

Hammamet, Tunisia.

Hannibal room.

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).

>> Hello. Good morning.

Good morning, delegations please be seated. We
start in two minutes. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

Welcome to the fourth meeting of Committee 4 of the WTSA
16. Committee 4 is on ITU-T work programme and
organisation.

Our languages, channel 1 is English, 2 is French,
3 is Spanish, 4 is Russian, 5 is Chinese and 6 is Arabic.

Our agenda for today can be found as ADM 25. Please project it on the screen. Our agenda for today, we will look at the report of yesterday's session, notes from Committee 2 to com 4. We will go through the reports of com 4 ad hoc groups and drafting groups, and consider the results to proceed on the way forward.

We also will take reports and outputs of Working Groups under com 4, and then we will spend the rest of the day on resolutions under com 4. And hopefully, with your cooperation, we should be able to present, discuss and hopefully agree on the way forward for all these resolutions.

With this said, again, I will want to indicate that with your indulgence it will be two minutes for the presentation of documents, and same two minutes when you are making an intervention. Please kindly consider that where there is enough disagreement, we should tend to agree with the Chairman to pause and consider the next steps forward.

With this said, I also want to introduce something in between agenda item 3 and 4, which will be an update on resolution 2. If you remember yesterday we could not inform you of the Chair of the ad hoc group on resolution 2, and there are other updates to resolution 2 as well.

So we can include that on the agenda, if you agree, as 3B, if you agree. I see no one objecting to this. This is our agenda. Do we agree to proceed on this? I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you very much. Our agenda is approved.

Now we take on agenda item 2 which is 9 approval of report from previous com 4 session. This is to be projected as TD 40. Now on the screens, page 1. Page 2. Page 3.

Thank you very much, I see no one asking for the floor. So the report of yesterday's sessions is approved. Thank you very much.

Now we will proceed on to agenda item 3, which is interCommittee issues, and we have received a note from Committee 2 as document 63, if you can project -- sorry -- okay, 62 and 63. We take 62 first. Right. So this is a note on financial responsibilities of the conference.

This is one for our noting, if you can look at 63 as well. For 63, if you consider the top paragraph, it said in reference to document 63 and 62, I'll kindly ask of the Chairman of com 3, 4 and of Working Groups to provide Committee 2 with all relevant information in respect of decisions and resolutions to be taken by

the Assembly that may have financial implications on both revenue and expenses. This will enable Committee 2 to fulfill its responsibilities as defined in the terms of reference indicated in document DT4 concerning estimates of the potential financial implications, by the execution of the decisions taken by the Assembly.

With this, we are guided to provide notes on every decision or resolution, which has financial implications to Committee 2. Thank you. I see no one asking for the floor on this.

So, we will proceed on to what we agreed as 3B, which is an update on resolution 2.

Yesterday from consultations, we heard Maria of Argentina accepting to be the Chair of the ad hoc group on resolution 2.

We have an agreement to this nomination.

I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you. We have Miss Maria Victoria of Argentina as our Chair for the ad hoc group on resolution 2. Thank you very much Miss Hackney. On the lead role for Study Group 13 and Study Group 20, in respect of big data there has been informal consultations and for now we will project the agreement that has been reached between these two Study Groups on the Study Group roles, so meaning the

inputs to resolution 2, as from the two Study Groups have been amended by what is on the screen. I will read with the involvement of SG 13 and SG 20 Chairmen, for now SG 13 will be the lead Study Group on cloud computing, and it will be the lead Study Group on big data aspects of included computing. For Study Group 20 lead Study Group on IoT and its applications and lead Study Group on big data aspects of IoT. With this said, I've seen United States asking for the floor. United States.

>>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, y'all. Is it a beautiful Saturday morning outside. And we are stuck in here.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have a question in regards to, if you bring that slide back up. On the lead Study Group on big data, aspects of cloud computing and lead Study Group on big data aspects of IoT, where is that mark of delineation? I see a problem of overlap, I see a problem of duplication. I don't understand how we can delineate who is doing what by just the lead Study Group on big data. If anything I would also propose that neither be a lead Study Group, that the Study Group 20 on aspects of IoT study issues on big data, on aspects of IoT, and that Study Group 13 Study Group studies aspects of cloud computing. You can't have two lead Study Groups on big

data. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

>> EGYPT: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and good morning to everyone. I'm not sure if the Chairman of Study Group 13 and Chairman of Study Group 20 is in the room. But perhaps the rationale for that discussion for their discussion could be presented by them. If not, I will share my views. To me it's clear there is a differentiation between the cloud computing and the IoT. I don't know the rest of the delegates what they think about that.

But in principle, there is a big difference between big data aspects of IoT and big data aspects of cloud computing. However, we might be interested to hear the views of the two Chairmen since they have conducted this informal discussion on that particular topic. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. This was not to, for us to start a debate. It was as an information. So that when we get to the Arab group on resolution 2 we know what the update is. Yet, I will give the opportunity for the Study Group Chairmen 13 and 20 to tell us about what they agreed on any of the agreed to on big data.

United Arab Emirates, SG 20 Chair, you have the floor.

>> United Arab Emirates: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and good morning to all colleagues.

After hearing the question from United States with regards to this specific point and intervention from Egypt, I would like to say that today morning, we had a meeting, myself and the Chairman of Study Group 13 on this specific topic.

And there was an agreement reached between the two Study Groups to divide the work between the two Study Groups. So 13 would be the lead on big data aspects of cloud computing, and this is clear. However, Study Group 20, the lead Study Group on big data aspects of IoT. So as I said, this is the agreement. Please perhaps I can give the floor, if you, Mr. Chairman, can give the floor to the Chairman of Study Group 13 also to give us his views on this. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Study Group 20 Chair. Study Group 13 Chairman, you have the floor.

>> Thank you very much. Good morning, everybody.

Like my colleague already has said, Chairman of Study Group 20, we met this morning to, because we became aware that from the contributions given here for updates

on resolution 2, we identified here conflicts in that both groups are claiming, the contribution claim lead Study Group responsibility for both groups, without any clear differentiation between these groups. And there was, I think you should be aware that this part that it would be in resolution, I can't -- I think it's paragraph 2 or paragraph 3, where very shortly, just one line, it is described in resolution 2 what kind of lead study areas are related to each Study Group.

The first differentiation, what we achieved and agreed, much more in detail indeed, first differentiation we saw is really to state that the Study Group is dealing with this topic in the context of their main responsibility, in both Study Group, neither in 13 nor in 20 big data is key. In 13 it's besides 5G it's cloud computing, and in 20 it's IoT. That was our proposal, how to separate in the first step and reiterate it would require further work in the detailed text of the Study Group to refine this and to find appropriate demarcation line, as it was stated by U.S.

However --

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Study Group 13 Chair. We get the sense of your agreement between Study Group 20 Chair. However, this is an information to this meeting. So that

in the discussions to resolution 2, it can be continued from there.

So if all delegates will agree with me, we could take this information as an update on what was said by Study Group 20 and Study Group 13 on their lead roles, and then we take it up at the ad hoc group on resolution 2, this afternoon.

If you can kindly withdraw your request for the floor, if it is on this update. It was for information. So that we don't discuss this any further, but leave it for the ad hoc group in the afternoon. I see France asking for the floor. France, you have the floor.

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chair. I didn't ask the floor too early but I'd like to give the comments from CEPT.

We also had questions, firstly I'd like to thank the Chairs of the two Study Groups on behalf of CEPT. We have questions regarding the division proposed on big data. I'd like to recall for the persons who were working on this that Study Group 13 already has worked on aspects of big data with regards to cloud computing. The proposal which is on the screens, leaves me a little bit confused, because it seems there might be two lead Study Groups. Perhaps I would like to offer a little bit of clarification, because no doubt the Study Group

13 should be the lead Study Group on big data with regards to cloud. On the other hand, perhaps Study Group 20 could bring its point of view on big data with regards to IoT, but without really being the lead Study Group, so this might be a solution to allow Study Group 20 to carry out studies on IoT with regards to big data. So perhaps you might want to integrate this in the proposals to the people who will be addressing these questions.

This is the point of view of CEPT. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, France. Again, I beg of those asking for the floor that if it is about this information which is an update on resolution 2, kindly withdraw so that we can move forward. Resolution 2 will be discussed this afternoon. Then this will be discussed further. There, so that we can go on to the agenda items. United States is asking for the floor. United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just to say that we support your decision, and so that we can see the terms of reference in the mandate of those two Study Groups on this issue this afternoon. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States. Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chair. In our view we support your proposal. However, following the intervention of CEPT, it seems that there are modifications might be introduced. As CEPT view essential within the Arab group states, we think that each Study Group should be the lead Study Group for a given question and the information which was shown at the beginning is very clear. We would hope that this matter is addressed and no further modifications will be therefore introduced. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, I had two agreements to stop the discussion for this to continue at the ad hoc group this afternoon. So we will carry on with the agenda item, thank you all who are asking for the floor, that we can continue the discussion at the ad hoc group, to be able to make time for the remainder of the agenda items.

So kindly, if you withdraw your request for the floor, so that we can continue on agenda item 4. We want to move on. I see Egypt, Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates. Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't understand. I'm a little bit confused. You have mentioned that you have presented this document for information, and yet I have seen modifications on the screen and you have closed the document saying that it

would be further discussed in the ad hoc, we support whatever discussions is going to be done later on but at this stage I don't understand why is it striked out on the screen. It is for information. And you have informed us very clearly, Mr. Chairman. So we are not taking decision here. We have been informed. Thank you very much the let's leave it that way. Let us, I totally agree with your proposal and then we can proceed with the agenda. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, yes. So it remains as the information, no modifications have been done to this update yet. Saudi Arabia. I want to close the list. Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates and Germany. Thank you.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. I'll be brief in my intervention.

I align myself with the honorable delegate of Egypt, and for Kingdom of Jordan. We would like to know one point, we will hold consultations on resolution 2, as you know, Mr. Chair, there is a series of meetings which are scheduled for today, and also we have the meeting of commission, Committee 4. Consequently, Chair, will the exchanges be discussing resolution 2, will they take place tomorrow which will facilitate our work? Thank

you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia, the Arab groups start meeting from 2:30 today on resolution 2. United Arab Emirates.

>> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, good morning all colleagues. I would like Mr. Chairman, also to associate ourselves with Saudi Arabia. I think our intervention relates to the timing issue, there are several aspects correlated between resolution 2 discussion and the Study Group 20 discussion which will be conducted at 4:00.

I think we can either have the resolution 2 from 2 to 4, for example, and then from 4 to 6 to have a Study Group 20, or to delay the discussion on either one of them, I think is resolution 2 to tomorrow.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for this suggestion, this alignment. This is noted. We will hopefully adjust the timing as well. Germany, you have the floor.

>> GERMANY: Good morning, everybody. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having the floor, we will be quite quick. As you have mentioned as this is for information so I consider what is there with regard to the lead Study Group on big data aspects and big data as small is in brackets and it's up to discussion and I support my

colleague of CEPT, of course. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you all. As we agree this is an update yet to be agreed, and it will be taken up at the ad hoc group on resolution 2. However, with also the Arab group on Study Group 20 matters we will make sure that they don't conflict in the timings and then they will feed into each other correctly.

