

Raw file.
October 31, 2016.
9:30 a.m.
ITU.
World Telecommunication Standardization
Assembly.
Hammamet, Tunisia.

Services Provided By:

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

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

***.

(standing by).

>> Ladies and gentlemen, please take your seats.

(sound of gavel).

>> CHAIR: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

Welcome to the fifth meeting of Committee 4 of the WTSA
16. Committee 4 is on ITU-T work programme and
organisation. Our agenda item for this morning is
available as ADM 26, which is currently on the screens.

We will go through the report of the previous com
4 session, and attempt to approve it. We will look at
interCommittee issues. We will take reports from com

4 ad hoc groups and drafting groups and if it is possible to make decisions, we will agree to take them.

We will look at reports and outputs of Working Groups under com 4. We will then deal with question allocations and refinement. Then we will go on to WTSA resolutions under com 4. So this is our agenda for today, if it stands further there is the annex on the remaining items, which we hope to tackle by tomorrow.

So again, today, this is our agenda item. Do we agree to proceed with this? I see United States asking for the floor. United States.

>>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning to all the colleagues and a happy Halloween to all.

(chuckles).

At least, we are starting on a happy note, and we are all laughing, I hope we can keep it throughout the day.

Mr. Chairman, just a brief request for clarification, no problems with the agenda. But we would like to seek clarification as to why info 11 has been attributed to a resolution 2 under agenda 4D. This document, I think, is to the benefit of the entire Assembly, and I don't think should be attributed to a particular

agenda item on your agenda, on the agenda. But it's for the benefit of the whole Assembly. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. The clarification is that that info document is related to the WTSA 2012 resolution 2, and that is why it has been mapped to what we are currently working on now as an information document.

Thank you. Is there any other comment? Do we agree to proceed on this agenda? United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, all colleagues. Mr. Chairman, there is some, one general comment that I think we would seek your kind understanding and maybe support in this. Mr. Chairman, some of the topics, the topics has been distributed, based on the submission of the proposal on different aspect.

So we found for example the topic of privacy, trust, confidence and infrastructure discussion has been split into two groups. The groups have been discussing separately exactly the same topics, which has resulted in distribution of experts among the two groups although the same discussion exactly being remediated in both the groups.

Just another example is the discussion on DOA and

handle system, the discussion was distributed among the groups, one group discussing in e-health another discussing counterfeit and another group discussing another resolution. We seek your kind understanding and support in this, that one of the major difficulties that we have right now that same experts are distributed among those groups in order to discuss the same topic, but in different shapes and manner.

So we would propose, Mr. Chairman, to have one group discussing all relevant topic and all relevant issues to this topic, and certain group for each of these topics. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Arab Emirates. I see Jordan asking for the floor. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning, all of you. We concur with what the delegate from the Emirates said, Mr. Chair. We found it very difficult to follow the work of the various groups, because there were questions being discussed at the same time, by different groups. I'm not talking about all issues, but there are some common issues. I believe that the Secretariat in participation in the groups could probably compile and assign to one meeting that would discuss the whole range of issues. So sometimes we have a topic and we are told

that this topic is being discussed by a different group.
And we can't follow.

So it would be good to have one session dedicated for common issues. And sometimes there is just a small overlap. So may I ask your indulgence, Mr. Chair, to assign one Committee in one single session, that would discuss the whole range of these issues. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. This is one noted from both delegates from UAE and Jordan. We try to highlight this in our second session, for us to have had a common ground on how you proceed on such things and we all had that time with it, and I plead that we don't repeat it this morning.

I've heard you usually, the documents are distributed from the plenary. We will try to look at these common themes as we have done for many others, and we are just accordingly, we will adjust accordingly as we go forward. If this is acceptable by you all going forward in assigning the themes, we will go by commonalities and see that this is addressed in one group.

If this satisfies your request, can we proceed on the agenda? I see Egypt insisting, Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Good morning, colleagues. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. We support your proposal for going forward. But I want to make another comment. It is a different comment. We have noticed some inconsistencies in the way the informal discussions on the topics have been handled. Some informal groups presented text and made editorial changes on the text, and others was merely discussing the topics from high level perspective, and that sort of inconsistencies also in dealing with informal discussion groups could lead to potential waste of time, because after all, an informal ad hoc group or informal group is not meant to address the specific text to be presented to the plenary.

In addition, it is not meant for an informal group to take decision or take any potential opinion over the other. In addition, an informal discussion group means that the conflicting parties or the opposing views should be present at the same meeting. Otherwise, what is the purpose of that informal consultation?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So that is noted, as feedback from the informal consultations, over the weekend what we heard is that some informal consultations were very progressive and that is why we have DR D Ts posted so

it was a success and yes, we acknowledge difficulties thatishadintheinformalconsultations. Ifyouaddress all that, so if you allow for us to proceed on the agenda thenwe can have the time to address all these difficulties. Saudi Arabia, do you insist on the floor?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning, all of you. Mr. Chair, we concur with what the delegates that spoke before us pointed out. We had a meeting yesterday until the small hours of the morning. And we were discussing one subject that was already assigned to another group to discuss.

So Mr. Chair, we would like to ask your indulgence, so that there can be later on no contradiction with regard to the decisions taken, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I see no one asking for the floor. So do we proceed on the agenda? Thank you very much.

We will proceed on the agenda, and the meeting, previous session, the report is available as DT47. We may want to go through DT47, as projected on the screens now, DT47. Thank you. DT4 on your screens. Page 1. Page 2. Page 3. Page 4. Page 5. Hold on, on page 5. On page 5, on the topic of financial services, the focal point is Ahmed Syed of Egypt so we will amend that.

Mr. Ahmed Syed of Egypt.

I see Japan asking for the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. May I comment on the page 2, 6.5. Before that, good morning to you all. I would like to express my sincere appreciation for the host, Tunisia, for arranging excursions on Sunday, Saturday. That was nice relaxing opportunity, although many of us spent the weekend in a different way.

It is honestly difficult for us to follow everything. But we hope this Assembly is proceeding towards its goal. Japan thought over our position on 6.5 of this report, and in the spirit of cooperation and to contribute to the progress of this Assembly, I would appreciate it if you could let us withdraw the reservation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Japan. I thought that deserves an applause.

(applause).

So thank you very much, everyone and thank you, Japan, for this spirit of cooperation and that is what we look up to for today. I see some Halloweens, but let's make it cheerful throughout this morning.

So with this, is there any other comment on the report as available as DT47?

Great. Thank you very much. Our report is approved.

(sound of gavel).

We will proceed on to agenda item number 3. Yes. We note that we have to transmit any resolutions, final obligations to Committee 2.

So with that, we will go on to agenda item 4, which is report from Committee 4 ad hoc groups and drafting groups, and then we will try to make decisions. We will take the very first one, which is 4A. The ad hoc group on Study Group 3 matters, and the Chair is Mr. Lwando from Zambia and the Arab report is available as DT58, if it can be projected on the screen. Zambia, you have the floor.

>> ZAMBIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Good morning to you all. As has been highlighted by the Chairman, com 4 established a ad hoc group at its meeting of 28 October 2016 to attempt to reach consensus on the title, scope and mandate of ITU-T SG 3. This document therefore provides the report of that ad hoc group meeting. The terms of reference for the ad hoc group are contained in working document 7 com 4. In terms of the discussions that were held we had a very lively and spirited discussion, that ran from 1400 until 1745, on 29 October, 2016. We

had some 40 to 50 participants who attended and represented all regions. The meeting was chaired by myself, Mr. Bhuku of Zambia with assistance from the TSB Secretariat. Most of the session was spent on examining the text of the title of ITU-T SG 3, and the key issues identified were the use of the term regulatory, and the switching of the order of the wording in the titles, as proposed by the ARB and RCC regions. It was noted that in both the title and mandate, the IAP contribution proposed no change. After long deliberations as well as informal discussions, the meeting agreed on a draft text for the title of ITU-T SG 3, as follows. Tariff and accounting principles and international telecommunication ICT, slash ICT economic and policy issues. This however was subject to confirmation by administrations.

In conclusion, with respect to the items listed in the terms of reference, the ad hoc group agreed on the title for SG 3 for consideration by com 4 as tariff and accounting principles and international telecommunications/ICT economic and policy issues. Of course, subject to confirmation by administrations. With regards to the mandate and points of guidance, since the title as stated above would still be subject to

confirmation by administrations, the meeting agreed that the full text on mandate and points of guidance could not be considered at the time, as they would need to be aligned with the agreed title.

It was noted that notwithstanding the agreement on the title above, there was no consensus on whether the full text of the mandate would or would not also include the term, regulatory. With regards to lead roles there was insufficient time to discuss the matter of lead roles, for which proposals also include the use of the term regulatory.

Com 4 is invited to consider the agreed title in 3.1 in its discussion of resolution 2. In closing, the ad hoc group Chairperson thanked the participants for their valuable input and discussions as well as the TSB Secretariat. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Lwando from Zambia. In your report you mentioned subject to confirmation by the administrations. Do you have any update on that yet? Zambia, you have the floor.

>> ZAMBIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Unfortunately we have no current updates, and it was proposed in the meeting that confirmation would be sought during this com 4 meeting.

>> CHAIR: Okay, so with this, we have to really progress on this, because it puts the whole Study Group 3 in a situation where we cannot proceed on the other items, as you mentioned. Now I want to open the floor for administrations to confirm. I see Germany, Jordan. I want to close the list on this. As many as want to speak, let me know, so I close the list. I see Germany, Jordan, United States. I want to close the list. Germany, Jordan, United States. The list is closed. Germany, you have the floor.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Chairman, for giving us the floor and good morning to everybody. With regard to this report, we first would like to thank the Chairperson of this group, Mr. Lwando from Zambia for his great work trying to combine the very different opinions on this particular topic within the group.

We not only, there was not only a inter-American proposal with no change, I would also draw your attention there was also a European proposal with no change. The group indeed with the help of some informal discussion agreed provisionally to the title, which has been spelled out in this document, subject to confirmation by administrations.

With regard to Europe, we do agree to the title,

and to the procedure, which is that based on this title the rest mainly is a mandate, the point of guidance and the lead roles will be defined. However, Mr. Chairman, this is for us a package, and please acknowledge that we came a long way to this package, because our initial position is, no change.

As there are some, when we discussed or started to discuss a mandate and points of guidance as you see in the report, there was for example no agreement on whether or not in this part of the text there would be reference to regulation or regulatory matters. We agree to the procedure to continue working on mandate and points of guidance and lead roles, based on this title, but we reserve our position should this discussion not be to our satisfaction, to go back to our initial position which was no change. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

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

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning to all of our colleagues. I want to start by thanking the Chair of the group for their efforts put forward, try to achieve consensus among all the participants. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I'm speaking on behalf of the Arab group in this matter. The fact that there was general

agreement subject to confirmation by administration really reflect the reality about the title. However, we had an issue that the title was including the reference to regulatory economic and policy issues. And after we agreed as a compromise to remove the reference to regulatory issues, we asked the floor if this would prevent us, if needed, if the text required reference to regulatory issues, to use this wording, and because there was an opposition to this, even though the reality and the fact that any economic or policy issues would require regulatory attention, was rejected from the floor, or there was no confirmation on the response to our request. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we believe a regulatory issues is a very important aspect of the work of Study Group 3. Currently Study Group 3 are addressing many questions of regulatory natures, and we did explain to the floor many aspects of the regulatory issues related to international roaming, universal service, international IB capacities, a question on accountability of the regulatory issues, and this is why the wording and the text itself, when describe the mandate and guidance of the work and the point of the task will require to use the wording regulatory. So it is difficult for us to agree at this stage that it will

not be needed to use regulatory wording, because this is, does not reflect the reality.

You need to describe the mandate of this work, and we had in the Arabic group a concern because regulatory issues on the domain of the ITU is not a new issue. This regulatory issues has been addressed and there is a lot of words in the ITU reference legal text that refer to regulatory issues. For example, the ITR S they are about international telecommunication regulations, the ITRs referring to the work on the standardization sector related to regulatory issues. Where we will put the reference to regulatory issues? We were in acceptance to remove it from the title, in condition that if needed, to reflect it in the text, we will have an opportunity to discuss and to agree among the group on the necessity to do it.