So we will amend the timetables as well, and publish it. Thank you very much for your cooperation. We will move on to agenda item 4, and this will be reports from com 4 ad hoc groups and drafting groups. Then we will take decisions or agreements from these results. First of all, we want to have the report on the drafting session on draft new resolution on consumer protection. Miss Momiko of Japan, if you are here, I see a Sector Member asking for the floor.

>> Sorry, I'm here on behalf of Japan, so thank you, Chair. We actually met yesterday, and mostly completed drafting. However, there are still a few points that we haven't yet reached an agreement. And some delegates requested a little more time for consideration. So I would like to ask you to allow me to report to you at Monday's Committee 4 meeting, please. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, you are not asking for too much if it's about time. Thank you for your progress and you have the time to report at the Monday meeting. Thank you very much for your work Miss Momiko. We move on to 4B which is on the drafting session, revision of, to resolution 76. Mr. Arami of Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

We have conducted two drafting sessions yesterday, the last of which actually lasted until midnight. I would like to thank all the delegates who have participated in the discussions and in moving that resolution forward. I'm happy to report that we have finalized the resolution, and we have reached consensus, and I really thank all the delegates who stayed up that late to finalize that work. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your report. So dear delegates, thank you as well for staying up. I hear you were close to midnight in this drafting session. So this document is available as DT34, currently projected on the floor. Do we have the agreement to transmit this to Committee 5 for translation and editorial refinement? I see no one asking for the floor so thank you very much. Resolution 76.

(applause).

Thank you all for your work, resolution 76 goes to com 4, com 5, sorry, for editorial refinement. We move to 4C. We will take the report on the ad hoc group on SG 9 restructuring. Mr. Greg Ratta of the United States will give us his report. United States, you have the floor, please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe Mr. Ratta is still writing up his report, and he will be here later, if you could wait until then. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Dear delegates, kindly note that 4C we will take it up again when Mr. Ratta is in with his report. So let's note 4C still pending on the agenda.

Thank you very much. We will move on to 4D, which is a report from the ad hoc group on allocation of Q1.11. Mrs. Irene Kagua of Uganda you have the floor.

>> Uganda: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, good morning delegates. The ad hoc met yesterday and made commendable progress which I'd like to thank all the participants for.

However, we ran out of time and were unable to conclude one single item which we request to be given

more time to find the consensus text and be able to produce the whole text back to you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your progress, and everyone who participated in on this ad hoc group. One more item to agree on. So you have further time. And with your cooperation we hope Monday we will have a good result. Thank you very much.

We will proceed, and you go to agenda item 5, which is reports and outputs from Working Groups under com 4. First of all, we will want to take reports from Working Group 4A, which is DT23 rev 1, to be projected. Report from Working Group 4A, DT23 rev 1. I don't see Mr. Bigi in the room. However, we could take this up on pages and see if we can approve it. Page 1. Page 2. Page 3. Page 4. I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you.

The report of Working Group 4A is approved. We will move on to the output from Working Group 4A, which is available as DT42.

Here, Working Group 4A is asking com 4 to forward the revised text of resolution 40 to com 5 for editorial review and transmission to plenary for formal approval. So we have resolution 40 as an output of Working Group

4A. Is this something we agree to, to be transmitted to com 5? I see no one asking for the floor.

So thank you. We have resolution 40 to com 5 and onwards to the plenary for approval. Thank you.

We will want to take the report of Working Group 4B, and their report is available as DT18 rev 3.

Mr. Jeferson Nacif is not available in the room. However, we can take the report on the various pages. So page 1. Page 2. Page 3. Page 4. I see no one asking for the floor so this is the report of Working Group 4A. Thank you. This report is approved.

We will now move on to agenda item 6, which is WTSA resolutions -- okay, sorry. That is a step back, there is a update of an output, which is available as DT44. We will take the output of Working Group 4B. The first is to inform com 4 that with respect to inter-American proposal 46A18 the meeting recognized the importance of the participation of SMEs in the work of the union. At the same time, it recognized that this issue is covered by resolution 187 of the Busan 2014 and as such membership issues are not in the remit of this Assembly. In addition, the Council Working Group on financial and human resources are being considering the issue on a ITU wide basis. Consequently, Working Group 4B agreed to close

the discussion on the proposed new resolution contained in inter-American proposal 46A18 and invited Council to address the issue of participation of SMEs in the work of ITU and especially in the work of ITU-T with urgency.

Do we have an agreement to this? I see no one asking for the floor. So we accept this output from Working Group 4A. The second output is to inform com 4 that the meeting reached consensus on no change with respect to resolution 59. Do we have an agreement to this? I see no one asking for the floor. Thank you. So there is no change to resolution 59.

The third output is to invite com 4 to forward the revised text of resolution 44 as presented in DT39 to com 5 for editorial review and transmission to plenary for formal approval, so we may want to see resolution 44 now, as in DT39, on our screens.

Resolution 44 is now available on our screens, bridging standardization gap between developing and developed countries. I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you. Resolution 44 is to be transmitted to com 5 for editorial review.

(applause).

Thank you. So we proceed on the fourth outcome or

output of Working Group 4B. And this is to inform com 4 in line with document 63, that the following modifications in resolution 44 have potential financial impacts and invites com 4 to forward these to com 2. A resolves 2ii assist developing countries on developing infrastructure, international test laboratories for emerging technologies, this is also repeated in programme 2 of the action plan in the annex. B resolve 6 that interpretation shall be provided based on the request of participants on the entire plenary and Working Party of Study Groups and the entire meeting of TSAG.

3, under instructs the TSB Director 14 to provide remote participation where possible for more ITU-T workshops, seminars and forums encouraging more participation from developing countries. D, under action plan programme 3, provide guidance and supportive materials to developing countries to assist them in developing and providing undergraduate and postgraduate courses on standardization. These are parts of resolution 44 to be presented to com 2 and that has financial implications. I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you. This will be communicated to com 2. Thank you very much. That is the output report from Working Group 4B.

We now proceed to agenda item 6, WTSA resolutions under com 4. We will take the very first one, which is a draft new resolution available as ARB4 3A27.1, rev 1. Here, before I invite the presenter from the Arab States, I want to indicate that it is rev 1 because it has been revised, accommodating concerns of some members through informal discussions, and with this I will invite the presenter to ask for the floor to -- Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. Good morning to everybody. On behalf of the Arab States, I would like to present to you this document, addendum 27 to document 43. It contains a new draft resolution, concerning the enabling of open source coded software.

Chairman, as you know, the international summit on information society in 2003, 2005, defined the important role of open source software, to diminish the gap between developed and developing countries. This was an important WSIS resolution. It identified pertinent areas of activity. So SDN software networking and the use of such software, as well as other functional resources. A number of different technologies were identified in this effort.

It's important to see how important open source

networking has become important in terms of ameliorating standards, reducing costs, increasing efficiency and so forth. This has made it possible to expand the application of norms and also accelerated their dissemination.

This is why we need to utilize coordinated regulations and norms in support, and this is why we support this draft resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I think that interpretation delayed, so thank you for ending right on the spot. So this is the proposal from the Arab States. I see United Kingdom asking for the floor. The floor is now open to seek clarifications. United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We thank the delegate of Saudi Arabia for their contribution, and good morning to colleagues.

Speaking for CEPT, we have a couple of observations and queries. Firstly, at its 18 to 22nd July meeting TSAG agreed to a process for how to look at collaboration with open source communities in ITU-T, after discussion of contribution C95 to that meeting by China Telecom. The outcome is reflected in para 20.3.4 of the TSAG meeting report, and the process agreed at that time is now under way. This resolution's operative clauses would cut

across those tasks, which are now I believe at the Working Group for their input, before they have concluded.

Clearly, Chairman, we of course I think all share the desire not to duplicate work and are especially mindful of this given the reading earlier today of our obligations related to the budget and programme of the union.

Secondly, I would say, or we would say that the open source community works as I think colleagues know, very differently, almost entirely differently from the way in which ITU's standardization work is conducted. Given that the centralized method of working which often does not involve access charges, in fact I'm not sure of any open source project which does involve access charges to participate, or even registration for participation or any affiliation at all, has ITU's management prepared any review of how to reconcile these very different ways of working with one another?

What would the costs to the union be of facilitating the engagement of potentially large communities of people who are not contributing to the costs of the union? We are not suggesting by the way, Mr. Chairman, that there is anything wrong with open source, or that we see it as anything but beneficial to look at our processes and

see what we may learn from the open source community and vice versa in order to improve the output of the T sector's work.

Just that these are two radically different approaches to working, and like any exercise in integration of two radically different cultures, we should look at evolution rather than revolution, when trying to do that. We have a few issues with the text itself.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom. You have been out of time for some time. So I will want to give you a few seconds if you could --

>> Of course. We have a few issues with the text, Mr. Chairman, but I'm sure we could work those out with our colleagues, and I'm sure that we could end up with a resolution that would not only be a good compromise but one which everyone would see as useful. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, colleagues. The U.S. has two questions for clarification. The first question is that we would like to seek clarification on the specific need to be addressed by this proposal. Obviously we clearly recognize the

value of open source software but we ask our question because we know that for decades ITU-T Study Groups including at least Study Groups 11, 12 and 16, have already been involved in developing reference implementations of particular ITU-T recommendations, when the Study Group was in agreement of the value of such development.

Question number 1 would be for the contributors to please clarify the need relative to this already ongoing effort within the sector.

The second question pertains to the text of the resolution that discusses, quote, "preverification" of ITU-T recommendations. Here we would like clarification to better understand what is meant by preverification in this context. In particular, if preverification pertains to conformity assessment processes, it seems to fall under the mandate, ongoing mandate of Study Group 11 with its conformance and interoperability effort. We would need clarification on the distinction between such efforts. Thank you.

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

>> CHINA: Thank you. Firstly, I would clarify information provided by our Distinguished Delegates from United Kingdom, that's TSAG July meeting this China's

contribution for open source, it's not China Telecom.

We think open source is a very important tools for developing the standards, especially for many emerging technologies such as SDN, IoT and also new SOSS so we propose then to ITU-T especially TSAG, firstly to start the research to improve the working method and work in collaboration related conditions to facilitate the cooperation with many open source communities. That is the first step.

I think TSAG has noted this after the discussion in July, and several research points have been expressed or has been in the TSAG's report to this Assembly.

Second, I think there's many new open source forums has been founded in recent years.

So, as very special positions as ITU-T has responsibility for keeping the international interoperability issues for not only network but also for, open source has many advantages and also they are very helpful for not only developing our recommendations but also for verification of our recommendations. It's a important trend, we need to research and follow, especially for ITU-T to guaranteeing the interoperability issues of our networks. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China. I want to close the list on seeking clarifications. I see Japan, and please what you have currently in the hyperlink is the original. What has been revised is what is being projected now. We have discourse on what is being projected now because there has been a revision to what was posted as original, so that we see what the update is, and that is what we seek clarifications on. I see Japan and I see Canada. I want to close the list. The list is closed. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have two points, one is a general point and one is a specific point. The general point is, reading this lengthy proposal, there is a lot of action items. I'm thinking about the current situation of ITU-T, so many Study Group as well as focus groups already initiate some activity related to open source, for example focus of IMT 2020 where we have discussion about how to cooperate with open source.