This is, Mr. Chairman, our position. And I request to reserve back to go to you if needed on this matter. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chairman, happy Halloween to all of my colleagues. I had like to thank the Chairman of this ad hoc Working Group for his

hard work. We all worked really hard for more than three hours on this issue. I agree with my German colleague that we also had a no change position on the title from CITELE, and we compromised and we agreed to this new title, and we said that as long as the mandate is reflected by the title, we will go along. As per my colleague from Germany he is insistent on having regulation, regulatory policy, I do agree that ITU-T has role on regulatory aspect but only in relation to international Telecom and ICT policies. If it is related to that, then that is fine. But if you are going beyond that, then we believe that the work is outside the mandate of the Study Group. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well, United States. I want to consider the propositions from the administrations now. I see that the Arab States indicate they would have referred regulatory as part of it and they have reservations if they take on this, whereas I hear from the United States and from Europe that they would have, they will go with this as a package.

However, in order not to have any more of reservations, I will attempt to make a proposal, and if this is acceptable by you, we will proceed on it. My proposal is that the title of this group will be the

last four words, as they came from the ad hoc group, economic and policy issues. Is this acceptable by administrations? I see no one asking for the floor. Germany. Portugal. Okay. Germany, you have the floor.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It looks as it may be a solution, but that would mean that Study Group 3 is working on economic and policy issues in general, not even related to telecommunications. We believe that there are other entities in this world who deal with this general economic and policy issues. And it's not as such a broad mandate, such a broad mandate is not justified for ITU and in particular not for ITU-T. So we can unfortunately not agree to your proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. Before I give the floor to Portugal I want to clarify. The title is not the mandate. Usually, for I will mention Study Group 12, where the title is performance, quality of service and quality of experience. Definitely, performance will not be Telecom networks but that is used and tends to be acceptable. We have to understand that the banner over all the Study Groups is a International Telecommunication Union. So international

telecommunication, economic and policy issues could be, if we want to have a full length of the title, just to clarify on that.

So that is why I proposed, yes, I saw the words international and telecommunication. But just to give a first name and a surname, so that it is quite brief, the title is not the mandate. So that is why I proposed as such. But I see Portugal, United States, Jordan, Germany and Egypt asking for the floor. I want to close the list on this. Then we will proceed. I see Saudi Arabia joining in. Portugal, United States, Jordan, Germany, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, the list is closed. Portugal, you have the floor.

>> Portugal: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning to all of you. I'd like to thank the Chairman of this drafting group on Study Group 3 mandate. As my colleague from Germany has pointed out, we have concerns with the title. We in Europe are making a considerable effort to negotiate with colleagues this mandate of this Study Group 3 and the title and so at this moment, we cannot agree for the reasons expressed for the colleague from Germany. But we keep on negotiating this. Thank you very much.

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

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thought we are moving ahead, but looks like we are moving backward.

To us, this is again expansion of the scope, because of the title does reflect the work of the Study Group, so we are not going to agree with this. Thank you very much.

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

>> JORDAN: On the principle of cooperation and the spirit that we would like to have a way forward, we accept your proposal, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. Germany.

>> GERMANY: Well, your proposal is exactly what is on, unfortunately for the last four years on the website of the ITU-T as title of the Study Group, and this is one of the reasons for confusion. The Study Group came from tariff and accounting. This would be normally traditionally the title. We have decoupled in our discussion in this ad hoc group the tariff and accounting from the policy and, from the policy matters. But we still have all this in relation to international telecommunications/ICTs.

We would insist that the international telecommunications/ICT is although in the title of the

Study Group, also in the title of the Study Group. Thank you.

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

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In the spirit also of cooperation, we do accept your proposal, also we agree with you that this is only the title, not the mandate. We support your proposal for this title. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. We support your position, Mr. Chairman. We accept your proposal. We would like to remind everybody that the original proposal included the word regulation. But in order to reach consensus, we think it's possible to accept the title that you propose to us and was shown on the screen.

The proposal that you presented, Mr. Chairman, is accepted. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: They will want me to go a little bit backwards, and say Telecom/ICT economic and policy issues, will this be acceptable by you. I see Senegal, I see Japan, but I want to ask a direct question to Germany. Will Telecom/ICT economic and policy issue be acceptable by you? Germany, you have the floor.

>> Germany: Well, it's very difficult to do it this

way, but I made a clear statement before that we insist on international telecommunication/ICT. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Just one step back again. International Telecom/ICT economic and policy issues, will this be acceptable by you? I see Germany nodding. But I want you to say it through so that we can have the text on it. You have the floor, Germany.

>> GERMANY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and as we mentioned, we will look at the whole exercise when the mandate and the point of guidance and the lead study roles are also finalized. But with based on this proposed title, we are willing to work on the other issues. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United States, you have the floor. Is this acceptable by you?

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your effort. It is in a positive direction, so it will be acceptable for us. Thank you.

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

>> JAPAN: I would like to ask the floor by the Chairman of Study Group 3, can I confirm that you are now proposing as a mandate just international telecommunication ICT economic and policy issues, and omitting the accounting and tariff issue?

>> CHAIR: To clarify, to SG 3 Chairman, this is the title, not the mandate. From this title, then the mandate will be developed from here. So the sense that I have is that the new title for Study Group 3 is international telecommunications/ICT economic and policy issues. Japan, you are asking for the floor. You have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you very much for this clarification. But as far as the Chairman is concerned, traditionally we have been focusing on the tariff and accounting issue, and the title is very important to represent our study. I prefer to leave it as it is. Leaving tariff and accounting principle.

>> CHAIR: I thought we had administrations all agreeing to this. Mr. Chairman, if you be kind enough to us, will you accept as everyone has accepted this title. You have the floor, Japan.

>> JAPAN: Yes, if general consensus is reached to agree to the title international -- yes, I will accept it, on the condition that consensus has been reached.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. So we have a new title for Study Group 3, international telecommunications/ICT economic and policy issues. If this is acceptable by everyone, kindly withdraw your

request. Kindly withdraw your request, if this is acceptable by everyone. I see four countries asking for the floor. But if this is acceptable by everyone, kindly withdraw your request.

So I see your support. Kindly withdraw your request, if you accept international telecommunications/ICT economic and policy issues, as a new title for Study Group 3. I see United States and Papua New Guinea asking for the floor. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: I'm sorry to take the floor again, Mr. Chairman, and I'm really, really I apologize, but I just wanted to make sure that this is tariff and accounting was actually, Mr. Shagawa reminded me was this is the historic role of Study Group 3. They have been doing this for example mobile roaming and all this work Study Group 3 does, that is related to tariff and accounting. If it's possible we would like to see that because we worked on that for three and a half hours in the ad hoc. If you could go back to that, that will be great. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States, for your suggestion. Papua New Guinea, unfortunately, I wouldn't want to go back any further. I would have loved to stay here because this is the title, and I will propose that

we keep the title short, and we avoid a situation where we have including, so that in the mandate of this Study Group we can describe the entire scope there, and I don't think that, if we all agree that tariff and accounting principles are something of old that is done by this group it will miss out because of this new title, so if you all accept, let us proceed on this new title, and describe all the touch points as they are for Study Group 3 in the mandate. If this is acceptable by everyone, I will want you to, Papua, New Guinea, you have the floor.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to for the same reasons that the Chairman of Study Group 3 has mentioned, I'd like to propose that we keep the original title as it is, and not to do any changes. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Papua New Guinea, as I appeal to the Chairman of Study Group 3 I again appeal to you. We have come a long way with your four-hour discussion. And if you don't have a title, we cannot go on to the mandate and the points of guidance and for Study Group 3 to even be part of resolution 2.

So again, I plead, in that with the amount of agreement that we have on this title, we will proceed on this, and the desire for tariff and accounting can appear somewhere in the mandate and the points of guidance.

If this is acceptable by you, I will want you to confirm.
Papua New Guinea, you have the floor.

>> Papua New Guinea: Thank you, Chairman. I have noticed that in the ad hoc group meeting there were about 40 to 50 members who were at the meeting this weekend to discuss through this title, and there the consensus, but now in this Assembly, it seems that now they have changed, Mr. Chairman. And it's 40 to 50 members. That is what I see from this head of group meetings report, and now a couple of our colleague countries have decided that we should change in this Assembly.

So Mr. Chair, I believe that this is not consensus, and I want this to remain as it is. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Papua New Guinea is insisting. And I'm constrained with this. Considering that 50 people had a title, and then they said subject to confirmation by the administrations, I'm seeing more than 50 people in this room, and I think that we have made a lot of headway with this. Papua New Guinea, again, I will appeal to you, to accept this title, or I break the work up, so again Papua New Guinea, the floor is yours.

>> Papua New Guinea: Thank you, Chair. Well, that was my opinion, so if anybody else has got no on this comment to make on this one, I would agree with the group

here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Papua New Guinea and thank you, everyone for accepting this.

So I can see everyone withdrawing their requests. Please withdraw your requests if you agree to this new title, so that we can go on. We spent some time on this title. It was four hours on Saturday, and it can't be four hours this morning. We have other things to look at. So if it is not an objection, please withdraw your request. I see Sweden and Japan insisting to have the floor. Sweden, you have the floor.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. I'm sorry but it was not possible to attend all the ad hocs this weekend. We did not attend this particular meeting. So I'm confused. Why is it so important to set the title before the mandate? Obviously, the intention is to change something by changing the title. Now we should agree on the title before the mandate is clear. So why don't agree on this together with the mandate? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: To clear your confusion, they said there was no time to go on the mandate, because they spent four hours on the title. If they have the title, they can proceed on the mandate and the points of guidance. So Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This intervention is made by the delegate of Japan, not Study Group 3 Chairman. But Japan is, thinks that tariff and accounting principle is very historically very important, and if we omit these words from the title, that can change the nature itself of Study Group 3. So I would like you to write down a reservation, not reservation but comments in your meeting report. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I wouldn't want to keep reservations for this morning. I will want us to be as decisive as possible for everybody to be able to have clear in their minds what we are proceeding on.

With this said, I will refer to all the submissions that have been made, and we go back to the no change title of tariff and accounting principles including related telecommunication, economic and policy issues.

(sound of gavel).

Thank you. So the old title as before this Assembly remains. And we proceed on that. Thank you very much. We will move on to agenda item 4B, this we will take the report from Mrs. Irene Kagawa. Points of order. Okay, Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair, I'm sorry, because you have taken the decision quickly, and we were not

following. It is our understanding that there was a support for your proposal to change the title, because we have discussed this for longly process and because of the intervention from Japan, that accounting and charging issues was a historical issue that dealt with Study Group 3, this does not mean that we cannot change the title. Economic issues consider accounting principle and tariff issue. This does not mean that if we remove that the title that this will prevent the mandate of the Study Group to consider economic issues related to accounting and tariff issues.

So I don't understand why was your decision to keep the old title, even though there is a lot of contributions coming to this meeting requesting to change the title and the mandate, and we spend very long period discussing this issue. I thought your decision was to accept what was proposed on the floor, so just please clarify the position for us, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. I see Saudi Arabia, Russia and Bahrain asking for the floor, and for this title cannot take all our time for this morning's session. We took time to go through the submission from the Chair of the ad hoc group. It was subject to confirmation by our administrations. Administrations suggested going

to as far as international telecommunication/ICT policy and economic issues, and then there were the requests to add tariff and accounting principles, and I pleaded with two, the Chairman of Study Group 3 and as well as Papua New Guinea, they obliged to my plea and then Japan came in and said they have reservations on this.

What this means is that there is no consensus on the change of the original title. My proposal, there was no consensus to that proposal. Without the consensus, it is on which I ruled that, because there is no consensus on this proposal, and of all the changes that we have discussed, the tradition is that we go back to the original title as it is.

Jordan, is this very clear? You have the floor, Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is quite clear. But I request that if you may please reconsider asking the floor if there is support to change the title, provided that there was a contribution coming from two regional bodies, and there was a lengthy discussion on that title that we would support changing the title, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. I ask, and I gave enough time to the floor, and the ruling was on the submissions

of the floor. So if you allow the ruling to stand, Saudi Arabia, Russia, Bahrain, Egypt, Nigeria, Singapore, you are asking for the floor. Is it on this, is it on something else or is it on the same ruling? We want to proceed on our agenda. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Saudi Arabia supports the point of order of Jordan. We are not in favor of the, what you have ruled. We have spent more than four hours discussing the title and we come up to a compromise text. We wonder why thus the proposed text was not taken and was ruled, I mean you ruled against that title.