Thinking about this proposed resolution, this is largely about SO cooperation with open source activities so we are doing that.

I want to clarify, what is a particular action tried to initiate by introducing this new resolution? For me

it's not so much clear. The point is item 6 instruct to TSB Director, we are aware there is a lot of training programme in open source community available, provided by open source community itself. So what is our training and what is the actual action trying to initiate on training. Clarify two points. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: We will take the questions and we will give the opportunity to Saudi Arabia to clarify. Then we will go on with the decision. But just as I was closing the list, Russia came in right when I said closed. So I want to give Russia the opportunity and then we will give Saudi Arabia the opportunity to respond to all the queries. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. We fully support this contribution. We agree that cooperation with open source societies, software societies, has been continuing for a long time. But it's in isolated islands, I could say, at each Committee. People are trying to do something, in 11, in 13, in others. We have a number of areas of work covering software defined networking, and it seems to us that we have reached the point where all of these different islands of activity has to be merged into one single field. So that we are not each working in our own corners, but to have one

general resolution, so that we can work, as we do with the ISO, for example, or the IEC. So we support this generalizing approach. Thank you.

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

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning to all. Canada actually feels that open source is very important way to facilitate implementation, but it is unclear for me to understand how ITU-T can help the open source community, how to synchronize, IPR issues, it is unclear to us how we are going to do that, and more than that is, I don't think open source is the only way that we can pose, there are many different models to do it.

For example, in Study Group 16, I believe, is the members, Member State or the Sector Members can work with the open source community and then they bring in the proposal to the ITU as a proposal to develop further. So there is a different way, it doesn't have to be to have a Director working together in collaboration with open source is, to me, very unclear. We would like to discuss this further. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. I summarize. Before that I give Saudi Arabia the opportunity to respond to

all these queries. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair, and good morning to everyone. I would like to thank each of the delegates for their interventions. Before responding to the specific issues, I'd like to draw everyone's attention to the importance of using open source software in the standardization sector, because in the ITU, and in ITU-T and the standardization sector, we see that we are one of the standardization bodies in the world, and so it is very important that we strengthen development in this area.

This was laid out by WSIS and I reiterate, Mr. Chairman, that for developing countries, this is a very important issue. It is very important for the World Summit Information Society, the WSIS to have ensured that this issue plays a significant role. It goes back to 2003. We are now in 2016, as you know. And given the technological convergence, the use of different apps and software across the world, notably in the Internet of Things, the use of software defined networking, SDN, network function virtualization NFV activities in this area need to be reinforced even further. Mr. Chairman, we are all well aware that, for example, TSAG is amongst those bodies of the WSIS which have acted

in this area. If there are activities that are discussed within TSAG, that doesn't mean that our Assembly cannot discuss them also. The contrary is true. We must discuss them, and we must do what we can to accelerate deployment of new activities in this area, particularly when they are so important.

Another point is that during the implementation of recommendations, we sometimes need to give these recommendations a kickstart by cooperating with open source companies and societies, SMEs, and finally, I would like to say a word about training. We ask the Director of the TSB to offer for participants and stakeholders in ITU training on working with open source software and working with communities of users and reducing costs, creating efficiency and so forth. I hope this was clear. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well, Saudi Arabia. So we have a fair sense of your submissions, and you have tried to clarify what the queries were. For now, the words of importance, open source, different cultures, radical approaches, the possibility of seeing the text being further revised to see how it can work, were positive notes that I took.

With this, I will propose to this meeting that we

further move into a drafting session, and if we agree, and Saudi Arabia will be kind enough to lead this drafting group. I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you. We have the agreement that this will go into a drafting session. Saudi Arabia, do you accept to lead this drafting group?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. Yes, of course, Chairman. We will be very happy to lead this group, unfortunately we don't have enough delegates to do this. The number of delegates, of the Saudi delegation, is quite limited. There are many ad hoc groups which will be meeting all the time. I was supposed to be participating in another ad hoc group but I'm here to work on this. If you might be able to give, might be able to give this mission, this work to somebody else, I'd really appreciate it, Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia, for your kind refusal. I see United States asking for the floor. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. We agree with our Saudi colleagues that it is extremely challenging to manage the many parallel drafting sessions that are going on right now. We would note that perhaps the answer might be to continue through informal

consultations a bit longer, and undertake drafting when we are clearer on some of the questions that were raised this morning. Thanks very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States. So that was very considerate proposal. I noted CEPT, I noted China, I noted, Canada, Japan, Russia and Saudi Arabia. So if you can have these informal consultations. Saudi Arabia, will this be fine with you?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. Apparently, there is quite a lot of support, it would seem for our submission. And with the time remaining is quite limited, therefore, I feel that it might be a wise move to set up a drafting group and perhaps the representative from China might be willing to Chair this group, if possible, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: I have Russia, I have Canada. I want to close the list on this, as to we set either a informal group or a drafting session and also who leads it. I see United Arab Emirates also coming in. I hope these three countries will be suggesting to Chair either drafting session or informal group. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Canada thinks it's better to have a some informal discussion and

consultation before we go on to the drafting group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. We face the same complications as other Distinguished Delegates do, and I'm afraid we are very busy until lunchtime tomorrow. But we are happy to Chair the drafting group, if it can take place after tomorrow, afternoon or later. Tomorrow afternoon. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your offer from tomorrow afternoon. United Arab Emirates.

>> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would like also to support Saudi Arabia and also Russia for and would like to thank Russia for Chairing this drafting group. It is a good way forward to have a drafting group, official one, to discuss further the way forward on this document. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, so the sense I get is that there should be a informal group, we have up to Sunday afternoon, tomorrow afternoon to have a drafting group, so there could be, just as we came into this meeting with certain informal consultations to revise certain part of the text, we can take that time if there is such a consensus to have informal consultations to even out

a revision 2 before we go into the drafting session in the afternoon as Russia has offered to Chair.

If Russia can give us a name, I see United States asking for the floor. United States, do you agree with my suggestion?

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. Yes, your suggestion sounds like a good way forward. I would simply also note that given the cost implications that were raised by CEPT, we might also use this time fruitfully over the next day and a half to consult with the Committee regarding some of the possible budget implications. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. All these points are noted for a drafting session from Sunday afternoon to be led by Russia. Russia, you have a name? Please proceed.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman, Dmitry, me.

>> CHAIR: We will note your name. Thank you for your kind gesture to Chair this group.

We will move on to, we want to take a break at 11:00 a.m. but however, if there is a need to continue, we would continue without a break, if it is not needed, so we will go on to resolution 77, which is on summarization

work in the ITU, standardization sector for software defined networking. We have a number of proposals. We have a proposal from United States to suppress this resolution. We have a proposal from Canada to suppress this resolution. We have modifications suggested by APT, which has already been presented. We have modifications suggested by RCC yet to be presented.

There will be three presentations on this resolution 77. I want to take the presentations which are suppression first. United States, you have the floor to present 48A2/1. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good Saturday morning to all colleagues. I'll introduce A48, excuse me, 48 A2 and be brief, making two points. United States as you say recommends suppression of resolution 77 on SDNs. First, as the APT contribution acknowledges, I quote here, the ITU-T SDN achieved some gratifying successes in this study period. Many SDN related activities are ongoing in various Study Groups of the ITU-T. Besides, there are plenty of SDN standardization activities in other standards development bodies outside the ITU, close quote there from again the APT contribution.

Indeed, in that same APT contribution, every

resolves and instructs the TSAG proposal begins with the words "to continue."

Second, since the previous Assembly, resolution 199 about promoting SDN was adopted at the Busan Plenipotentiary in 2012, so suppression also would be consistent with the TSB Director's goal to streamline resolutions. Importantly, however, suppression of resolution 77 does not suppress work on SDNs. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Is there any clarifications that we want to seek from United States? I see Iran asking for the floor. I want to take the list and close the list. China, I see China. Iran, China to seek clarifications. So the list is closed. Iran, you have the floor.

>> IRAN: Good morning, to everybody. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Regarding two proposals from United States, as we know SDN related concepts like NFV are new approach in telecommunication and network design and implementation. These concepts are main issues in virtualized networks. This approach is used in 5G wireless and wireline network platform, and as we know, there are 5G and related aspects, are on roadmap to IMT 2020. Following this interaction I want to say SDN is

one of the important roles in developing networks and related aspects, explained in resolution will be useful and extendible at least to 2020. On the other hand, question in Study Groups still are extendible, for example, regulatory aspects for network slicing in SDN should be force in related resolutions and etcetera.

So I think this resolution not only should be retained, but also should be enhanced to cover new aspects. Thank you for time, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. The list was closed on China. It was Iran and China. I won't take any more clarifications for the United States, for United States to respond. We have a number of proposals on this. China, you have the floor.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm from China, I'm also the leading person, APT common position on this subject. First of all, I'd like to thank our colleagues from U.S. and Iran. They made good comments on this subject. Our Iranian colleague gave us strong support and continue this resolution 77. The U.S. resolution has done some good analysis in the beginning, as they point out we have achieved a lot, in the last four years since we had the resolution 77 in 2012, WTS 12. China strongly supports to continue this resolution 77 on SDN

and also very successfully achieve the common position through our coordination in APT. We also had some coordination with those countries who propose to suppress this resolution, but we already achieved some mutual understanding.

Our rationale to support the continuation of this resolution is like this. For the time being and looking into the future, this resolution will provide useful guidance on SDN work in ITU-T. I think at least for the next study period, it still will be very useful. Also we need to take into account some new technical development in the industry. At the time we create this resolution 77, there wasn't such new technology like network of functionality virtualization and other relevant technology. But today this technology are very popular and they have a close relation with SDN.

We think the harmonization and coordination among all this relevant technology will be a very important subject for study which can be an important task for ITU-T. Is it a natural part of our task in SDN study which is a natural part of SDN resolution.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China.

>> CHINA: We just want to mention its value to the developing countries, with regard to this part, to

developing countries.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China.

>> CHINA: Thank you very much, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: I want to give the opportunity to United States to respond to these two comments from Iran and China. Just to remind delegations that this session has interpretation in all the six languages. You may want to go with your first language, so that it becomes quite successful for us.

United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Mr. Chairman, I believe we will hold any response until after the other presentations on suppression. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States, for your kind offer to hold on to this. We will want to take the presentation or the proposal from Canada, 51 A1/1. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. First of all, Canada wants to thank to the different Study Groups for such a quick progress on SDN standardization during the study period. I want to stress that Canada really support the continuation of the SDN standardization work in ITU-T. However, in the context of resolution 77, we believe most of the work

identified has been completed. And as Distinguished Delegate from U.S. point out, the work has been going on, and in the different Study Groups, and we understand they will pose it accordingly and we expect any new proposed teleco topics perhaps can be best served by the members provide contribution to the different Study Groups and perhaps setting of different questions, and there is no need to go to the resolution 2 to identify different technical areas.

I want to stress that by bringing suppression of the SDN resolution doesn't mean that the work won't continue. In fact, it should continue. But it should be done in the appropriate Study Group level. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Now I will give the floor for those who want to seek clarifications from Canada. I want to take the list now and close the list. I see United Arab Emirates, only. The list is closed. United Arab Emirates.