So we request you, Mr. Chairman, to go back to the title that was proposed by the ad hoc group and approve that title. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, my simple proposal here will be that, and this was the decision, the decision was that I ruled on my own, against my own proposal, which had reservations from Japan. I will want those in support of my proposal to approach Japan, and agree on how we proceed on this. If this is fine by you, so that we can move ahead, because I don't want reservations on this title, as we cannot be working on the mandate and points of guidance with reservations.

I see Saudi Arabia asking for the floor. Is this fine by you, Saudi Arabia?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We understand that the title as proposed by the ad hoc group, that will be discussed and will be considered. Is this, is our understanding is correct or not? Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: The title will no longer be discussed. The title, if Japan agrees to remove its reservation, will be as everyone else agreed, in calling it international telecommunication ICT economic and policy issues. If not, we don't have consensus. So, I want the ad hoc group to go back and work with the mandates and points of guidance, pointing to the agreed title, either between international telecommunication ICT economic and policy issues with no reservations or the original title, as we have. I see Japan asking for the floor. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make one correction. We haven't said that we will wish to have the reservation, but we wish our comment written in your meeting report. That is the first thing.

And we are, we can go along the original text proposed by ad hoc group. That means tariff and accounting

principle and international telecommunication ICT economic and policies, I think this is what ad hoc group proposed to you to adopt. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR: So we are back to everything again, because this was what ad hoc group proposed, and then certain administrations, more than one indicated that they have problems with this full title. It was shorter and we had Papua New Guinea who wanted tariffs mentioned and I pleaded and they accepted, and now you have reservations or you say you have comments on it.

I want to plead with everybody who has asked for the floor to withdraw your request, for me to make another proposal, please.

Everyone who has asked for the floor, please withdraw your request, so that I make another proposal. I know some countries have not spoke this morning. I plead with you, I'll give you the opportunity again. Kindly withdraw your proposal -- your request for the floor, and I make a proposal, please.

I still have one country asking for the floor. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. I have been waiting for this opportunity to speak for quite a while. Thank you very much, that you have nevertheless

given me the opportunity to speak. We would like to express the fact that we do not support the decision made, because currently we do not have a consensus in the room, as regards the solution that you have adopted.

Secondly, I have a question about the need for clarification about our working methods. So if your next questions as regards moving from SG 11 to SG 12, part of the questions, the Russian Federation have a reservation as regards this transfer. This is our question. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Those issues will be dealt with later. Let me make another attempt. I want us to go back to the title as proposed from the four-hour meeting. I see nobody requesting for the floor now. If I see anybody asking for the floor, I will not give you the opportunity, but if it is to tell me that you don't agree with this title, then I can have another proposal. So requesting for the floor means you are against the title somehow which we came to but if it's quiet, it means that there is consensus and I'll announce that. For now this title tariffs and accounting principles and international telecommunications/ICT economic and policy issues, this is the title for SG 3 as from the ad hoc group.

Is this something we can work with? I see no one asking for the floor. I see Brazil now asking for the floor. Brazil, you have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Sorry, thank you, Chairman, I do appreciate all the effort you are trying to do with this. But this is the first time Brazil gets the chance to speak.

We do prefer the second proposal, the original proposal you have made, I would like to point out that even though we don't have a full consensus, I do understand we had a lot of support for that proposal. Then again, I don't understand consensus as having everybody agreeing, we can have some not exactly unanimity with the consensus work. We can have somebody that doesn't disagree and we could note something like that, but I do feel that we had a lot of support for the original proposition that you did with the international ICT policy, economic policy issues. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. So again, I'll attempt to, if we can highlight it again, the sense that we got from Japan is that it's not a reservation. It's for their comment to be noted on international telecommunications/ICT economic and policy issues.

Is this something we can work with as a title for

Study Group 3? I see United States asking for the floor.
United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Mr. Chairman, the Chairman of this group did an immense
work over four hours, over four hours and the text says
that it was agreed, if you show the text, that the title
in yellow was agreed, subject for confirmation. I kindly
ask for, in the spirit of compromise, for all of us to
agree on the work that was done by the work drafting
group as shown in the yellow text. Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Well, so now it's between yellow and green,
nice colors for Halloween.

Here again, I see great support for the ad hoc,
and then I see some support for my proposal to make it
short as well. Let me rule on this. Considering that
I pleaded with Papua New Guinea who also wanted the tariffs
mentioned, can we go with the title as submitted by the
ad hoc group? I see no one asking for the floor. I see
no point of order. So we will go for tariff and accounting
principles and international telecommunication ICT
economic and policy issues, as a title for Study Group
3.

(sound of gavel).

Thank you.

(applause).

Now we will proceed.

Let's go to the ad hoc group on allocation on QI11. I will invite Mrs. Irene of Uganda to give her report which is available as DT31 rev 1.

Uganda, you have the floor.

>> UGANDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, colleagues. Following on from such a discussion, I hope this will come as a relief. This ad hoc that I chaired was responsible for reviewing the text in QI/11 as provided in document E, and assess if the new QI/11 scope fits better in Study Group 11 or Study Group 12 mandates. In case these overlap, identify which part of the work should be performed by Study Group 11 and which by Study Group 12.

If possible, revise the current question I/11 text. Mr. Chairman, we had four meetings to be able to progress in this task, and I'm happy to report that we were able to arrive at a consensus text. We observe that the original text had some aspects applicable to Study Group 12, and we then revised the text to align it to Study Group 11 work.

Mr. Chairman, this is an output of our high and

commendable effort of compromise and hard work, and with this I submit it to com 4 for your consideration. Thank you very much. And thank you to the members that participated.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mrs. Irene from Uganda for your report on this so we have this as DT31. I see Germany asking for the floor. Germany, you have the floor.

>> GERMANY: I will be very short, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. Despite the applause you were very very quick, just a question, would you and the Secretariat clarify when the ad hoc group on the other matter SG 3 matter is going to discuss the mandate and the lead Study Group things, it must not be now but we shouldn't forget that this work is not yet done. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, so the ad hoc group on Study Group 3 matters will resume somewhere from 2 to continue on the mandate and the points of guidance on that, if that is not clear in my submission. Thank you very much. Is there any comments on this report as the Chairman of the ad hoc group on allocation of work QI to SG 12. I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you very much for your work. So this is agreed by the meeting.

(sound of gavel).

It will feed into resolution 2 when it comes to

questions -- I see Russia asking for the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair, for the floor. We would like to clarify whether this text is the last one, the latest version. We haven't quite been able to look through it. Yes, thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So as per the report received, the text is what was agreed at the ad hoc, and it is text which is aligned for the question to be kept at Study Group 11. This is as per the report. If this is clear to Russia, we can move on with this. We take it that this text is closed, and it will feed into resolution 2 for refinement.

Thank you. We will proceed on agenda item 4C, which is report from ad hoc group on Study Group 20 matters related to IoT, privacy, security and infrastructure. I'll invite the Chair, Mr. Milo to take us through the report. You have the floor.

>> Thank you, Chair. The ad hoc group met three times, and managed to have some informal consultations as well, in a way to move forward with the discussion, there was no consensus on how to proceed with the use the word privacy and trust in resolution 2 and related questions. With regards to the matter of critical

infrastructure addressed it was addressed at the last ad hoc meeting this morning, so it was agreed in the meeting to have a footnote in the points of guidance and the resolution 2 under ITU-T SG 20 mandate. The point of guidance in question is the one that says IoT infrastructure services available in smart sustainable cities architecture framework and requirements for ITU-T. The standardization work and infrastructure does not extend to the policy regulatory decisions, their surrounded designation of infrastructure as critical infrastructure, however, I'd like to point out that this agreement was reached in the meeting this morning. It was at 8:00 and not every interested party in this discussion was at that meeting. Additionally the USA requested the floor text to be added to this report as well. I'll quote what they requested to be said. While some party believes that privacy and trust are clear other parties are of the view it is needed to provide clarity within the use of ITU-T, privacy refers to technical aspects of privacy protection, personal protections articulated by privacy policies can be supported via technical mechanisms such as those enabling or protecting sensitive data, broader decisions such as definition of data as sensitive should take place

at national, regional or other levels outside the scope of ITU-T work. Likewise because the term trust is broad and encompasses both technical and nontechnical aspect it's used in this text as understood to refer to technical aspects of trust as they exhibit themselves international telecommunication standards. I'll close quotation marks there.

This is what we have reached. I'd like to thank the Secretariat for all their support in the work. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Chair, as well for your report. The sense is that not all interested parties were available at this ad hoc meeting, and I also got from the opening of this meeting that because of the constraints of other meetings that the delegates could not participate in this meeting.

Yes, we also are aware that working on IoT security, on resolution on IoT security, and then we also have this ad hoc group on IoT security matters for Study Group 20.

I will want us to consider that that ad hoc group on resolution on privacy and security, the Chair is Mr. Jeferson Nacif, he is Working Group 4B Chair. So his hands is quite full now.

Again, this is something which will need much more time. I would have preferred to combine the two texts, considering that both Chair of the ad hoc groups at com 4 and Working Group 4B, or Working Group 4A are from Brazil, and for Brazil to lead this work. However, I will want us to take a different approach, by going on a informal consultation on this, so that the interested parties can briefly discuss this further, to be able to agree on the choice of terminologies, so as it can be fed in either the resolution or the questions on IoT security going forward.

So, if this is acceptable by everyone, I will want us to scale down the ad hoc group to a informal consultation, so that this informal consultation will be fed into all other matters where there is questions or resolutions to make it easier for all delegates. I see United States asking for the floor. I see Brazil. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. The United States is happy to participate in further informal consultations. However, after participating in both discussions for many, many hours over the weekend, and last week, that lasted well into the night, we are not of the view that this is a topic that we are going to

be able to reach agreement on through further consultations. So we are just not sure what these discussions will yield.

We were present at 8:00 a.m. and we didn't really sense a willingness to discuss this further then.

So we definitely look to Brazil for their leadership as they have very, they have very well led us, I think, to some constructive conversations. But Chair, we wanted to clarify what your expectation is. We are not sure that we are going to be able to agree on terminology, in the time that we have left.

So we wonder, as we go into these informal consultations, what should we be expecting from you, Committee 4 Chair. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. I see Brazil, I see Egypt. To answer directly to the United States and if that will help for others to withdraw their request and for us to save time, to move on, com 4A under resolution on IoT security matters will come to com 4A anyway -- to com 4. Then com 4 has also set up a ad hoc group which report to com 4 so it is one family, and we have lunchtime today, before we even move into com 4, Working Group 4A meeting.

So there is still time. And I want us to take this

opportunity to make one more attempt, one more attempt, and after many attempts this morning, we are able to agree on the title of Study Group 3, even though we didn't agree on it when it was first presented. So if this is clear to everyone, can we proceed? I still see Brazil, Egypt, Cote d'Ivoire, United Arab Emirates, asking for the floor. A new informal discussion on the terminology, and then it can be fed into the question and the resolution.

If this is fine by everyone. Brazil, you have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair. Brazil will always be available to help you in any way. I had the original question that the U.S. posed and just to understand exactly what was expected, I see the idea is for us to conduct informal consultations basically the same mandate as we had in the ad hoc. But the discussion on the security and privacy resolution will remain in the discussions under 4A so we are not supposed to -- just to make sure my understanding is correct. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: The mandate won't be the same because in the ad hoc you are going to use the tools and terminologies to relate to the questions.

Now, we want it scaled down, where you agree on the terminologies. So, that is a clarification. Egypt,

you are asking for the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are very much aware that it was a difficult discussion. And I think what needed more difficulties, what made it more difficult is that the experts, most of us actually have been staying until very late hours at night, possibly with no possible, with no possibility to do any excursions and perhaps this is what made the discussions very heavily loaded.

I would propose in the spirit of the WTSA that the discussions go on, and I'm sure that the possibility to resolve any conflicts, I mean this is the spirit of the WTSA, if we decided not to conduct any further consultations with each other, we still have one more week to work together, and accordingly I would urge all parties to have more fun and let's meet over coffee. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Cote d'Ivoire, you have the floor.