>> United Arab Emirates: I thank for the proposal but I would like to support keeping the resolution as it is. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Now we have received two proposals which are from United States and Canada to suppress resolution 77. We had the presentation of China

earlier on in the second session which was presented, on revising this resolution 77. We have one more presentation which is from the RCC, which is also seeking modification to revise this resolution 77. I want to give Russia the opportunity to present their proposal. You have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. During the current study period, a number of groups organizing, developing open source software sent to SDN information about their work in development. This group positively assessed the quality of the documents submitted. We consider that development and encouragement are both needed here.

Our proposal from the RCC countries includes development of resolution 77, with the goal of reflecting the importance of attracting companies and groups to develop OSS, also to standardize SDN. Reviewing the resolution, we suggest adding various instructs sections for SG 13 TSAG and the TSB Director aimed at expanding cooperation with open source software companies, including holding a special seminar on existing SDN solutions, on the basis of open source software. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Now I give the floor

for seeking clarifications to the Russian proposal. I see Malaysia. I want to close the list. I see Canada. Malaysia, Canada. The list is closed. United States came right -- China. Okay. So Malaysia, Canada, United States, China. The list is closed. Malaysia, you have the floor.

>> MALAYSIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Malaysia would like to support the proposal for the works of software on SDN to be further enhanced through the revision of resolution 77. The revision would ensure ITU-T continue to play prominent role in the development of SDN standards in order to facilitate SDN broad application in ICT fora. Additionally while we acknowledge that the standardization work related to SDN has already been carried out by the relevant Study Groups there are still considerable amount of research and development that can be done on this subject, in the next ITU-T study period specifically in the area of NFV and developing standards to harmonize SDN with the different open source and vendor specific control product. Malaysia welcomes future activities related to the subject in the effort to bridge the standardization gap. We reiterate support in enhancing resolution 77. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Malaysia. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Earlier we have been talking about the open source as a separate resolution. In terms of using open source to implement SDN I think it's a subject for discussion for technical perspective. I suggest we move the reference to open source for now, and I think we should focus our discussion and focusing to one resolution on open source to determine how to move ahead. If we continue the SDN work I'm sure the Member States can certainly produce contributions to suggest the application of open source in the SDN standardization. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to second what the, my distinguished colleague from Canada said. I think we should consider resolution 77 at this time, and take up open source later. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. I'll ask China, China, you have the floor.

>> CHINA: Thank you. As regards SDN standardization we must take note of the sector on the

other part, I would like to talk about the contribution of the USA. There were some mistakes in that, I feel, with the resolution 77. We have already spoken about SDN on the resolution 77, we have discussed the work of SDN at the same time, we have also looked at the new content with research. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China. These seeking clarifications from the Russian proposal, which will Russia want to respond to this?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. I don't see any contradiction, if we are going to have a general resolution on open source, and if we propose doing this work in a specific area under SDN networks. I can even give you an example. We worked very closely with the ISO, International Standards Organisation, but it's not mentioned anywhere. Things are mentioned where we thought they were appropriate, so if we are going to work on programmable networks, then we consider that it's appropriate to mention that under open source and resolution 77 should therefore continue to exist to make this possible. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia.

So from the proposals and seeking clarifications and the comments and the supports that were in suppressing

and revising resolution 77 and also the linkages and the mention of open source, all these were noted. I especially noted the following from the submissions of United States and Canada, that your creative parts of the current resolution 77 is completed and they agree that SDN work as is going on at the Study Groups should continue, and it doesn't need the resolution to be there to continue its work.

Again, I also noted from the Russia proposal of the new creative parts of resolution 77 of assigning work to SG 13, TSAG and as well as the TSB director, where it links to open source to SDN. I want to propose and have the view of our delegation that considering that we have a draft new resolution on open source to consider, what is our feeling, if all these revisions that we intend to have in resolution 77 is considered under the draft new resolution on open source, and for us to suppress resolution 77. I see Jordan asking for the floor. I see France asking for the floor. I'm asking about your feeling that the proposed revisions to resolution 77 should be taken with the draft new resolution on open source and resolution 77 suppressed. I see Jordan, I see France, I see Germany, I see United Arab Emirates, I see Saudi Arabia, I see Russia, I see

China. Now, I want to close the list. Jordan, France, Germany, United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, Russia, China, Sweden. The list is closed. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chairman. And good morning to all the Distinguished Delegates. Mr. Chairman, this proposal to suppress resolution 77, well, I believe it will be very difficult for us right now to support this proposal. There have been various proposals to modify the text of the resolution, for it to take into account recent developments in programmable networks. There is even a new resolution on open source code. But we cannot right now speak definitively with respect to the content of this new resolution. These are concerns which need to be taken into account. We would like to preserve and keep resolution 77, introducing modifications after an open exchange with those Member States who have requested the suppression of the resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jordan, for keeping it under two minutes. It's two minutes for each speaker. France, you have the floor.

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. I believe there was a compromise proposal which takes into account the different suggestions made for resolution 77, and also

for the open source issue. We are happy to support even this compromise on behalf of France. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, France. But your, maybe because of the translation, your suggestion is not clear to me.

>> FRANCE: My apologies. I will try to be more lucid. We support your proposal to suppress resolution 77 and then to work on modification of text on open source codes within the framework of a new resolution on open source. So we support you, Mr. Chairman, and your proposal.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, France, for your support. Germany, you have the floor.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would have also supported the idea to suppress resolution 77 completely, but having heard some colleagues that they would like to introduce some additional elements, we are of course ready to go with your proposal that this should be then done within the new resolution. Thank you.

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

>> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, we support the previous speakers who supported preserving this resolution on the condition of

introducing modifications. We should not mix up the different components here, which should take into account the Arab States proposal on open source software. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Again, this was also not clear to me, United Arab Emirates. What is your clear proposal, on my proposal? UAE, you have the floor.

>> United Arab Emirates: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I had the side discussion with my colleague on this topic. Perhaps I did not hear your final proposal, if you can kindly repeat your final proposal. However, let me reiterate what I have just indicated, that we would like to have the discussions on the open source, not with resolution 77. We prefer to maintain resolution 77, and discuss the amendments on this resolution separately, not to be with, not to suppress the solution, this solution include the parts from resolution 77 to the new proposals solution from Arab group on open source. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Arab Emirates. Now it is clear to me. I think we align.

We will move on, and I want to take Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: I thank you, Chairman. Very briefly, Saudi Arabia does not support the proposal aimed

at suppressing this resolution. There are some proposals from Russia and from Asia, we support the modifications proposed, and therefore, we would like to keep this resolution, and continue to discuss updating the content thereof. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. I see two persons asking from China, please coordinate to choose who will speak among you. For now, let me ask Russia. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are forced to not agree with your proposal. Open source software is a part of the work on software defined networks, and so if we remove it from resolution 77, we will have to shut down all our work, not just the work on open source. So it seems to us that these are two separate issues which should exist separately. The resolution on open source, and a resolution on SDN, 77, separately, two separate resolutions. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. We will take China, we will take Sweden. China, you have the floor.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Chairman. As regards resolution 77, we would like to have more clarifications. Four years ago, we met already in Dubai at WTSA 12 and we had a lot of differences regarding that effort.

As regards SDN, China is very confident, we had resolution 77 in 2012, after four years of development SDN technology is of course changing fast. New technologies are appearing. So for the 2016 meeting, we came to discuss together to achieve the common goal of regulation in this four-year period. We would like to review the resolution 77 regarding NFV and open source coding and networks. We would like to work together and bring together the resources of a number of different domains to expand standardization for SDN.

This is why we would like to modify resolution 77.
Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China. I take Sweden and then I come again with another proposal. Sweden, you have the floor.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. I want to express our support to your proposal, and I think it's wise to have the discussion at one place, and it's premature to have a split discussion on, at this point of time. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sweden, and thank you all to made your feelings known on my proposal. As much as I got some good support, I also saw that it is safe for me to listen to the opposing views, and with this said, just as there is the request to suppress this resolution

77, there is also available modifications proposed. With this said, I will ask China if they will be kind enough to lead a informal group, informal consultations with all the interested parties who made their submissions on resolution 77. And then report to us on Monday what the progress is. So if this is fine with you, I think this will move into further consultations, but we are keeping resolution 77 separately from the new draft resolution on open source. So this conversation is about the suppression or keeping resolution 77 with the revisions going forward. This is what the informal consultations is about. If this is fine with you, this is with the way I propose we proceed.

So thank you. I see no one asking for the floor. So China, do you accept to lead us?

>> CHINA: Thank you, Chairman, it is our great pleasure to take this assignment, yes. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China, for accepting to lead this informal consultation on resolution 77. Now we will move on to 6C, which is on resolution 78. Resolution 78 is on information and communication technology applications and standards for improved health, for improved access to e-health services. We have three

proposals on this. United States is asking for a suppression. We have proposals received from the African Group for modification and proposals from the Arab States for modifications as well.

We will want to take the proposal from the United States, 48 A3/1. United States. You have the floor.

>>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning. I thought we were going to take a coffee break. I guess we are not entitled to it. But that's fine.

Mr. Chairman, just consistent with the priorities that we have articulated in the main body of our contribution number 48, and consistence with the guidance provided by TSAG, all the activities in this resolution are fully integrated in the work of Study Group 16 and 11, and are being successfully implemented without the need to invoke this resolution.

As we have consistently mentioned across many topics, just as we did in the SDN, there is no need to proliferate resolutions unnecessarily, if the work is already integrated in the Study Groups. Accordingly the United States proposes to suppress this resolution as the work is being done and most of it has been completed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Now I will take the list of countries who want to seek clarification from the United States. I see no one asking for the floor. This is clear to all of us. Thank you very much. Now we will proceed on taking support for the proposal for United States to suppress resolution 78.

I see no one asking for the floor as well. So thank you. We will move on to the proposal of the African Group, 42 A3 1/1.

Africa, is there anybody to present this proposal on behalf of the African Group? I see no one asking for the floor. We will want to take the proposal from the Arab States 43A24/1 on resolution 78. United Arab Emirates. Sorry, Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. I have the pleasure of representing the Arab States administrations, and to present on their behalf the addendum 24 to document 43. This document contains our proposed modification of resolution 78 on applications and standards for improved access to e-health services.

Chairman, I'll be as brief as I can. Most of the modifications proposed by the Arab States administrations are modifications of an editorial character to allow us to keep up with technological

changes. In particular, in the area of standardization, specifically and ITU in general, since the last edition of the Assembly in Dubai in 2012 with the creation of Study Group 20 and a number of other developments, which have taken place during this period. Thanks, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. I'll ask countries or Member States to ask for the floor if you need any clarifications from the proposals from the Arab States.

I see no one asking for the floor. I see the United States now. I see Canada. I want to close the list. I see United States, I see Canada. The list is closed. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to thank my good friend and colleague from Saudi Arabia for his introduction. He stated that these edits are editorial in nature. I would just like to question, seek clarification which one he deems to be editorial. Thank you.

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

>> CANADA: Is it on? It is. Thank you. Yeah, Canada looked at this contribution, and thank you for the suggestion in making modifications on this resolution.