>> Cote d'Ivoire: Thank you, Chair. We would not like to reopen the debate here, after the ad hoc session over the weekend. What we would like to have clarification with regards to the footnote, if we understand quickly, you said that this note was within

a environment within a mandate of Study Group 20. As it is drafted, however, we feel that this applies to all of the standardization sector of ITU. Could you please clarify this footnote for us, because it says that the standardization work of ITU-T, so we are talking about only the mandate of Study Group 20 here. So I would really seek clarification on the footnote as it's drafted. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Cote d'Ivoire. We have moved on from the footnote, because the report indicated that not all interested parties were available for the meeting, and it is for this reason why we want to give the opportunity for all interested parties to be in further consultations, and then all these queries could be asked, so that we can progress on. I want to give Saudi Arabia and then United Arab Emirates the floor. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. We are in alignment with your proposal with regards to hold new consultations on Study Group 20. But are we going to work within the framework of the focus group, the ad hoc group? That is what we would prefer indeed.

And with regards to the other issues that have arisen, with regards to the question, will these be discussed within the current framework or will they be re-allocated,

Chair? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Yes, thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

Indeed, we are agreeing with you, Mr. Chairman, just to make it brief, on the way forward, however, we would maybe ask also with our colleagues from Saudi Arabia, we might have it as a ad hoc, official ad hoc, combining the discussion on this topic and relevant topics together in the same group, and also with regards to the comments from Cote d'Ivoire I think we would like to agree with them. This would be a differently discussed again in the ad hoc that we are going to have it on different relevant aspects, with regards to this topic. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Arab Emirates. At this point, informal consultations, Mr. Fabio Bigi, Chair of Working Group 4A, you have a resolution, another group on resolution on IoT security, and I also have one on the same matter. Will you agree for us to combine our ad hoc groups so that they can deal with the matters of the terminologies, their questions as well as the new resolution? Mr. Bigi.

>> FABIO BIGI: Thank you, Chairman, in fact my ad

hoc group have completed their work, either satisfactory or not satisfactory, we will be reporting this afternoon. I know that the one meeting with resolution 50, 52 has not reached agreement. So I will be more than pleased that they combine the effort together, and be in unique group to try to solve, and if possible before the end of my meeting will be better, so I will have instead to report that there has been no result, there has been some results. So I am, but anyway, my ad hoc group have finished. No more meeting foreseen. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. We hope that later in this meeting, to be reported from Working Group 4A. So with this, I will plead with the delegates that we hold on the way forward on this one, as to whether it's an informal consultation or an ad hoc, and then when we hear from Working Group 4A, we can see how we combine all these IoT privacy, security and infrastructure matters.

So to move on if you agree, I see Saudi Arabia asking for the floor. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, regarding the ad hoc that deals with the new resolution on the privacy and trust, we understand that we were working yesterday until 1:00 a.m., however,

the mandate of that ad hoc group was not yet completed. So, we cannot say that the ad hoc group is finished. The ad hoc group is finished when it's, it completes its mandates. However, due to the time constraints, we were not able to continue after 1:00 a.m.

Just to clarify the situation, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. But if you all allow for us to move on, we will take the Chairman's report later on in this meeting, so that we can decide on the way forward on IoT security, privacy, trust, infrastructure matters.

If you all withdraw your requests for us to hold on to 4C for us to proceed on the agenda. Please, if everyone would withdraw. Thank you very much. We move to 4D which is on the other group on resolution 2, and at this point in time, the best of a new age to our dear Chairman, Miss Victoria siknik of Argentina, update to you, can we have your report and I hope it comes with the best wishes to everyone.

(applause).

Argentina, you have the floor.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you very much, Chair. Good morning, everyone. I'm now going to present the report

of the ad hoc group which addressed resolution 2, the mandate of this group can be seen in document DT57, the group met twice over the weekend on Saturday and Sunday. I'd like to thank all of those who attended over the weekend, working extremely hard in order to complete our mandate.

The following approach adopted was to take document 36 as a baseline which consolidated the proposals received from the different Study Groups and for the advisory group and to review all of the proposals received which might affect resolution 2, and which came from different regional groups.

First, we worked on annex A part 1 and then we moved on to annex B. We can see in detail the report, the different contributions received in each of the cases.

For the end we left annex 2 with regards to lead Study Group roles. With regards to annex C, it was decided to leave this until the Secretariat of TSB had updated all of the agreements in the previous Assemblies.

We reviewed the different proposals and we completed this work except with the issues with regards to other ad hoc groups within the framework of Committee 4 which were held in parallel, one was with regards to the work of Study Group 3 and the other with regards to Study

Group 20, internet of Things, privacy, security, and infrastructure, which has just been addressed. In the report you see a revised version of resolution 2. There are fortunately, we were able to reach agreement on Study Groups 5, 9, 12, 15 and 16. For the other groups there is still a number of square brackets which exist, which can be discussed. In Study Group 2, for example, there are issues arising with regarding Internet of Things and their possible role on classification of telecommunication services, these issues can be seen, will be addressed under other ad hoc groups, and resolutions, which are still yet to be addressed and are ongoing.

In Study Group 3, it was still not reviewed because we were waiting for the ad hoc group to identify the title, and now we can see that we have a title, and with regards to the mandate there were various proposals received, but these weren't analyzed because we understood it was another group that had this within their mandate. With regards to Study Group 11, there was a question with regards to the lead role for combating the use of stolen ICT devices whether it should be in Study Group 11 or Study Group 17, and this is still in square brackets. In Study Group 13, we still have open

the definition of big data in the title, and whether Study Group 13 or Study Group 20 had reached agreement on the lead roles with regards to big data. We weren't able to reach consensus in the room on this. Therefore, these two lead roles are still within square brackets.

With reference to Study Group 17, there is a mention of conformance testing, and the lead roles for identity management together with Study Group 20, and the Internet of Things, and I mentioned before within Study Group 11 with regards to the use of stolen ICT devices.

Furthermore it was still left open the agreement between Study Group 17 and Study Group 20 with regards to security in the area of Internet of Things, which can be seen in annex B. Finally, with regards to Study Group 20, we weren't able to address the proposals from the Arab group, because this had to do with many issues with regards to other groups, and we weren't able to reach consensus in the room. It was mentioned before with regards to specific issues of big data together with Study Group 13.

Finally, Chair, I wanted to mention, as a general note, that it was decided to adopt the ITU terminology IMT 2020, when referring to 5G.

Finally, I'd like to thank the Secretariat of TSB

in particular to Mr. Simao De Campos and Mr. Stefan who worked closely with us on this. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Miss Victoria for your report and your hard work over the weekend. I acknowledge the extensive hours and the sacrifice of all to be able to achieve this very progressive results.

Ladies and gentlemen, here we are with this progress on resolution 2. So we will want to agree and adopt on the parts which we have all agreed to proceed, and then we decide on the way forward on the ones which are on square brackets, in due course.

So if this can be scrolled down further, the preamble of resolution 2, the page, here are the changes, changing Dubai to Hammamet. Is there any comment? I see no comment. I see no one asking for the floor. I suppose we agree on this.

Okay, this part is agreed, I mean the, not to the general parts, yes, before the annex.

Okay. So looking at the recognizing, considering, noting and resolves, and the instructs. This part is agreed. Thank you.

So, we can now go to the other Study Groups for which there are no square brackets, there are five of them, Study Group 9, 5, 12, 15 and 16. Can we reflect

for Study Group 5, yes, Study Group 5. Yes. Is there any comment on this? I see no one asking for the floor. Again, thank you. Study Group 5 mandate is agreed.

Yes, the lead roles as well, is not in square brackets. So yes, the lead role on Study Group 5 is also as it is shown, I see no one asking for the floor. So the lead role as well is agreed.

Thank you. So we will take Study Group 9. Annex B of Study Group 5, being highlighted now, under recommendations. I see no one asking for the floor. So this as well is agreed.

Go further to annex C, under recommendations under Study Group 5, they remain same. I see no one asking for the floor. Great.

So we have everything covered for Study Group 5. So, we go back to Study Group 9, which also qualified without any square brackets.

Back to annex A, so this is as on the screen, revised text for Study Group 9. I see no one asking for the floor. We have an agreement. Let's proceed further, to the lead Study Group role for Study Group 9, is a single item, lead Study Group 1, integrate broadband and cable television networks. No change to that. We agree.

With same, we move to annex B, on Study Group 9,

as on your screen now. I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you. Study Group 9 has it. And for the annex C, the TSB will check the recommendations listed for Study Group 9.

We can now take on Study Group 12, from annex A, the general areas of study, as projected now. No one asking for the floor, so thank you.

We proceed on to the lead Study Group roles, three of them. The new one being on quality assessment of video communications and applications. No one asking for the floor. Thank you. We go to annex B, if you can go further, there was a revised text at the bottom there, so as for the transfer of work to Study Group 12 this change was made. I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you.

Annex C will be looked at, by the TSB. We move on to Study Group 15. In annex A, on their mandate, Study Group 15. So, I see no one asking for the floor. The lead Study Group roles, there is a new one on home networking, as a lead Study Group on home networking. The lead roles, and then we had lead Study Group on architecture technology and Study Group on architecture transfer networks. The one on architecture networks has been canceled out as agreed on the ad hoc meeting on resolution 2. I see no one asking for the floor. So

thank you.

Okay, so you catch that. So let's go to annex B. On Study Group 15, as projected now, new revised text, I see no one asking for the floor. Thank you for Study Group 15, the annex C will be looked at.

For Study Group 16, you go to annex A. In their mandate we can now see that the text has been revised, with human interfaces and services, as the human factors question was transferred to Study Group 16.

I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you. As revised for Study Group 16. We look at the lead Study Group role, and now it is showing the lead Study Group on human factors, for Study Group 16. I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you. We go to annex B. For Study Group 16, okay, as projected. I see United Arab Emirates asking for the floor. UAE, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm not sure if this is the agreed sentence here, regarding the e-service. My understanding, Mr. Chairman, from yesterday's discussion that we were speaking about the multi-media service and application, I think the sentence was completely changed in the last meeting. Maybe I would ask the Chairman of the ad hoc to reflect the agreed let us say draft yesterday.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. Miss Victoria, can you respond to this part on the mention of eServices. Argentina, you have the floor.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. With regards to this point in particular, I understand that it was discussed, we discussed multi-media eServices, and to not include the examples where it is mentioned e-government, e-health, and eEducation. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the clarification. With this clarification, that means the mentioning of the e-government, e-health, and education is redacted. Is this fine with UA, UAE, is this was as agreed?

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would not fully recall the agreement, but maybe as mentioned by the Chairman, however, we propose to have it as multi-media aspects of eServices, and I think if this works, that is fine. Otherwise we can consider the Chairman proposal.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, this is the spirit of the discussion yesterday, multi-media aspects of eServices. If this is fine with everyone, everybody has withdrawn their -- with this, can we approve for Study Group 16? No problems. Thank you very much.

The annex C will be looked at by the TSB to map

all their recommendations for these Study Groups 5, 9, 12, 15 and 16.

Now we have to go back to what to do with the other Study Groups who have square brackets.

We will start with Study Group 2, and as per the report from the Chair, the numbering in the title of Study Group 2, the IoT management in the 9th bullet of annex A part 1, and possible role on classification on telecommunications services pending the review of the proposal from the RCC, who effected this whole package. So with this it comes as another package for Study Group 2 matters. The numbering in the title, the IoT management in the 9th bullet of annex A part 1, possible role which representation I hope you have to take it today before we close. So if, we will hold on to this also, we will come back after the presentation to look at the way forward for SG 2. I see United Arab Emirates asking for the floor. United Arab Emirates, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just for clarification, I think the Study Group 2 will be further discussed in the ad hoc, so there is no need to make any comment on a particular aspects right now, if my understanding is correct, Mr. Chair? Just to confirm?

>> CHAIR: Yes, I wouldn't want to take comments right now. I want us to deal with square brackets away from here, so I will want us to proceed on Study Group 3, because we will come back to Study Group 2 when we have the pending presentation by the RCC.

So that we know what to do with Study Group 2 matters, if this is fine with all of us.

United Arab Emirates, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just it's not to go into the debate on the specific Study Group, I think we have made comments yesterday on requested square brackets across the identification part. I think this can be taken further in the ad hoc if we are going to the ad hoc but to clarify, are we going to discuss again in the ad hoc for this edition again or how are we going to proceed further in this topic?

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So let's go through all that we have, and then we can draw the way forward for each of them if you allow me. Thank you. For Study Group 3 we now have a title, and we are supposed to have a mandate, and then points of guidance.

With this, I will again plead with delegates and the Chair from Zambia, to continue on their work, as per the terms of reference, to agree on the mandate and

the points of guidance, lead Study Group role, to be able to feed into resolution 2, if this is fine by everyone. I see Germany asking for the floor. Germany, you have the floor.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. But you are a little bit contradicting what you said earlier, the title we agreed on is the title we are going to work on from this for the mandate. It does not mean that this is a final agreement. I made it very clear at the beginning that if this package does not result to the satisfaction of all participants, we may go back to our initial position, European position which is no change.

But for going, on the ongoing work we have agreed to be based on this title. So I would kindly ask to keep the square brackets around the Study Group 3 exercise in resolution 2. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Germany, we have the same understanding. Study Group 3 part was not part of the discussions at resolution 2, because we have already taken that part out. So we have the same understanding.

So just as work started, we want you to proceed on the title as we have now, and then you go into the mandate and the points of guidance, lead Study Group, so that it feeds, it feeds, it will not be discussed

resolution 2, if this is fine with everyone. I see everybody withdrawing their requests. So thank you very much. Thank you to Zambia. We will reflect the time for you to be able to continue your work on Study Group 3 matters. Thank you.

Now, we go to Study Group 11, and it's whether the lead role on combating the use of stolen ICT devices should be in Study Group 11, vis-a-vis Study Group 17.

Again, with this one, there is currently the discussion on the new resolution on combating the use of stolen ICT devices. I want us to hold on to this, and see how we can combine with the work following the report from the informal consultations on this new resolution.

So that we can have everything about the lead study role on counterfeit and on resolution as well so that on the same matter we are not divided. I see Russia asking for the floor. I see United Kingdom asking for the floor. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair. For us, it is absolutely clear that SG 11 should be the leading Study Group in terms of considering issues of stolen devices. At the meeting of the study Group itself it has been noted many times that these questions are

technically linked to questions of the fight against counterfeit and CNI programmes. For us it is not also clear how this question tallies with Study Group 17, because to date we have two proposals, from the RCC and from the U.S., inter-American that is, on this topic, and in neither of them is there a definition of the leading role or of Study Group 11 -- 17, apologies. It's mainly focused on the work of Study Group 11, not 17.

Today these documents will be presented, and we will be able to discuss this further. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So from the Russian understanding and if you all understand that we will take the proposals on this alone, let's not start the debate now. I plead that we hold on to this matter until we have taken the presentation and discussions on the new resolution on combating the use of stolen ICT devices. Then we will consider the way forward.

Let's save that time, the time for those presentations as we have a decision going forward. If this is acceptable by the countries who are requesting for the floor, if you can withdraw your request, then we can proceed on. If you withdraw your request, if it is about Study Group 11 role on stolen devices. It is

not decision time. You want to listen to the presentations later on, and then we can come back to this.

I see United Kingdom insisting to have the floor. United Kingdom, you have the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, given the intervention by our esteemed Russian delegate, I think we ought to record that other regions, I think three regions, have made proposals in this respect. Mobile device theft is currently in Study Group 17, they have a question on it. They have worked on it. The reason I have just raised on the floor is that mobile devices theft should be in square brackets, it's in square brackets in some of the text but it's not in square brackets in the part 1 annex A general areas of study. But it is in square brackets elsewhere. We will discuss that at the appropriate time. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. If you all accept that we discuss this at the appropriate time, can you withdraw your requests? You have the opportunity to discuss this later on, so that we can proceed to that time, in time. Thank you very much.

So we go on to Study Group 13, which is on big data in the title, partitioning of big data lead role with

SG 20. That is where the holdup is on. If you remember, there was the discussion between the two Study Group Chairmen, Study Group 13 and Study Group 20, and they gave us a certain output, and this was discussed further, and then it went to resolution 2. And it was really discussed much much much more there, and it is still in square brackets.

With this, I propose that interested parties, interested parties refer to Study Group 13 Chair, as the convener to agree on big data title, and partition of big data lead Study Group role with Study Group 20. I see Switzerland asking for the floor. Switzerland, you have the floor.

>> SWITZERLAND: Thank you very much, and good morning, everybody.

Coming back to this, I understand you would like to have some kind of ad hoc Chaired by me on this topic. Unfortunately, I think we cannot consider this isolated, from the rest of the mandate and the text of Study Group 20. I think in the end, we had a lot of discussions here in the ad hoc group, Chaired by Argentina and in the end these both brackets on the big data and the title, and the proposal of the Chairman to split lead responsibility for big data between the both Study Groups,

I think it could not be resolved isolated. I think it's important that, and I propose to keep, to run this in the package with the other discussion, the Study Group 20, because I'm convinced as soon as we have resolved this, then we will have here bracket or no bracket or whatever, it's just a consequence there. And it will save us all many times here not to hear several issue on this proposal, I would like to propose not to separate this discussion now but keep it in the discussion of the Study Group 20 text and mandate. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Right, thank you. So what I gather from you is that we already have an ad hoc group on Study Group 20 matters, which is related to IoT privacy, security and infrastructure, and with that, we could consider the lead role of Study Group 20 relating to big data, vis-a-vis that of Study Group 13 as well. So, this should be part of the terms of reference for what we deferred earlier on. That reflects in the last bullet point as per the report of the resolution 2, that all AR B4 3A18 proposals, partitioning of big data lead Study Group role with Study Group 13. So this is noted. I think it's quite progressive, so we will add that to that part of the work on Study Group 20 matters. So it now is not just with IoT privacy, security and

infrastructure technologies, but also to determine the lead Study Group role on big data as well.

So, with this, being -- I see Argentina asking for the floor. Argentina, you have the floor.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. Thank you for giving me the floor once again. I would simply like to see if you might consider the possibility of holding an ad hoc group which addresses all of these issues, with regards to Internet of Things, privacy, within the mandate of Study Group 20 and the proposal of the Arab group which we have not yet been able to review, and other questions which might arise with regards to Internet of Things, with Study Group 20, with a view to be able to simplify the work and to really bring forward concrete proposals to this Committee. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So for now, we have an ad hoc group to make it clear, we have a ad hoc group on Study Group 3 who will refer to the agreed title, the mandate, the point of reference, lead Study Group role on Study Group 3.

We have another group which on Study Group 20 matters relating to IoT privacy, security and infrastructure. Now we have the issue of the lead Study Group role on big data aspects vis-a-vis with Study Group 13. Now we

are revising the TOR of the ad hoc group on Study Group 20 matters to include the part on big data aspects, and put all this together. This is my proposal, so that everything about Study Group 20 will be similar to that of Study Group 3, so that it can be followed together in one ad hoc group.

And whatever decisions are taken there, will be fed into resolution 2. Do we agree with my proposal? I see Brazil asking for the floor. Brazil, you have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair. To be very clear, the point being for the ad hoc on 20 is it to take on decision on the whole mandate of SG 20 as well or just to decide on the privacy and the big data that was mentioned before? Or is it the whole mandate of the group? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: What we have to resolve as of now as per the previous terms of reference is on the terminologies, privacy versus confidence, and the appropriate terminology for infrastructure, and then which ever terminologies are agreed on will reflect in the change of question of Study Group 20. That was the original TOR.

Now we have the additional item of the lead Study Group role of Study Group 20 when it comes to big data.

We want to consider this as well as part of the discussions of the previous TOR. So this is packaged together under the umbrella of Study Group 20. I see UAE asking for the floor. If this is clear to everyone, UAE, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Definitely would appreciate your way forward, Mr. Chairman. However just again to clarify it further, our understanding from the earlier discussion that we need to have everything related to security, privacy and trust and so on within one pool and discussed in certain ad hoc. I think will be a new one, either maybe Study Group 20 one or new resolution one, noting that the comments made earlier by Saudi Arabia that the discussion yesterday was not yet completed. So I think it needs to be further considered.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have additional element coming into the picture which is big data aspects, of Study Group 13 and 20, which is another aspect between two Study Groups. My question, Mr. Chairman, is, are we going to combine the discussion on privacy, trust and security aspects with the big data aspects together, with the new resolution on the privacy and security, just to clarify. So we have one ad hoc, covering all

aspects of security, privacy and trust, as well as big data, whether it is Study Group 20 or Study Group 13. Just to clarify, Mr. Chairman.

>>CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. Just to clarify, the sense I got from Working Group 4A Chair was that their resolution is about to be completed. So, here I will use, if. So in the situation where it is not complete, we will consider this resolution as part of the ad hoc group we are trying to use to look at terminology, privacy versus confidence, the appropriate terminology for infrastructure, lead Study Group role on big data, and if the resolution on IoT, security and privacy is not agreed, the same ad hoc group will handle it, if this is clear to everyone. I see UAE and Saudi Arabia asking for the floor. UAE, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your kind clarification. Just listening to the comments made by Study Group 13 Chairman, our understanding that the, exactly similar to the Study Group 13 intervention, that the issue of the lead group as well as discussion on the big data has two aspects here. They have to go together based on the discussions that we have conducted long hours during the last period of the WTSA. The Study Group 13

and 20, with regards to the big data, will go in one package. Then this means also the relevant big data aspects of Study Group 13 will also be discussed in the same group. This is my understanding. Is it correct, Mr. Chairman?

>> CHAIR: Yes, your understanding is correct, because big data aspects is also about Study Group 13. It will be determined in the meeting. That is what term Study Group 13 Chairman says he prefers. Thank you. I see, if this is clear, Saudi Arabia, do you still want to have the floor? You have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: thank you, Mr. Chairman. The situation has to be clarified. The ad hoc group was given a mandate and due to the lack of time, it was not able to complete its tasks. So we couldn't say that the ad hoc group completed its mandate or completed its work. Yes, we were yesterday until 1:00 a.m. in this building, discussing the new resolution on privacy and trust. We haven't discussed some of the part of the resolutions. So it seems that we need a time, more time to discuss that resolution, but we cannot say that the ad hoc group completed its mandates. There is a difference between completing mandates and lack of time. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So if you agree with me on the terms of reference for the ad hoc group on Study Group 20 matters, now it is on Study Group 20 matters, and the matters are related to IoT, privacy, security and infrastructure, and also related to big data, vis-a-vis that of Study Group 13, and if the resolution on IoT privacy and security is not completed, this will be the package for this ad hoc group. I see Saudi Arabia still asking for the floor. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Does that mean it's a new ad hoc that was, that will be created in order to handle all of these matters, just to clarify the situation here, because we have two ad hocs we are discussing those aspects. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Saudi Arabia, do you agree with the combined terms of reference? That is my question. If everybody agrees, then we can see the way forward. Do you agree with the terms of reference of combining everything related to Study Group 20 under an ad hoc group? I see no objection. So thank you. So this is a revised TOR which considers terminologies for privacy and security, privacy and confidence, for terminology for infrastructure, big data, lead role, either it is part should be going to Study Group 20 or part should

be going to Study Group 13, the resolution on IoT privacy and security, if it is not completed by the ad hoc group created by Working Group 4A, will be part as a package.

With this understanding, I will now propose to you a Chair from Malaysia, Mr. Taeb Mustafah, is this acceptable by everyone?

I see no objections.

So, Mr. Mustafah, can you please accept your acceptance to Chair this ad hoc group which will be ad hoc group on Study Group 20 matters. Malaysia, you have the floor.

>> Malaysia: Thank you, Chair. And thank you all colleagues. I think for Malaysia, we accept the role of the ad hoc Chairman for this important group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. With this acceptance and the agreement of the revised terms of reference, the previous ad hoc group which was led by Brazil on Study Group 20 matters related to IoT privacy, security and infrastructure, is closed. We want to thank Brazil for their effort. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We do agree with your proposal. However, we would like to note that the new resolution from Arab States about

strengthening the role of IoT and trust and privacy is not only focus to Study Group 20, just to note this, that is it not only about Study Group 20 matters. The new resolution is a general resolution that is proposed by the Arab States, on the privacy and trust matters. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Saudi Arabia, to make life easy for all of us, this is a 4A matter. Let's be patient for their report. Okay? That is why I used the word "if," okay? Thank you very much, Saudi Arabia. Thank you Switzerland, for withdrawing. Egypt, do you still insist on the floor? We have taken a decision on this, if you would be kind to withdraw we could progress to issues that are related to this, and we can move further on this, if this is fine by everyone. Thank you very much for your tolerance on me. It is left with the last item from the report to consider, which is the note, that it was decided to adopt the ITU terminology IMT 2020 when referring to 4G terminologies -- 5G terminologies. If this is fine with everyone, with all the tasks that we have with 5G we will replace with the IMT 2020.