But going through, reading through some of them, I am a little puzzled by identify any particular suggest or technical solutions as a way in the resolution, we believe the resolution should be technology neutral in this case. In particular I'll talk, we think about these contributions endorsing the use of DOA and handling system as a suggest solution, the only solution. In fact there are many solutions. This will be discussed under different, different topic instead of introducing this particular resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. I will give Saudi Arabia the opportunity to respond to these two queries. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: I thank you, Chairman. I thank the Distinguished Delegate from the United States of America for having posed this pertinent question. I would simply like to recall that there are a number of editorial modifications, which can be found or more clearly we have referred to Study Group number 20.

As regards the intervention by the Distinguished Delegate representing Canada, I would like to recall that this resolution is one of the most significant resolutions from the viewpoint of developing countries. A number of areas of work exist, where developing

countries hope to achieve success working with the ITU, working together that is, in the fields of the application of ICT standards, and this with the goal of strengthening and expanding access to e-health services.

Our societies have a great need for such e-health services. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia for your clarifications. I don't know whether the Africa Group is ready to present their proposal now. I see no one asking for the floor from the African countries. But I see Sweden and I see Japan. Sweden, you have the floor.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chairman. A question for clarification here. In parallel with these discussions, we had a discussion on resolution 60 in the morning with similar language introduced by our colleagues from the Arab group. We agreed to change any reference to a particular technology for different reasons. One reason in this case was that the concept of the handle system is a trademark for the donor foundation and the concern was raised whether it was okay to use that. Another concern was that, we haven't seen any assessment of this particular technology, and we would prefer if ITU is not picking any technology or winner like this. At least not without assessment of alternative solutions first.

Thank you.

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

>> JAPAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Japan also supports intervention made by Canada and Sweden on the issue of DOA. Japan would also think DOA is specific solution, and we have a lot of alternative solutions in the market. I think as so we should carefully listen to the voice and consensus of the technical experts, and in that sense so the resolution should be technically neutral, and we are not in favor of including DOA. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. So if these two countries, I'll give the opportunity to speak, we have a sense of the way forward, so that we can deal with other resolutions as well. So I want to give the opportunity to Russia and Egypt. And then we can see the way forward. Egypt, I'm sure, is ready to present for the African Group. Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of the African Group, the African Member States revised resolution 78, in order to take into consideration the importance of the information systems in the e-health domain to transfer update and change data in a

interoperable manner.

Basically, the amendments introduced the possibility to use the handle system as a potential technology, as a potential scheme that could be used as a component of the DOA to be used in the e-health interoperability and data exchange systems.

Basically, that is the major amendments. I'm happy to receive any feedback or comment from the floor, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Is there a request for clarifications from the African proposal? I see Russia, I see Sweden. I want to close the list for clarifications. Clarifications on what was presented. Russia, Sweden and Mexico I have. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. Good morning, distinguished colleagues. Our comments will be general in character. We would like to draw your attention to the fact that the resolution before us covers issues of e-health and the contributions presented demonstrate a high level of interest in developing countries.

We support these endeavors, as we understand, that ICT technologies can make a major and significant contribution in this area, specifically for developing

countries. To speak about the comments which have already been voiced and which may be reiterated by some of our distinguished colleagues from more developed countries, we would like to propose the possibility of considering a compromise and perhaps modification of the existing text, by inclusion of all possible new technologies, in order to preserve the neutrality which was mentioned here.

But once again I would like to draw your attention to the fact that those, for those countries who presented this contribution, this issue is of critical, even life and death importance. Thank you.

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

>> SWEDEN: Thank you. I have some questions for clarification to my colleagues from Africa here. I have three comments, questions. Which assessments of needs has been done that leads to the conclusion that DOA is a preferred solution to a specific need? We would like to see that.

Secondly, it's not a consensus view that DOA features, "interoperable systems" but it's certainly something that would need to be assessed.

Thirdly, it's not meaningful to use language here

and in other proposals that ITU should recognize that DOA would have many benefits. We wonder in relation to what? In comparison to what? There has been no comprehensive review of alternatives and here again we are asked to pick winners without vetting an alternative at all. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sweden. Mexico and then I come with my proposal. Mexico, you have the floor.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chair. We would like to thank the three proposals put forward on this resolution. I'd like to speak very generally on the three proposals, because they all refer to the same subject matter, in particular, we think it is very important to maintain this resolution with some modifications with regards to the objectives of the SDGs and also some advances which have been made in different Study Groups. Nevertheless, Chairman, we also feel that the language of this resolution should be neutral, to be completely neutral, therefore, in our view, we do not agree that we, we do not agree that we should make specific mention to certain technologies. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your submissions seeking clarification. I will want to give the opportunity to Egypt to clarify on the queries that were

raised on his proposal. Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With regards to the notes I would like first to thank the colleagues who have raised the questions regarding that particular issue. With regards to e-health, our modifications were targeting issues related to Study Group 20, which is mandated also to tackle services related to that particular domain, and that is why we have focused on the competences at hand that we are currently considering in Study Group 20.

We think that the handle system addresses the major challenges that can be found in the e-health domain along with other also potential application domains. However, since we are currently focusing on the e-health domain here we think that the handle system can help in achieving the interoperability service management and, among others, which are really very pressing problems in the e-health domain.

With regards to whether the DOA or whether the handle is copyrighted technology or not, I think that this issue has been very well discussed in Study Group 20 last meeting. There have been many debates and many discussions, and we came to the conclusion that there is no problem, that first of all, this is not the case, we had received a

presentation from the donor foundation explicitly explaining that it is not copyrighted technology. However, even if this is the case that does not mean also that ITU cannot engage in activities based on that. Either way, a standard body is there to discuss whatever is being presented as a technology in order to standardize it to modify it, to generalize it. This is the whole purpose of developing standards.

And actually, a very important part of our membership of the Sector Members who actually bring their technologies to be standardized, so I can see no contradiction with that particular domain. Is there any question or any further clarification that I've missed, Mr. Chair?

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Egypt. I believe that we will save further and better particulars as were being requested, and I get the sense that we will need more time for this discussion on resolution 78.

So just to summarize, there were three contributions, the first being from the United States to suppress resolution 78 of which I asked for support and there was no support as of that time I was moving on to the next presentation. Then the presentation from the Arab States to modify resolution 78 was taken and

clarifications were given. Then there were queries and comments on mentions of particular technologies, and it was similar with the proposals from Africa, where there were mentions and there were the requests for statistics of why pointing to particular technologies and making such claims. With this said I want to propose to this meeting that with the support to modify resolution 78, we all go by that, and ask the African Arab States to come up with a consolidated text, the texts look quite similar, and this should then give the sense of using the discussions in resolution 40, because there was also the mention of resolution 40, for similar language and report back to us on Monday.

So, there are already the mention of particular technologies, with resolution 40, and it tends to appear here again with resolution 78.

So the first move is for the African states and Arab States to have a combined text, and use the lead with resolution 40 to determine the text as it is to be revised in resolution 78. This should be an informal consultation, which with good work done by Mr. Hamid Fati, you have already completed one in your group so your hands are free now so if you accept to lead us on this informal consultation, I'll be happy. Egypt, you

have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Mr. Chairman, am I being punished?

(chuckles).

>> CHAIR: It's a reward.

>> EGYPT: Well, I would humbly accept then,
Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>>CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. But I have United States
and UAE asking for the floor. I see Saudi Arabia as well
on my proposal, I suppose. United States, you have the
floor.

>>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
First of all, we concur with your approach. However,
we still wish to make two points that were already, some
of which were already raised. First of all, we have two
areas of concern. On a mild level it's about the role
of Study Group 20 in this area. We do not see, we do
not wish to expand the role of Study Group 20 any further.
However, as the Chair of Study Group 20 showed us, we
will keep calm and move on. However, our greater concern
and our much, much greater concern is about calling the
handle system in this resolution, Mr. Chairman, as was
mentioned by our colleague from Sweden and other
colleagues as well. Since this is a product, it would
seriously put in question the integrity of this

organisation as a technology neutral organisation. Interestingly, Mr. Chairman, I note that the counselor of this activity is the man sitting on your right. And this mention would undermine the work that already has been completed by the ITU, and would ignore its own recommendations.

Under this auspices, the ITU has already completed data exchange and interoperability on e-health with the continue alliance and has been very nicely demonstrated proving ITU-T publish technologies in the A series, again, I would reiterate that the ITU-T does have recommendations proving interoperability, design guidelines for e-health, that were demonstrated three years ago under the auspices of Study Group 16 and with the counselor on your right. Again invoking the Handle system as a product would seriously question the integrity of the ITU-T.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well, United States, the first time you really accede to the time. We will take on Sweden, Sweden, you have the floor.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So just two questions, in relation to the statement on copyright. Would it be possible to, for us to see that legal opinion

that the contribution, the contributed technology is not copyrighted?

Secondly, we wonder whether there has been any patent declaration when this technology was brought to ITU. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sweden. UAE.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Listening carefully to the discussion, I would like just to have some maybe highlight on a long discussion that we had in the last Study Group 20 meeting. Actually, Mr. Chairman, the same discussion have been conducted there in question 4 and the views was presented, exactly the same that we heard right now from some of the administrations.

After consultation with the legal advisor, Mr. Chairman, within the question 4, and after the declaration, there is no any copyrights that have been already expired for the Dona, for the Handle system, that the Handle system is not a product, that are being promoted, in case you mentioned it in the ITU document.

The reason, Mr. Chairman, that there are some very let us say difference, very important difference between talking about a product it being promoted, or a technology that being standardized. This is exactly the difference that we speak about right now.

The legal advisor at that time give an example. For example, with outlook, Microsoft Outlook or any other product, so such kind of a product is a specific product belonging to specific company that have so many other as a product. However when it comes to the Handle, the difference is it's DOA architecture already recognized and already discussed and agreed to be let us say addressed within the ITU.

Mr. Chairman, the same discussion now is being repeated. I would maybe save the time to say the legal advisor and Study Group 20 and I think the capture of the discussion, I think we can return back to it, if it's important, and save the time, shows that it is not a product as can be promoted in case if we mention it within the ITU document or resolution. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, so we take the final comment from Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. What I wanted to say was captured very well by our distinguished colleague from United Arab Emirates. We have to distinguish between the architecture itself and the implementation of the architecture, Mr. Chairman.

Technology neutral is not a requirement of standards.

Please think about how many standards are technology oriented and specific. Company technology, I would say bias, we have G.fast, H.264 and 265, IPTV, all of them specifically technology oriented. I want to say that. I don't want to take much time. The discussion has taken place as indicated by my colleague United Arab Emirates and legal advice was put and can be referred by these distinguished colleagues who requested that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. This is one of the many conversations which have gone on at Study Group 20, and was almost agreed to, and will need time to be agreed to.

So would Egypt accept to lead this informal group, one, it is very clear that we are looking for -- sorry, informal consultation, it is clear that one, there should be a consolidated text from the proposal from the African Group and the Arab group, and two, their consents with the text of the revision, one, the role of Study Group 20 in this resolution, calling out the Handle system for the sake of net neutrality and also the legal opinion on copyrights which is associated with the Handle system.