I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you very much for your agreement on this.

So, just to remind you on what we went through,

were resolution 2, for it to be clear to everyone, anything in annex A and B of resolution 2 about Study Group 5, 9, 12, 15, 16, have been agreed.

On Study Group 2, we will wait on the presentation from RCC to note the way forward.

On Study Group 3, the ad hoc group will resume to progress on the mandate, points of guidance and lead Study Group based on the title agreed this morning. On Study Group 11, we are holding on to the presentations on the new resolution on stolen phones and for it to go as a package as to see who will be the lead Study Group on combating the use of stolen ICT devices.

The remainder of the issues which is about Study Group 13, 17 and 20, which are related to Study Group 20, we have, if you call it a revised ad hoc group with a new Chair from Malaysia. Then we have agreed that anywhere we see 5G is replaced with IMT 2020.

With this, I see United Kingdom asking for the floor. United Kingdom, you have the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chairman. It was just one other point which you didn't mention, and that is in Study Group 2, the proposal by most regions was that Study Group 2 deals with identification, and one region I think wanted that taken out. And then in Study Group

20, Study Group, there was a proposal by a region for Study Group 20 to deal with IoT identifiers which are in square brackets. I assume that will be covered by the group which had met before, which is resolving the outstanding issues in relation to resolution 2. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: To emphasize and to make it clear, issues that's got to do with Study Group 2 and Study Group 11 we have yet to decide a way forward because it's pending some presentations to come. If this is clear to everyone, you can withdraw your requests, with this identification linked to Study Group 2 or IoT link to Study Group 2 or stolen counterfeit with Study Group 11, based on the presentations to come, we will take a decision on it. So now we have these two Study Groups left to know what to do, based on the presentations to come.

If you will withdraw your requests, then we can proceed on the agenda. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just for the record, that the Arab States and the African states are proposing a resolution 60 that IoTs, that Study Group 20 to be the lead Study Group in IoT identification. So just to note this, because we have heard about the, that there are many proposals that are not supporting

that direction. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. To everyone, please, anything got to do with Study Group 2 or Study Group 11, allow us to listen to the presentations and some data to this Assembly and then we decide a way forward, please. Thank you very much.

This is to thank you, Miss Victoria for your work on resolution 2. Definitely that will be the feed from all these other ad hoc groups to you, so that we could get resolution 2 refined thereon. Thank you very much for your work. Now we proceed on to the drafting group, on draft new resolution on consumer protection, and the conveners from Japan, Mrs. Momiko Osuki. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: It's almost noon, but good morning, everyone. I would like to report to you the result of our drafting session, for the new resolution on studies concerning the protection of users of telecommunication, ICT services, which was originally proposed by RCC.

The meeting was held on Friday for two hours, and about 30 members attended representing all regions.

The agreed text has been published as TD 73. As you mentioned at the first Committee 4 meeting, the gentlemen in my group and of course ladies as well were

so helpful, so we made a great progress on most of the part. There were two reservations noted on items in square bracket in the text.

First one is in recalling part, so reservation was, the first one was noted on item E, the reference to article 4 of the ITR. The second reservation is in the resolves part 1, after the notably, in the areas of quality, security, tariffs and policy mechanisms. This is because that this relates to the scope of Study Group's mandate including Study Group 3, which is still under discussion at ad hoc groups. And members of our group wanted to wait for their outcomes before taking a decision.

Finally, I would also like to report to you that this resolution has a financial implication. It invites the Director of TSB to assist the Director of BDT in implementation of the resolution 196 of the Plenipotentiary Conference and to carry out studies on consumer protection. Thank you, Chair. That's all.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Japan, for this very clean text, and the agreement of all Member States for what you have done, so we can project the resolution as it is now, DT73. Here we look at recalling E and it's recalling article 4 of the international

telecommunication regulations ITR and at the resolves part, resolve 1, can we scroll it down. So the recalling part is the E which is in square brackets, and the resolve 1 we have notably, resolve 1, notably in the areas of quality, security tariffs and policy mechanisms. I see Germany asking for the floor. Germany, will you want to remove these square brackets? Germany, you have the floor.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Chairman. Well, probably I should try to take it one by one. The first matter is in recalling E, the reference it was international telecommunication regulation. We would prefer to have a generic reference as in other documents, in order not to encounter the problem of exactly which ITRs we are talking about. Insofar, we would kindly ask to remove the word, article 4 of and only to refer to the international telecommunication regulation and then of course remove the square brackets. So this is our comment on the first square brackets, probably we leave it to you to discuss and we will come later to address the second square bracket. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So that is the proposal from Germany. Will it be fine with everyone if we just refer to international telecommunication regulations? I see

no one asking for the floor. Am I taking a quick decision, so I see no one asking for the floor, so thank you, we will take out article 4 of the, so it will be, it will just remain ITR. Can we see that on the screen? Okay. That is acceptable by everyone. Please display that on the screen so it is of use to everyone.

DT73. Yes. So if we take, yes, and we remove the square brackets, this is acceptable by everyone. Thank you all.

So we now go to --

(sound of gavel).

Thank you. We now go to resolve 1. Resolve 1, we have notably, in the areas of quality, security, tariffs and policy mechanisms. Do we accept to remove the square brackets, just to prescribe what areas we are looking for consumer protection. Germany, you have the floor.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Chairman. While in principle we would prefer to have the entire text within the square brackets deleted, but if this is not acceptable, we would at least delete, and policy mechanism. We were very optimistic when they put the square brackets around this part of the text, thinking that all Study Groups' mandates are clear at this juncture. But they are not. Insofar if we want to approve this resolution now and

here, we would at least request to remove, and policy mechanism. And then of course remove the square bracket. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. As proposed by Germany, we would open square brackets or remove it and that will go together with, and policy mechanisms, but notably in the areas of quality, security and tariffs will be maintained. I see no one asking for the floor.

(sound of gavel).

Just again, on the decision I have, Japan asking for the floor. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm sorry for the belated asking the floor. But as convener told us that this part would be revisited during the ad hoc group, so we propose to keep it as it is until such time as we decide definitely. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, again, I'll appeal to you, Japan. We are looking for a resolution on consumer protection. And here in this text we want to be precise on which areas that we want to give consumer protection. We can take our minds away from this Assembly, and look out for what consumer protection is about.

And the areas that are of interest that the consumer wants to be protected. Tariffs, quality of service,

security, are obviously areas that the consumer which we all are among them, will want protection on. Policy is a very broad area, not as specific as we can say with tariffs. And how do we really address policy when it comes to consumer protection? In an organisation as the ITU. Will we lose anything if we take out and policy mechanisms, and let the three remain for a start. Japan again, I appeal to you. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Chairman. I hope I can help you. I listened to Mr. Shagawa and he believes that these are going to his Study Groups. Now Study Group 3 does all kinds of things, but I don't think they do security. So if, my suggestion is to take out security and just say notably, in the area, A as of quality tariff and policy. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Let's slow down, let's not take out anything. If you look at resolve 3, it says that where appropriate, that Study Group ITU-T Study Group 3, where appropriate, with Study Groups 2, 12 and 17, within their mandate, carry out studies including standards for the protection of consumers. So I believe this is where we can map the quality with the security to Study Group 12 and 17.

So let's not look at this resolution as a resolution

belonging to a particular Study Group, because in resolves 3, it is clear that it will work with other Study Groups. I see Russia asking for the floor. But again I want to put it clearly. Do we accept to take off policy mechanisms and then we remove the square brackets, as the way forward? Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair. We would like to support your proposal to remove policy in this context, yes, because it perhaps is wider than is necessary. Also, as you have noted, in paragraph 1, it is dedicated to the whole sector, but 3 is more specific as regards activities. So we express our support to your decision and we hope that our Distinguished Delegates will be able to agree on this. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russia. So do we agree to these changes to remove the square brackets and take out, and policy mechanisms, to have a new resolution on consumer protection? I see no one asking for the floor.

(sound of gavel).

Thank you very much. Tell the world. ITU has a new resolution on consumer protection.

(applause).

Okay. So with this, we have tasks with financial

implications and we will give that note to com 2 and then we will send this to com 5 as well for editorial refinement and for approval at the plenary. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Now we are making progress. And we move on to agenda item 4F, which is a report to be received from the drafting group on the draft new resolution to enable open source as a work methodology in ITU-T. Would the Chair from Russia, Mr. Dmitry, please, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman.

After the meeting I held some informal consultations with the authors of the report, the Arab States. The based on the outcomes of these consultations I prepared a temporary document where we had a proposal as a basic document for our meeting. However, some of the delegates expressed that they were not in agreement with such way of carrying out a consultation, as regards this information provision.

They believed this did not allow them to participate in these consultations. Therefore, they expressed their disagreement with this document under consideration, made on the basis of these consultations. As a result, I withdrew my proposal for consideration, and as regards the Arab States, we worked on agreement with this only

with Member States. Thus, we started to work, only after 45 minutes after the start of the meeting, with the basic document as the Arab States proposal. Canada, U.S. and the European region expressed how they did not agree with this draft resolution because there was ongoing work at TSAG on similar issues.

They proposed to put the whole text in square brackets. This was so done. After the start of the work, everyone actively participated in the drafting, however, we did not manage to conclude our work, and around, went through about 20 percent of the text, having not agreed on any paragraphs. The outcomes to date of this resolution are set out in DT -- working document 41, and there is a cleaner version without, in document 82. Canada, U.S. and European region have their opposition and reflected in my report, in temporary document 5.5 having noted the need to take into account TSAG's work on this issue. We need to carry out further meetings, and I would invite you to a meeting this evening at 6:30, to 8:30, and from 2130 until we conclude the work. We will put this immediately on the timetable for our work, and on all screens in this excellent facility.

Thank you very much, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Dmitry for your

report to us. So we have the resolution in square brackets. I see United Kingdom asking for the floor. UK, you have the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And to Mr. Cherkosov, as a point of minor clarification, CEPT does not oppose the resolution per se. We simply do wish as he said to see the work that already takes place continue, but are not opposed to a resolution on any terms. It's subject to agreement on its contents. With respect to the scheduling of the meeting, I will of course defer to you, but it may be useful to first of all get the entire scope of all the different ad hocs that may be required given there are 7 additional resolutions getting their first reading today. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United Kingdom. What I get from United Kingdom is that they are ready to work further as CEPT, if I should put it more broadly, to work further on this draft new resolution. We only have to look at the time, and as they requested for the time, they are willing to look at the text in its entirety and see the way forward.

So, yes, again, we will then take it up as we can, the time for further discussions, if this is agreeable

by everyone, we will find additional time for this to be reported to. Thank you very much for your acceptance on this.

So the ad hoc, the drafting group, sorry, will continue its work on the open source as work methodology in the ITU-T.

With this, we have completed agenda item 4, but with parts to note on Study Group 20, sorry, Study Group 2. Study Group 2 part we will take it later on in the agenda.

Now we move to the fifth agenda item which is on reports, and outputs of Working Groups and Study Group 4, com 4. I see the Chairman of Working Group 4A, Mr. Fabio Bigi, do you have any report for us, please? You have the floor.

>> FABIO BIGI: Thank you, Chairman. We have a lot of, like you, during the weekend, we have had five ad hoc groups, and they will make the report this afternoon. So we have reviewed all the material presented to us. We can, I can better report on the result after having had the meeting this afternoon. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your update. So that means tomorrow afternoon we will take all the reports from Working Group 4A.

Do we have any report from Working Group 4B, from Mr. Jeferson Nacif? Brazil, you have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. 4B we will reconvene tomorrow. Up to now, we have discussed almost all the documents that were presented to the Committee 4B. We still have some pending issues regarding resolution 54, which will be presented tomorrow, and I think that our discussion Thursday will be enough to deal with all this, on the issues that are pending, after very fruitful discussions within the presentation of the whole members. We also have the resolution 75. We still have to make the formal presentation but I know that informal consultations are undergoing. I think that tomorrow we will also have a final and definitive discussion on those two resolutions. And that would be the conclusion of my work on com 4B and also of the documents. I hope with the cooperation of everyone, we can reach a good conclusion in this 4B and send the documents, and forward the documents to com 4 accordingly.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Jeferson Nacif from Brazil, working group 4B Chairman. To request of Working Group Chairman 4A, in case the resolution on

IoT is not completed, kindly forward that document, pass it on to com 4 for it to be part of the new ad hoc group on IoT matters, or sorry, on Study Group 20 matters. So that they could progress with it.