So, Mr. Ahmed Fati, this is something to guide the informal consultation. With all you accepting this, moving forward, we expect your results on Monday.

Thank you very much.

So we will proceed and we will go to 5D. 5D is a draft new recommendation on standardization work, sorry, resolution on standardization work in the ITU-T telecoms standardization sector for cloud based events data monitoring application. We have received a proposal from APT. APT, 44A16/1. Malaysia, you have the floor.

>>MALAYSIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Goodmorning to all colleagues. It is my pleasure to present document 44 addendum 16 on behalf of the APT member administration.

Mr. Chairman, in February this year the ITU-T focus group on aviation applications of cloud computing for flight data monitoring have presented its final report to the TSAG in Geneva. The ITU-T focus group on aviation cloud was established by TSAG in June, 2014, in response to a special meeting on global flight tracking of aircraft organized by the International Civil Aviation Organisation, and an expert dialogue on realtime monitoring of flight data facilitated by the ITU.

The outcome of the final report was accepted by TSAG and appropriate deliverables were communicated to the relevant ITU-T and ITU-R Study Groups, ICAO and other organisation for consideration and further action.

However, the coordination of activity between the

Study Groups and the aviation community in developing standards for realtime and cloud based data monitoring can still be improved. We recognize the relevant achievements that has been made by the respective Study Groups, in the area of cloud computing, security and M2M and acknowledge the constraints faced by the Study Groups to collaborate with standard developing organisations from other industries.

Perhaps one solution is to extend the principle of realtime data monitoring beyond the aviation to other industries. Mr. Chairman, while data recorders have their origins in aviation as a important tool for increasing safety, there is a growing interest in event data recorders other than aviation industries, as means to safely connect and automate devices. For example, event data recorder for transportation, digital recorders for utility services and cardiac event recorder for healthcare.

Additionally, the introduction of cloud computing and event data monitor can provide great benefits as cloud computing enables network access to a scalable and elastic pool of shareable physical resources with potential for self service provisioning as well as administration on demand.

When connecting billions of devices.

It is essential to highlight that this issue, that issue on information security is important to ensure the safety and trust when realizing the potential of cloud based event data monitoring technology. In this regard, with the interest to accelerate development of standards for cloud based event data monitoring application, APT members would like to propose a new WTSA resolution on standardization work in the ITU telecommunications standardization sector for cloud based event data monitoring application for the consideration of this Assembly. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Malaysia. Now I will want to take those seeking clarifications for this proposal from the APT. I see no one asking for the floor. I see China now. I really want to close the list. I see United States. I see United Arab Emirates.

To close the list, China, U.S., UAE. Thank you. So China, you have the floor.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, China would like to support this proposal to launch a new resolution. We believe it's a beneficial action for ITU-T because it will combine cloud computing, data

analytics and Internet of Things. It can extend the value of ITU-T's work on flight data tracking analysis. During the last two years, as a result of focus group, it is worthwhile to extend the research to other area that will create more benefits for the industry.

This is actually now why we support this proposal. We are part of the common position formed by APT. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China. I asked for those seeking clarifications. To make very good use of our time, we understand that a proposal from a region definitely has support of Member States, and we need not spend the time taking those support on the floor. So that we could use better the time that we have.

United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll just skip the introduction part. I would simply question as to why can't this be done through a question in Study Group 13. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Malaysia, this is the singular question to you. Why a resolution and not a question to Study Group 13? Malaysia, you have the floor.

>> Malaysia: Thank you, Chair. I think for the

first one, we have been requesting participation from the Member States countries as well as the, with recommendation from TSAG to all the Study Group, including SG13. However, there is no contribution after the recommendation of TSAG, and therefore, this resolution is to drive concerted effort for all the Study Group resolution work on cloud based event automating application.

This is to make sure that we have enough mandate, not only from TSAG but from, coming from WTSA itself, one of the resolution to expedite, to accelerate the standardization work on this particular critical topics for all the Study Group as mentioned by TSAG and as recommended by TSAG. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well. I see Russia asking for the floor now. We will want to go into some discussions further. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. We would like clarification on the use of standardization of applications, why applications? The activities of the T sector generally encompass protocol standardization and standardization of applications might mean that they will make reference to specific applications. Those we have heard this morning, standardization should not focus

on specific technologies.

So what do we understand by application standardization? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. I see France asking for the floor. France, you have the floor.

>> FRANCE: Thank you very much, Chairman. CEPT has a position. The focus group which has worked on this question and the response to question which was put forward, we think that the Study Group 13 might have a role as a lead Study Group on this issue. We don't think it is necessary that we need to have a specific resolution in order to go forward on this.

Therefore, we support which has been being worked on in Study Group 13 which should be the lead Study Group and that a resolution is not necessary in order to move the work forward. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, CEPT. So I will want to seek further clarifications from Russia. You mentioned that the use of applications, if you, do you mean that the use of the word application in all the text, as a word? Is that what you want to point to, that you are seeking clarification on that the use of the word application is inappropriate, and what do you suggest as the appropriate word? If that is the case. Russia, you have

the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. Yes, my question is regarding the term application. The text which has been put forward might be considered as a standardization activity of applications, as a product, as a software product. Therefore, we should modify the text to point out that it is referring to standardizing technologies which would be used in this particular area. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. I'll give the opportunity to Malaysia to respond to the additional queries that came up. Malaysia, you have the floor.

>> MALAYSIA: Thank you, Chair. Thank you all distinguished colleague from Russia with the proposed recommendation. I think we have discussed it in APT, I would agree that the text on the technologies is more appropriate standardization work on technologies related to cloud based event monitoring as proposed by Russia. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So, for this proposal, there is enough support, it coming in from a regional group. Then there was the objection that this is already being done and no need for such a new resolution. There was the question on why this should be a resolution and not a

question, and then also there was the question on why the use of application and not technologies. Ladies and gentlemen, there is enough support for this new resolution. So I propose that we are meant using the term application with technologies, and if this is appropriate, and acceptable by us all, we take this to com 5 for editorial refinement. This is my proposal. Portugal, you have the floor.

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

First of all, I obviously would like to support our French colleagues who spoke on behalf of France, and also to remind colleagues in this Saturday morning that we have been reminded several times that we should work to streamline ITU-T resolutions, but what we have seen this morning so far is an enormous proliferation of new resolutions, and so we should be reminded that we should do something also to streamline our work in the resolutions that we are developing here. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Portugal. You see approach to this by our agenda going forward, really there was enormous proposals on draft new resolutions, more than we ever have.

So you see them listed, but you see the best way in streamlining all this, already, you have seen some proposals being made already and all these part of this streamlining process.

I want to take United States. United States, you have the floor.

>>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I mentioned earlier, I skipped the introduction part. This is a very important topic, but it does not merit a resolution to implement it. As mentioned in the Malaysian contribution, Asia Pacific contribution, and we thank Malaysia for this contribution, it says, at the conclusion of the focus group on aviation cloud, the TSAG recommendations were communicated to the respective ITU-T and ITU-R Study Groups and ICAO and other organisations for consideration and further action. As supported by France several Study Groups have taken action and held several meetings on this topic. In fact, I cochaired one of them myself. Furthermore, we have already sent a liaison to ICAO which held its first meeting on this topic in September this past month, and we are awaiting a liaison statement back from them to implement the work that is being requested here.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we have taken action on

the output of the focus group and they are being fully implemented in Study Group 13, as well as in Study Group 17 in terms of the security aspect of the cloud for the aviation application.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, again, I kindly ask you to reconsider this as a question, and we will be more than happy to work with our colleagues from Malaysia in drafting, if needed, either revising the question in Study Group 13 or putting in a new question for event data recorders. Again, this is a very important topic, but it does not merit a resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. So I'll take a step back and ask a direct question to Russia. Russia, with your consent with the use of the term applications, would it be appropriate if it is replaced with technologies? Is this something you consider? Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. We are completely satisfied by the option of such a substitution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Now we move to the stage that every word in here, application, is replaced with technologies. Now, our decision is on whether this resolution merits to be a resolution. That is the

decision to be taken.

Malaysia, I want you to accept to have informal consultation to convince Distinguished Delegates further, I know you made very good terms passionately on why this should be a new draft recommendation.

So I give you the opportunity to have informal consultations with the CEPT, and with the United States, on the merit of this being a new resolution. Is that acceptable by you, Malaysia?

>> MALAYSIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, we accept your proposal, and we thank you very much for the opportunity. We will engage on a informal discussion basis. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. With the acceptance of Malaysia, I hope all interested parties considering that this proposal is not just on aviation, we will have a good resolve and for the informal meeting or discussions to give us a report on Monday.

Thank you all for your acceptance.

We will want to pause here on resolutions under com 4, and go back to our agenda item 4C, which is on the ad hoc group on Study Group 9 restructuring.

Mr. Greg Ratta of United States, if you are with me, your report is ready as DT45. If I will have your

attention, Mr. Greg Ratta, of United States, you can take your report now on the ad hoc group on SG 9 restructuring. You have the floor.

>>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, colleagues.

The ad hoc group on the restructure of Study Group 9 met again this morning, at the request of this Committee, to attempt to consider what to do about the questions related to quality of service and home networking that are presently assigned to Study Group 9.

We had a similar result to the original attempt to find consensus on a way forward which is there is no agreement. We did consider several alternatives, Mr. Chairman. There was a lot of interest in attempting to repackage work, recognizing the significant preparations from various regions on where affinities could be achieved with other work.

But again, Mr. Chairman, we were not able to reach consensus. I did make a specific offer in my capacity as Chairman on a possible compromise to move forward, which although it did not reach agreement, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to offer it to you, because at a Committee level, you have more tools at your disposal than I did at the ad hoc level.

Recognizing that there seems to be consensus growing on the movement of the quality of service questions, studies within Study Group 11 to Study Group 12, we view this as an interest of the participants in this Assembly to try and consolidate and recognize the prominence of quality of service studies in a single Study Group.

So, would offer that moving the two questions, question 2 and question 12 of the current Study Group 9 over to Study Group 12 would have a benefit of reinforcing that growing consensus. If we were to take that step, although there were some advantages and interest in moving the home networking work out of the current Study Group 9, that would leave the remaining set of questions given we have already decided we must keep Study Group 9 with only ten, which seems to be an extremely small number of questions for a Study Group. Also it was observed during our discussions within the ad hoc group that in some countries, different ministries are responsible for cable television versus telecommunications.

So moving the home networking aspect out could be a complication. So the proposal for you to consider, if you wish, Mr. Chairman, would be to move just question 2 and question 12 over to consideration with the other

questions on quality of service in Study Group 12, and that is the only modification that we introduce at this time. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Greg Ratta of the United States for your report on the ad hoc group on SG 9 restructuring. Thank you all for those who took time to participate and giving us this result.

Additional tool or mechanism that I only have which is different from Mr. Ratta is that I have interpretation, and so as he has put it before us, I also want to put it before you, and to clarify on its points and to give certain preamble. He indicated that if these questions are moved to, moved out of Study Group 9, they will be left with 11 questions. And maybe it will be low enough for such a Study Group.

But as we have now the current Study Group 5 has 8 questions for which yesterday we saw some good results from the Working Group. Again, we can look at Study Group 16, which has 11 questions, which also produced some very good results. So it is not the number of questions which will really determine your working but the appropriateness and the congeniality of the experts in the scope.

So with this said I want to put up the proposal

that it has been proposed and it went to the ad hoc and it has come back to us again. Can we consider that question 9 of Study Group 9, which is on home networking, Study Group 15 is also on networking of homes. So it's just home networking and when you are reading from the angle it's networking of homes.

We have the consideration that Study Group 15 is doing for teleco networks and Study Group 9 is doing for broadcasting networks.

But we are in the age of convergence, and this is a home. Do we want to have a separate standard of how a house is connected by a broadcasting network different from a Telecom network? In the age of convergence can we look at a single standard for which irrespective of the service or the standard the home can be connected.

So, this is something before us. Ladies and gentlemen, I want to know your feeling on moving question 9.9 on home working to the Study Group 15 which is on networking of homes. The floor is open. I see United States, United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, everyone.

Mr. Chairman, our original proposal was to suppress 9, and move the home networking question 9 to Study Group

15 and to move question 2 and question 12 to Study Group 12. Mr. Chairman, after long discussion yesterday as well as today, the reason for our proposal was to reduce the need to attend multiple Study Groups, the need for, to eliminate the need to maintain a small Study Group that specializes on a certain region of the globe, and to reduce the amount of Study Groups.

We find that there is a need for synergy among the topics between the Study Groups, if there are common elements, common questions. In one Study Group that could be transferred to another Study Group where they could find a proper home, we think that is the way to go. As you had mentioned, Mr. Chairman, the convergence and a single standard is very important these days.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to invite also your suggestion and consider that home networking of question 9 of 9 be moved to Study Group 15, and to go even further, and that is that we consider moving question 2 end-to-end QOS and question 12, the audiovisual quality, to Study Group 12, where it could find a proper home, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you.

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

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. On behalf of the

CEPT, the CEPT also participated in the three groups, the ad hoc group in charge of this issue. Our proposal was limited initially to suppress Study Group 9 and transfer its activities to various other committees, including 12. But mostly, 15.

I could reiterate the arguments that were stated with respect to the Working Group, with response to your question about the future of Study Group 9, we are guided in this proposal today and after having participated in the ad hoc group by the goal of hoping to have a coherent structure for the work of the ITU-T in the future. The idea is to regroup and to bring together the study issues as much as possible into Study Groups that deal with the same issues. So the goal is to be logical and coherent. You have discussed the issue of home networking. And we think that in this area, we need progress on the question 9 under the work of Study Group 15. There are two other issues, 2 and 12 on the quality of service. As I have the floor, I'd like to talk about those.

You're the Chair, Chairman of Study Group 12. So you are on both sides of the bar if you like. All the issues with respect to quality of service, we believe should be regrouped under Study Group 12. This is the position of CEPT. We no longer support the elimination

of Study Group 9. We have changed our opinion some days ago.

We are in favor of transferring the questions under Study Group 9 to Study Group 15, so we are moving home networking and we are in favor of shifting issues 12 on the quality of services. I hope that this is clear and understandable to all. That is regarding 2 and 12. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So with the proposal that I made on the movement of home networking question 9.9 to Study Group 15, there is support for that, for now, and even support of question 2.9 and question 12.9 to Study Group 12 as well.

Is there any other opinion on this? So that we can have an agreement? Uganda. You have the floor.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you to -- just to indicate that as the African Group, we support the proposal, your proposal to move the questions on quality of service to Study Group 12. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any other view? I want to close the list, and for us to have a decision so that we can move on. I see Brazil, I see Canada. Brazil, you have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In fact like

U.S. just said, CITELE original proposal was to disband Study Group 9, and also movement of the key 99 to Study Group 15 and 2 and the other question to Study Group 12. Based on that, your proposal is aligned with CITELE original proposition. I believe we could support it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Canada supports your proposal, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. So with this, I close the list, and I want to take the decision that considering that there is considerable support with no objection to my proposal, question 9.9 on home networking has been moved to Study Group 15, and question 2.9 and question 12.9 have been moved to Study Group 12.

(sound of gavel).

Thank you very much.

We move on, and we will go back to our agenda item 6. I see Japan asking for the floor. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. Japan explained at ad hoc meetings, Japan position is questions remain in SG 9. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So this is kind of after the list has been closed, Japan says they preferred, which question to be in Study Group 9?

>> JAPAN: Both questions should be remain in the Study Group 9, that is Japanese position. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well.

We will move on to 6E. 6E of our agenda, which is diversifying the resources of Telecoms standardization sector of the ITU, and this is Arab States proposal 43A26.1.

Arab proposal 43A26/1. I see no one asking for the floor. If Arab state is not ready, we could hold on to that draft new resolution and we move to the next one, if they are ready. We will go to agenda items -- okay, UAE. You have the floor.

>> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Chairman. On behalf of the Arab States administrations, I would like to present to you this proposals, a draft new resolution on strengthening ITU-T standardization resources. The goal of this draft new resolution is to, apart from strengthening and diversifying resources of ITU-T but to invite the ITU to engage in analysis of new possible areas of revenue, revenue that could come from INR

resources, by creating an ITU brand and through tests on conformability and interoperability which could be a source of revenue, a detailed financial analysis is required and requested here of the different forces of ways of generating this revenue, and possible implications for the ITU budget for each of the possible sources.

This also asks the standardization Bureau Director to present a report on the results of this study, and to recommend the appropriate measures. We have also called on the Council to take into account the report and recommendations of the TSB Director, and as soon as possible, take the appropriate measures to generate additional revenue to benefit ITU-T in order to guarantee that this important sector can discharge all of its obligations with respect to all countries in general, and with respect to developing countries particularly.

You will know, Mr. Chairman, that a discussion took place on this issue within the advisory group of ITU-T. The discussion which were held was very sustained and took some time, this in the framework of TSAG. The Council asked the Director of TSB to present a report, a report to be presented in 2017, next Council, on the result of the studies and analysis undertaken. The goal of this

resolution is to continue working on this issue in order that the TSB Director will be in a position to present a report not just in 2017, but also during subsequent Council sessions.

Mr. Chairman, you will be aware that the resources of ITU-T are limited, and during the Council and TSAG there were requests from Member States to look for ways to generate additional resources and revenue.

This notably during the last Council session, a number of countries then requested for measures to be adopted, in order to find additional revenue to prop up our sector. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. It will be time to seek clarifications. But I want to inform this meeting that we have five minutes to officially end this meeting. But if you could accept for us to take some few minutes more to finish this meeting, but then I beg of the interpreters. I don't know, this one I will not ask, I will want you to suggest how many more minutes you can donate.

>> Ten minutes is the usual portion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So this is not -- it is donate. We will have ten minutes to conclude on this and then we will move on. Japan, you have the floor.

I want to take the questions.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Chair. Thanks for this proposal from Arab States administration. Regarding noting B, noting B touched on this year's Council and to be precise Council requested Council Working Group on financial human resource, to further study on all possible source of revenue in ITU and report to next year's Council. This is a conclusion of this year's Council.

We Japan think that this matter should be discussed at CWG and ITU-T does not need to study this matter. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. United States, I see Germany, I want to close the list. Canada. United States, Germany, Canada. Anyone else? Thank you. The list is closed. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we thank the Arab States for their proposal. Mr. Chairman, these type of issues have already been addressed at the last Plenipotentiary Conference as well as the 2016 Council as the Distinguished Delegate from Japan had mentioned. At Council of course, there were issues of whether the revenue could be generating using INRs and there was no consensus achieved at that. And

as the delegate of Japan already had mentioned, there was a Council Working Group created to pick up that topic.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that any financial matters dealing with the union or any of the sectors to include proposals of possible revenues to be gained should be submitted to Council or the Plenipotentiary, as they are the deciding body on such financial matters.

Mr. Chairman, we see no reason for this new resolution.

Thank you.

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

>> Germany: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be short. We support the view from Japan that this is a issue to be handled on the Council level and I think it was also in line with the U.S. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. To reiterate what the previous speakers expressed, this is a matter that has to be dealt at Council, and it is not within the purview of the WTSA. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. These queries to the Arab States proposal, I will give the United Arab Emirates the opportunity to respond to these queries. Then we will

go into a few discussions and close on this. United Arab Emirates, you have the floor.

>> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Chairman.

I would also like to thank the Distinguished Delegates for all of their comments on this draft new resolution. I agree with them, that this here is an issue that concerns financial issues, it's a question of ITU revenues.

So it falls under the remit of the Council. This is naturally so. But in this draft resolution, we ask of the TSB Director that studies, analysis, are conducted and the conclusions be sent to the Council for the appropriate decision-making.

So this is a resolution which sends a request to the TSB Director giving him the mandate and resources necessary to conduct, the authority rather to conduct analysis and send the report to the Council, which will take the appropriate decision in line with its remit. We have presented a draft new resolution, the text of which concerns our standardization sector and the issues that concern us. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We will want to progress on this. We have seen considerable concerns about this draft new resolution, mainly that it's inappropriate

for this Assembly to deal with. But it's something that is for Council to consider.

Russia, you are asking for the floor. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We would like to express our support for this draft new resolution. During the work of this Assembly, we have spoken a number of times in favor of supporting decisions aimed at ensuring that the standardization sector works in a stable, sustainable manner. The work of this sector in general is aimed at sustainable development of standardization in developing countries.

So we would like to support this proposal. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia as well. So there is the fair sense of where the discussions is going. The support definitely as it's coming from the Arab group, Arab States, support this proposal, so I'll beg of you that you don't need to ask the floor to in, it's obvious your support for this proposal.

We have seen some other views on it, and with this, I will propose to this meeting that the United Arab Emirates will lead us on an informal consultation with

the various parties concerned on how best we can communicate this to the world or out of this meeting, whether it will come as notes from WTSA proceedings or we will want to have this as a resolution.

This is something I want you all to consider as a informal consultation on whether this should be captured as WTSA proceeding or we go ahead and come out a resolution by the end of WTSA.

If this is acceptable, I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you very much. UAE, do you kindly accept to do this informal consultation? You have the floor, UAE.

>> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Chair. Of course, we will undertake that task. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So now we will have to pause here, you have to give us your results on Monday. We got to agenda item 6E, and we will want to pause here, for agenda item F, 6F, G, H, I, J and to that point, to the point J, there are a number of draft new proposals, and when we look at these new draft recommendations, they are of a certain theme, and for this reason we have grouped them.

We will want to appeal to the regions involved to consult each other on this, and be kind to give us a

consolidated text on Monday. So that it fast forwards our discussions on these draft new recommendations, because they look similar and they tend to be on similar things. So we can look at 6F, G, H, I and J. Okay? So we are looking for leaders. On this I will mention regions, are proposed regions really, and then you could take it up.

So for F, on QoS, CITELE will be responsible for leading this consolidation. On IoT ... it seems I have a list already. So, okay. If you have a prepared list to facilitate this for us, that will be good.

Not in order, but I will try to find them out. That is fine. It seems that there are some considerations, so let me withdraw the proposal to CITELE to take up the QoS.