So, again, on any other resolutions that may be related to Study Group 20, that you may not get closure, please they will be referred to the ad hoc group for Study Group 20. Thank you.

If this is clear, we can now go on to agenda item 6, which is on the questions. We will take the first one, proposals of Study Groups. The proposals from the Study Groups as drafted are presented to this Assembly is available as document 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20 and 22. This was translated in all languages. It has been posted for some time. If there is no request for the floor, I want to propose that we agree on the questions as proposed by the Study Groups in block.

I see no one asking for the floor. So we have the questions as submitted by the Study Groups. Agreed.

(gavel).

Thank you very much.

As a update, we made certain changes, that resolution 2 is also reflected in resolution 2, but the questions again which is on modified question 4/2 is

now moving to Study Group 16. Question 9/9 on home networking is moving to Study Group 15. Question 2 and question 12/9 moves to Study Group 12. As agreed earlier, today in our meeting, the modified QI/11 as available as DT31 rev 1, stays with Study Group 11.

Is this acceptable by everyone? Rwanda, you have the floor.

>> Rwanda: Thank you, Chair, I'd like to bring to your attention the proposal of moving the responsibility of recommendation Q .3960 to the Study Group 12. The title of that recommendation is framework of Internet related performance measurement. That is the proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Rwanda, was this part of the decisions that were made at the ad hoc? Was it part of -- let me ask it from Uganda. Was this what was agreed at the ad hoc? Uganda, you have the floor.

>> UGANDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That subject was not considered under the ad hoc.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So, I see Russia asking for the floor. Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. If we look at document from the ad hoc group that the colleagues proposed, by the colleague from Uganda, then there are

comments as regards this resolution, as regards this recommendation. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Okay, I was not clear, because we are talking about a question, and I heard in translation recommendation. So I'm not very clear. Yes, we want to look at the text of the question on the screen again. DT31, rev 1. The text of the question.

So here, what we have is the note that ITU-T Q39/60 framework of Internet network related performance measurement was approved on 6 July 2016. Rwanda, this is what you are asking should be moved too Study Group 12. Rwanda, you have the floor. Was this what you were asking for?

>> Yes, please.

>> CHAIR: Is there any support for the proposal from Rwanda? I see Russia asking for the floor. I see Gambia asking for the floor. I see -- Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much.

I'm looking at the harmonized text of this group, and there is a reference to the recommendation Q3960. This is a result of a lot of work to reach a compromise. So I don't understand why we are considering it again. We believe that what we have achieved in this group should

be kept. It is new text to the question which has had great attention to it from many parties, we considered it and I don't understand why this is now, do we need to within the group look at this again, apologies, but I would require that we keep this reference. Thank you.

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

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A point of clarification, I'm sorry to take you back on the agenda, but since we have approved the proposals by the Study Groups, it is our understanding that these proposals would be modified probably, not the proposals but the decision on the questions and the mandates of each Study Group would be modified as per the outcome of resolution 2, which is currently being discussed in the WTSA. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: As for the pending issues, they will all, especially if there are text where a certain word has to be changed then that part will be replaced with the agreed terminologies. I was asking for support for Rwanda. I see Brazil asking for the floor. Brazil, you have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chairman. A point for clarification, my understanding that we were dealing

on the terms of reference of the group, ad hoc group to the definition of where this work should be located, we have not touched -- the approved work item recommendation that has been pointed out by Rwanda, in the sense, even the note that we have inside, it just pointed out that it's a recommendation that was approved. It doesn't mean that, it is not pointing out where it should belong to. I believe maybe this is a decision for here, in my point of view, since this is a framework, it really doesn't matter where it belongs but the future work should consider the question, the new text of the question, so we can know what it will be allocated or not. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. So I get no support for Rwanda, and so I will take it that we keep this text as it is, and it should be part of the package for Study Group 11, if this is fine with everyone.

Thank you.

We will proceed on. Then we go to proposal by TSAG, there was none on the questions from TSAG. We have to look at revised and new questions. Again the questions that are proposed by Study Groups, we have the use of privacy in Study Group 20 questions, which are currently under consideration. So whichever term is determined

will affect the text for the questions in Study Group 20. And also for the modified questions, E20 and F20 as well, if this is fine with everyone, that will be our agreement going forward. A Sector Member is asking for the floor. Sector Member, you have the floor.

>> Chairman, Study Group 2 Chairman, I'd like to clarify that question 4 has already been agreed to move to Study Group 16. However, the participants and management team of Study Group of Rapporteur of question 4 has indicated the request there to when they are moved to Study Group 16 to be separate question. Of course this is internal matter for Study Group 16. And maybe TSAG has a role. But for clarity, and transparency, we would like to raise this to WTSA to be taken into consideration, because they are a question for merger of accessibility and as they have indicated these are two separate areas and should be separate question, although there is intersection between two topics. We would like to bring this view into WTSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. This decision on the question of human factors to Study Group 16 was agreed to go as a separate question, and it is recorded in our meeting report.

So, just for clarity and assurance, this has been agreed before. Thank you so much.

Now we will go on to new questions. There was a proposal from Bangladesh on policy and regulatory aspects of quality of service and quality of experience matters. This has already been presented. I don't know if you want to project that text now. BDG 52/1. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I ask the floor as the Chairman of Study Group 3. This proposal of new question was not raised during the last conference meeting of the Study Group 3. So we didn't put this item in our proposal in terms of the new, proposed new questions.

We know that all member countries have right to propose a new question during the WTSA. But as a Chairman, I would like to suggest that Bangladesh will raise, propose this issue once again during the first session, first plenary meeting of Study Group 3, and study whether we would like to set up or propose this as a new question of Study Group 3. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Study Group 3 Chairman. United Arab Emirates and Brazil. UAE.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just for clarification with regards to the proposed modification under resolution, I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman, what was the decision on those two proposals, to clarify it, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Please come again with what you are asking for. Which agenda item are you referring us to? We are on 6.3. Is your request on 6.3?

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman, no, I'm referring to 6.1 and 2, I requested the floor earlier, so with regards to the proposed modification, in 6.1 and 2, what was the decision by the meeting?

>> CHAIR: All right. I'll get back to that. But let's deal with 6.3. Thank you. Brazil, you have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you very much, Chair. Regarding the proposal for a new question under SG 3, Brazil is of the view that we already have work being carried out under SG 12 on some matters related to this that has been proposed. I believe it's question 12 from Study Group 12. I believe we might be making some overlapping of efforts. We do believe the study item itself is relevant, but we believe it's better suited to stay in SG 12. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So to Bangladesh, I will want

to, based on the advice of Study Group 3 Chairman and also from Brazil, that you consider to propose a question as is appropriate and look at it well as to which Study Group can best deal with regulatory aspects of quality of service, so that you can propose to them in the next meeting for consideration. If this is fine with you, Bangladesh, we don't want to go on any further on this. Bangladesh, you have the floor.

>> BANGLADESH: Chairman, I would like to again, proposal for contribution of Bangladesh, QSN quality of experience, Bangladesh supports the living questions proposed by Study Group 3 and proposed a new question be added on policy and regulation aspects of quality of services, and quality of experiences. For ITU-T is Study Group 3 for the new study period 2017 to 2020, even though Study Group 12 is working on the technical aspects of quality of service, Bangladesh is also requesting policy and regulatory issues. In this way regulators can be informed in monitoring quality of service with the objective searches, the regulator targets establishing effective cooperation, checking claims by operators, understanding the state of the market, making interconnected consistency. As Study Group 3 is the home for economic tariff and policy issues

for telecommunications, is the forum for regulators, so Bangladesh propose quality of service and quality of experience to be addressed in Study Group 3. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Bangladesh. Thank you to interpreters. I know you will be kind enough to give us some ten minutes, our time is definitely up for this session.

We have many more issues to address, especially when it comes to resolutions that we couldn't get to. We have to work with, go along with this without interpretation, somewhere to 1:00 p.m. if possible. Interpreters, if you could grant us ten minutes of your time, please.

>> Yes, ten minutes is fine.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Bangladesh we are taking your presentation before and the guidance from Study Group 3 Chairman was that even if you have this question, it has to be something which comes back to them at the Study Group. This is the lead, and my guidance as well was that look at it critically and look at where you want to have this work, if this is consistent with the practice of previous Assemblies. Thank you. If it is on 6.3, if it's on 6.3, can you withdraw your request

so I can give clarification to the UAE on 6.1 and 2. Jordan, you are insisting to have the floor. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Regarding the decision on the Bangladesh proposal, I think when they did present it to the floor, they had the support from many members. So I don't know if it's decision of Bangladesh to withdraw the proposal, we don't mind. But at least I recall that there was support to have such a new question. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. There was good support, and then there was also as you recently heard from Brazil there was also the direction that regulatory matters on quality of service is done at Study Group 12. So Bangladesh could look at it. So just to be consistent with the practice of previous Assemblies, this question could be forwarded to Study Group 3 or any other Study Group as they wish for it to be considered.

The other -- agreement on this so let's proceed and let me clarify to the UAE, that for questions as proposed by Study Group 20 which has the words privacy, those questions will have to be modified if the word privacy is agreed to be modified. If it so happens that the word privacy is maintained, privacy will be

maintained in Study Group 20 questions.

Similarly, it will apply for modified questions E20 and F20, so the determinations on the terminologies for Study Group 20 will affect the use of privacy in Study Group 20 questions and also modify questions E20 and F20. I hope this makes it clear. Thank you. UAE, you are asking for the floor. The ad hoc will consider all these. The ad hoc will consider all these as a package, as part of the Study Group 20 matters. Terminology, mandate, lead Study Group role, questions, points of guidance, everything, Study Group 20 will be there. Thank you for understanding.

Now we can proceed on to agenda item 7, WTSA resolutions under com 4. We heard two resolutions presented, resolution 77 and 78. We heard two draft new resolutions presented on standardization work in the ITU, standardization sector for cloud based event data monitoring application, and we heard another which was on strengthening and diversifying resources of the telecommunications standardization sector of the ITU.

Here, the proposals were presented. We asked that it goes into informal consultations. We want to take the results out of these informal consultations. So let's start off with resolution 77. And the focal point

was Mr. Noah Lu of China. China, you have the floor.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The morning of Sunday and 8:00 a.m. today our resolution 77 we have two informal consultations and had some discussions, USA, Russia, Canada, and other related interested parties attended the two consultations and we made editorial changes. We agreed that we will continue resolution 77 and continue to push for the strengthening of the standardization work in ITU-T, and the updated version has been loaded to the ITU-T website.

The number is DT80. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, the name is Mr. Kai Hu of China for your report. So being projected now is the text of the, revised text of resolution 77. We can go through page 1, page 2, page 3. Can we agree to this revised text? I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you very much. Resolution 77 is revised and it will be transmitted to com 5 for editorial refinement.

Now we proceed on to resolution 78, and I invite Mr. Ahmed Fati of Egypt to take us through his results.

You have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Informal consultations on resolution 78 regarding the development of the consolidated text combining documents from the

African common proposal 42 addendum 31 and the Arab region 43A24 was held over the weekend. A consolidated text was prepared. However, the proponents prefer to discuss the core issues of the proposals rather than the text itself, which were related to the use of the handle system and DOA inside those resolutions' proposed text. Two different views have been expressed, while the proponents of the proposal from their views demonstrated the merits of using the Handle system regarding its key features with regards to security, integrity, privacy of data, interoperability of systems, quality of information and its scalability, the opposite proponents didn't acknowledge such merits.

They also expressed their concern regarding the standardization of appropriate product belonging to a specific corporation with several associated copyrights. They explicitly expressed their request to modify the existing text which includes reference to the Handle system to reflect a more generalized reference to a technology which may provide seamless exchange of data within and between health information in secure manner.

Advocates of the proposal, however, explained that extensive discussions regarding this, these issues, have been conducted in the last Study Group 20 meeting with

the presence of the ITU legal advisor, and as per the legal advice provided at that time no legal issue or conflict was noted. Additionally, the proponents expressed their willingness on adding an additional article to include any additional candidate technology which serves to realize the interoperability, security and service discovery mechanisms combined if such a technology existed today.