QoS, awareness, will go to Uganda. Miss Alinkawa of Uganda, is that correct? On the resolution on IoT, it will go to Singapore. The resolutions on financial service will go to Egypt, Mr. Masaid, combating counterfeit, will go to Mr. Isaac, that is supposed to be J of Ghana. Mobile theft will go to Mr. Isaac as well of Ghana.

So, to repeat, for quality of service we have Uganda, for IoT we have Singapore. For financial services we

have Egypt, for combating Telecom device theft we have Ghana, for combating counterfeiting we have Ghana.

And for informal consultations we start on ITRs and Chairman will be from Bahrain, Mr. Abdoulaye.

So this is our plan for the weekend.

We could have had com 4 for tomorrow but considering the amount of consultations that have to go on, we have to take a break of com 4 and be able to deal with these informal consultations, and our group to regroup on Monday for com 4. I have two minutes to close this meeting.

So, if it is not urgent and if it can be done under ten seconds, Russia, Japan, UAE, the list is growing. I beg of you, if you want us to continue to be without interpretation, if you don't withdraw, for us to close, it will be without interpretation. If that is fine by you. Okay. So interpreters. Thank you so much for your kindness of ten minutes. We will continue this meeting taking Russia, Japan, UAE, UK, United States and Portugal without interpretation. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning dear colleagues. Maybe I missed something. But you didn't mention item K on ITS. I think we should also consider that. We already coordinating efforts

with African and Arab countries. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, to quickly respond to that, we have Mr. Mosad of Bahrain to coordinate that. If you are already doing some consultations, that is brilliant work already. But consult with Mosad with it and let's see what we can have on Monday. Thank you. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much for your excellent leadership on managing the meeting. Managing com 4 is always challenge. However Japan needs to point out on the issue of Study Group 9, actually before you made a decision to transfer of some of the questions to other Study Groups, Japan requested the floor to make comments, however, without that opportunity you made the decision. Therefore, Japan has some concerns on this point and Japan resolves its position on this matter and open this issue later. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. The Chairman express the rights of Japan but just for the meeting to note before the Chairman took that decision considering the proposals, the Chairman asked for the countries who will have positions on this, and the list was closed without Japan asking for the floor. It was within the time of

the decision that was when Japan asked for the floor. The list was closed on Japan. It was not as if Japan was part of the list and was not permitted to speak on the matter.

This is the reality. We will move on and will give United Arab Emirates the floor. United Arab Emirates, you have the floor.

>> United Arab Emirates: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. With regards to the new proposed resolution from the Arab group that we have just discussed and we are leading that discussion, I would like to ask colleagues who have concerns and raised comments on this resolution, that if we can meet immediately after the closure of your meeting, Mr. Chairman.

Second comment, I received from colleagues from the Arab group that issues regarding Study Group 3, if we see there is an ad hoc group on regulatory work in Study Group 3, planned from 14 hours to the 16 hours which coincides with another ad hoc group on OTT and MRI resolutions so those two topics are relevant, I mean MRI and OTT is relevant to Study Group 3 as well. If we can reschedule the meetings in order not have those two groups meetings in parallel, that would be very helpful, because the same experts are participating in

both groups. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. At this point in time before I take the other comments, I will want doctor to announce the timetable for this weekend so it will be clear to us. Maybe that will help with requesting for the floor. Dr. Bilel Jamoussi.

>> Thank you very much, Chairman. Good afternoon to all delegates working on Saturday. There are two points.

One is the request for the scheduling of the ad hoc groups, right after this, the close of this session we will have an updated timetable that we will post on-line, that will try to avoid some of these conflicts. Then another point since I have the floor, Chairman, is that we will have electronic consultations of Committee 1 over the weekend, to look at the schedule for next week, as it's clear that you need more time for Committee 4. So we might have to adjust the time for Monday. Since there is no scheduled meeting for com 1, we will conduct that consultation electronically with the members of com 1, the Steering Committee. Thank you, Chairman.

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

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Very briefly,

with regards to the proposals on IoT, CEPT has discussed proposals for the new resolution on IoT, and through you, Mr. Chairman, we would like to ask our colleague from Singapore to have some informal consultations with my colleague from Spain while they do their work. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. That is a good announcement. Singapore, please take note and consult Spain, I suppose he is Vice-Chair of this Committee, so you will relay the information of CEPT. Thank you very much. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to sincerely thank you for your excellent stewardship of this meeting, Mr. Chairman.

Just a couple of questions for clarification. I believe that one of them, Mr. Bilel Jamoussi mentioned, I'm assuming that there will be a revision 2 to DT41 that will publish the list of the new drafting groups that we have discussed this morning.

The second question I had, Mr. Chairman, to you, is that I'm assuming based on your instructions that the drafting group chairs are to produce a consolidated text of the various proposals, but without previous discussions and so forth, so I'd like to get clarification

as to what instructions has been given to the various drafting group Chairs that were mentioned. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, so with this, these designated persons are supposed to consult informally and see common points to consolidate and indicate the differences as well, and if there are any touch points that are supposed to be deviated on, this could absorb and highlighted so if they bring a consolidated text we will know from which contribution, that will show. It will show from which contribution and the paths of agreements and paths that do not have agreements, so that we can move on this. I hope this is clear to everyone. Thank you. Portugal, you have the floor.

>> Portugal: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You have just addressed some of the issues and our concerns that I would like to raise. In any case, I would like to raise the issue that we still don't have the agreement of the room on the proposed topics which are addressed in these new draft resolutions. This should actually, in order to know if they should be actually new resolutions. As I mentioned before we should be careful to amount of new resolutions we are approving. In particular the proposal on the new resolution of the ITRs which is one of the most sensitive in this Assembly, it should deserve

a careful consideration of this Committee before we start discussing it in a drafting group. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Portugal. My proposal on such a situation is this.

Let's take it that there are two positions, that we don't want a resolution done, but it has a text. So as we are used to that whole text is in square brackets. Now we can go into that square bracket and have the text which are of agreement, and text can also be put in square brackets.

So on Monday, we will have the text which has everything in square brackets or text which comes without square brackets.

We have text which are square brackets within so that it will be easier for our conversation.

The first thing is that if there is a certain recommendation which during the informal consultation the entire text is in square brackets, when we come, we discuss it and see whether we have to proceed on it or we have to hold on to it.

I hope this will be clear to us. Thank you. Malaysia, you have the floor. I have Malaysia, Egypt and Ukraine. It is already 12:49. There will be ad hoc

sessions starting any moments, you need lunch as well. It's good to be healthy. We still have some days to go. Malaysia, Egypt, Ukraine, I want to close the list again. Malaysia, Egypt, Ukraine. That is what I have on my list. This list is closed. Malaysia, you have the floor.

>> MALAYSIA: Thank you Mr. Chairman. With regards to the new proposed resolution from the APT on event data monitoring, I'd like to ask colleagues who raised concerns and comments on this resolution if we can meet briefly just to plan on the informal discussion. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Due to the numerous interventions presented from delegates from the Arab group on IoT related issues and Study Group 20, we would also like to be part of the informal discussions that is going to be held on the IoT, under the management or under the leadership of Singapore. I would also like to announce that after the meeting I would welcome all the interested parties to approach me if they have anything related to the e-health resolution. Thank you.

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

>> Ukraine: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Following clarification to United States that possible consolidated text may be expected after regional discussions, I would like to clarify, if all interested delegations not only regional organisation can participate in this informal discussions, because for Ukraine, we are very interested in participating in discussions on combating counterfeiting and mobile theft. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Ukraine, for clarification. Everyone is most welcome, and the informal discussions should be open to all interested parties, so depending on your theme of interest, you could be part of the conversation.

Our next steps, on Monday, 9:30, we have com 4 to meet. If you should go back to our agenda ADM 25, you will see that we have considerable amount of draft new resolutions to consider for which we have suggested and agreed to doing informal consultations so that we could have a bridge ones for Monday to be able to decide on whether we want to have them or not.

And again, to then go into the questions as the proposals received from Study Groups, and from TSAG, and that we will attempt to deal with the intra Study

Group matters on Study Group 20 structure. This is the plan. On Tuesday we will look at TSAG group on restructuring, the African proposal and the classification of ICT. We will take approval of reports and agreements, as they may come.

We still have a lot to do, in terms of document presentation, discussions and agreements. And as much as possible, I want us to facilitate discussions in the background to be able to achieve this and to be able to report to the plenary.

With this said, is there any other business? Or is there any other matter?

Thank you. With the convening of these informal meetings, if you are able to get a document out of your discussions, kindly send it to the Secretariat for this document to be posted ahead of Monday, so when everyone is coming in, yes, as a contribution, so that when everyone is coming in on Monday, they are clear on what the update is to be able to help with the discussions. Is there any other matter from the side of TSB?

Okay. With this said, I have Egypt asking for the floor. Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to notify the meeting that we, yesterday we had a meeting

with the contributor on the MFS and I have prepared a consolidated document, that consolidates three contributions from the Arab States and from the African and from Senegal. So that I have now a consolidated draft that contains all, that accommodated all the changes and all the updates from different versions. If any of the delegates also would like to check or discuss this version, I'll be here.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We have Egypt, Egypt is commenting on agenda item 6H. That is the proposed new resolutions on financial services. There were three proposals received. They have taken the lead, they have done the informal consultations, but just as he said, he has a consolidated text, and those interested on this matter can consult him, at Egypt's position for further consultations.

When, as your text is ready, you may give it to the Secretariat for posting, so that is available to all members. I see Bahrain asking for the floor. Bahrain.

>> Bahrain: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It appears that in my absence I've been given a great gift. I believe I'll be leading the discussion on ITRs.

We do accept. I would however like to raise a couple

of points for clarification for those interested in these discussions. The first is I would ask the Secretariat to define the appropriate time to meet tomorrow, taking into account the large number of ad hocs and discussions going on finding a suitable time for this. The second point I'd like to propose is in the interest of time and in order to minimize the amount of time in the ad hoc itself, given the time commitments of all the membership, I will be attempting to create a consolidated consensus document from now through informal discussions with all interested parties, those that are supporting and those that have concerns.

In that regard I would ask all those who are interested to seek me out today to try to clarify the text as much as possible in order to minimize our time in the actual ad hoc noting that we will be having a ad hoc in any case. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Bahrain. The ad hoc is not starting yet, in your absence your gift is that for now it will be informal consultation as you are so proposing. Firstly, to look at the text from the Arab States, the African Group and RCC and see where you have similarities and to highlight, where you have differences, you highlight them as well. Others who are interested in

this matter as well will consult you and see the appropriateness of when you start your ad hoc meetings. We want to have this closed before we move to other ad hocs to have availability of Distinguished Delegates.

For now it is informal consultation. It is not ad hoc. Informal consultation going forward on all these issues that were mentioned, with the convenings. At this time it is about 1:00 p.m.

Thank you so much for your extended time, sitting from 9:30 until now. I want you to enjoy your weekend further with informal consultations and the ad hoc groups and to bring us very progressive report on Monday morning at 9:30. Thank you all. One more thing.

The adjusted times will be posted soon on the screens, so that they are aligned and it is to address the concerns of the overlapping. The adjusted time will be posted now before the meetings start on. Watch out for the screens for the updates of the times. Thank you very much. Enjoy your weekend.

(meeting adjourned at 1300)

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.