We also noted that some delegates expressed concerns that similar issues were being discussed in parallel sessions, the essence of which could represent a potential way out of the issues being discussed in the informal consultation. Since you have charged us with the responsibility to develop a reconciled text together with all the parties, we think that more time is needed for developing a consensus for these matters, and accordingly, should you wish to conduct a combined ad hoc group handling all related DOA and handle system issues in all related resolutions, I will leave that matter into your hands. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Interpreters, you have given us your ten minutes, it's up and we are left with English only. Thank you, Mr. Fati for your report and as you ask for time, yes, that you need time to resolve

this standoff. I see UAE asking for the floor. I want to make a proposal on this so that we can look at other agenda items.

Mainly, this is about DOA and Handle system which tends to be linked to other matters. I want us to hold on this for a while and look at other proposals which are also on the same matter and then we decide on the way forward on it, if this is acceptable by everyone, kindly withdraw your requests. I am pausing, not a decision. I want us to rest on this report. We will come back to it. Just to rest. We are taken a pause on this matter. We will come back to it. If everyone will withdraw their requests, please. If everyone will withdraw their request, please. We will come back to this matter. You will get the opportunity again.

Kindly withdraw your request. Sweden, you have the floor.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. Just a question for clarification. Yesterday or actually perhaps it was Friday, I asked about the legal opinion, if that was available. Now I heard again that there was legal advice given that there were no legal issues involved in relation to the DOA introduction here. I agree that we could rest now and discuss this later, but could you please provide

that legal opinion, so we can consider whether there are any copyright or patent aspects to consider. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sweden. The legal opinion was provided at the ad hoc meeting. I will refer to the Chair for he to respond to that briefly. Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. No, the legal opinion there were no legal advisor with us in the meeting. But the proponents of the proposal have reference to prior discussions of these matters in the last Study Group 20 meeting. I believe that if we have the legal advisor here also with us in the meeting, he could clarify, because that particular opinion was conveyed to us from the legal advisor. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, so we will again pause on this, and then we will proceed and we will come back.

Let's go to 7C, which is on draft new recommendation on standardization work in the ITU sector for cloud based event data monitoring, now it will be technologies. Malaysia, you have the floor.

>> MALAYSIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm pleased to inform you that the interested parties were able to agree on the proposal, it was done over an informal

consultation over the weekend, for the new resolution, and only with minor amendments on the title.

Mr. Chairman, through our discussion, we have agreed to replace the subject of the title from cloud based event data monitoring application, to cloud-based event data technology, to further add clarity of the scope of work that is carried out. This change is reflected throughout the resolution for consistency. I think you will be able to find a amended document in DT75.

If I may please allow me to thank those who have contributed towards this resolution, and for their cooperation and support in assisting to finalize this resolution, either through their inputs or comments. I think that is all, Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Malaysia, for going through this informal consultation as a convener and coming out with a very good outcome.

Here we are. We have the heading, which is revised to technology, and then we have the results part as well also revised. Can we have an agreement to this new resolution? I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you. This will be transmitted to com 5 for editorial refinement. We will have a new resolution on cloud based

event data monitoring technology.

Thank you very much. We will end at 1:00 p.m.

So now we look at agenda item 7D, which is on strengthening, diversifying resources of telecommunications standardization sector of the ITU, UAE, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With regards to the new proposed resolution on the strengthening and diversifying the resources of telecommunications standardization sector of ITU there is still ongoing informal discussion with different bodies and we would like to get you back with the next session, with conclusion on this informal discussion. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. Informal consultations going on, asking for time to present their results at the next meeting. That is not asking for too much. If you agree, we could discuss this further. I see no one asking for the floor.

Portugal, you have the floor.

>> Portugal: Mr. Chairman, in relation to these proposals not yet presented but sent for informal consultations, and I'm now speaking as head Chair as agenda rightly pointed out these were not yet presented

and in some cases the terms of reference of the drafting exercise is related to the consolidated of the text --

>> CHAIR: If you allow me, Portugal, this particular one was presented.

>> Sorry?

>> CHAIR: If you allow me, this particular one was presented.

>> Okay, so do you want me to wait until someone, the proposal that is not yet presented or may I proceed, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Portugal, we are dealing with the proposals already presented and sent for informal consultation, and the outcome on this particular one is that they will need more time for consultation. If it is about proposals, not yet presented, if you could hold on for that.

>> Okay, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you very much, Portugal.

If we agree, then this proposal for more time on the new draft resolution on resources of the ITU standardization sector of the ITU could be carried on.

Thank you for your agreement. We have ten minutes to go. Now we have to make a decision on all the proposals not yet presented, but sent for informal consultations.

Definitely we need time everywhere to be able to consider all these presentations and go into discussions with them.

I refer to the rights of everyone to present their proposals at this meeting but especially at this point in time we don't have interpretation.

So if you agree, and because we do not have the time to present all these, I will again plead to the Distinguished Delegates that we now open up this informal consultation to decide on whether we want to have these new resolutions, and if you so decide that we want to have these new resolutions, what the text should be. I see Portugal asking for the floor. Portugal, you have the floor.

>> Portugal: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Your intervention touched upon the issue I was going to raise. What we have seen is that the terms of reference of such drafting exercise is related to the consolidation of the text of proponents, therefore, Europe would like to present a generic disclaimer that we reserve our position to accept new draft resolutions after careful consideration of the results of consolidation exercises. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Did I hear not accept? I see Canada asking

for the floor. But let Portugal be clear to me. Portugal, you have the floor.

>> Portugal: No, I said reserve our position, we will carefully consider case by case. Thank you very much.

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

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman, following the intervention of our distinguished friend and colleague from Portugal, the first item in the agenda you have on new resolutions is on the issue of the ITRs. We have already been working on consolidation proposals and we were supposed to meet at 1:00 to continue our work. We are in your hands, Mr. Chair. But we could go and do our job, but again, you let us know what you want us to do.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Canada. With your willingness, agree with you for all that we have made progress on, we go on from 1:00 p.m. from here to continue the work.

So that as we have agreed to what we have agreed on, we will proceed on that. I also recognize that some resolutions may not have made progress, because the discussions are at the informal consultations was that

because they have not been presented, then they were not discussed, the text at all. It is for these groups that I'm appealing to that they now open up into the discussions on, one, whether they want the resolution or not, and two, if they want the resolution what the text should be, should be like. This is my proposal, if everyone will agree with me, then we can close the meeting, in a moment from now.

Thank you. With this, I ask for us to pause. I see United Arab Emirates, if you allow me, I want to give one more guidance, and on where we paused and we can go back to them. You will see that on the agenda, 7(g) is resolution on IoT and Smart Cities. This resolution can as well go into the ad hoc group on Study Group 20 matters, if that is fine with everyone as well so that everything with Study Group 20, I see Singapore asking for the floor, because they are the convener, and Malaysia asking for the floor.

I suppose this is in agreement that Singapore moves to Malaysia. Singapore, you have the floor.

>> Singapore: Thank you, Chairman. We had two sessions on Sunday to discuss the consolidation of the text. There was some important progress made. We have consensus on the substantive portions of the text, which

is the resolves, and invites sections. However, the text is not final. We still need time to resolve the remaining portions of the text. Having seen the text, it is less contentious than some of the other matters that will be dealt with at the group, ad hoc group that is being chaired by Malaysia. With your consent, once we have a final text, I can propose to bring it back to com 4 for consideration whether it is acceptable as a new resolution or not. It does not have some of the other issues that are being deliberated in the ad hoc group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well with your progress report, Singapore. This is good, but so if those who participate, will participate in Study Group 20 matters you have to notice that with the progress that is made on this resolution, you may want to have one leg at this consultation as well, so that I don't think it will be too much to have this resolution separated. I see Malaysia asking for the floor and I see Ghana asking for the floor. Malaysia, you have the floor.

>> MALAYSIA: Thank you, Chairman. I think for Malaysia to Chair effectively on the ad hoc, we need to have a very clear mandate, the terms of reference, the priorities that we need to achieve within this next

two days. We don't have that much time. Also the impact if we cannot come to an agreement to whatever that we want to resolve within the next two days for these, all the resolutions discussion to be consolidated in SG 20 ad hoc group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Priority will be all the things that are supposed to go into resolution 2. But we will provide you in text what the terms of reference. Ghana, you have the floor.

>> GHANA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I need a bit of clarification from you as to whether the established informal groups particularly on the stolen devices can continue work in terms of the discussion of the content. I'm asking because yesterday we had a challenge with respect to the discussion of the content, basically because we are an informal group and did not have the mandate to discuss the content of the text. What you have said, I need clarification, can we, when we have time to meet, can we go ahead and discuss the content of the consolidated text that we have produced or what is the direction for us going forward, Mr. Chairman? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. What I propose to the meeting was that if we so agree that we want a

resolution on a particular theme, let's go into the text, the content, discuss it and see what text we agree on. So now, all those informal consultations, if you agree, are now upgraded to become drafting sessions, so that it is clear to everybody, that it is now up to be drafting session. I see no one asking for the floor.

Thank you very much from E to J, having drafting sessions. I see Bahrain asking for the floor. I hope this is not an objection. Bahrain, you have the floor.

>> Bahrain: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, no, this is not an objection. It is a point for clarification with regards to the informal discussions on the ITRs, that the discussion will be happening in a few minutes in room E. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I see Singapore asking for the floor. Singapore, you have the floor. UK asking for the floor. Singapore, you have the floor.

>> Two things, we need the help of the Secretariat to give us time this evening. There are other parallel session was delegates interested in the same topics. It will be challenging. But I want clarification on the other point I raised to you, Chairman. Once we do have an agreed text, once we do have agreed text my question is whether I bring it back to com 4 or forward it to

the ad hoc group on SG 20 matters for them to deliberate on the content of it?

>> CHAIR: The Secretariat will make sure that the issues that can be separated will run in a good time. Again, I have UK, asking for the floor.

>> Thank you, Chair. I might not have been paying attention, what happened with 7D?

>> CHAIR: 7D asked for time to continue their informal consultations. Now they can go on as a drafting group and, yes, they can now go on as a drafting group and discuss the text as it is, because this has already been presented. If this is clear to the UK.

So I come back to 7C, I see Uganda asking for the floor. Uganda, you have the floor.

>> UGANDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We didn't get an opportunity to report but 7F did have its informal consultation and we succeeded in merging the two proposals, and were able to draft a document for the consideration of com 4, so the understanding will be that we will simply wait for the next session to present this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your progress. So you can put that on Halloween and we can present at the next meeting for it to go to com 4. We don't have

the time. We don't have interpretation. I want to be fair that when I'm asking about these agreements, everybody is understanding in their first language.

If you will allow me, I will want to give my proposal on 7B which is on resolution 78, and again if the focal person, who will be kind to us now to continue the work and open up the discussions it will now be a drafting session to consider this matter on DOA and the hand-off system. Egypt, you have the floor.

>> EGYPT: With pleasure, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. UAE, you want the floor. Please, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It seems we are proceeding without interpretation. With regards to the resolution, the new resolution from the Arab group regarding the strengthening the resources of ITU-T sector, we have had informal consultations with a number of colleagues from United States, from Canada. The text is ready. We will send it to the Secretariat in order for all colleagues to have a look at that resolution. Perhaps we can take it up in the next session of com 4. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for the progress and update. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I regret to inform you that we don't agree with your proposal to, if I heard correctly, I may have misheard, to expand the scope of resolution 78 to include discussion on the DOA and the handle system. It is not within the purview of that resolution. It is, this is a resolution strictly on e-health. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Sorry, as you may have heard me otherwise, my proposal was for resolution 78 as has been discussed now to go into a drafting session as it was an informal group. I want it to go into a drafting session. If this is clear, I will thank you and we can proceed. UAE, I hope I'm clear. I want to tell about a schedule and then we can close this meeting. It is past 1:00 p.m.

Ad hoc groups are supposed to start work. The schedule for ad hoc and drafting sessions is DT27. You may refer to it. As much as possible we want to avoid any conflicts in subject matters which we know are close to each other. Mr. Syed, I know you want to talk on H, financial services. Let me say that for you, that DT77 is posted. People will have to see you on the drafting session for those who are interested.

For all issues from E, F, G, H, I and J, they are now drafting sessions and we hope we will get some good

outcomes tomorrow afternoon? Okay, all right, in this meeting. The first thing to refer to is DT27 to be able to complete the work on this. Thank you very much for all your time and your extended time to sit through all this. Is there any other business that you want us to consider at com 4 before we take a break? I see no one asking for the floor.

Thank you very much and enjoy your lunch. The meeting is adjourned.

(session adjourned at 1307)

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.

***.