

Raw file.
October 31, 2016.
1430.
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.

***.

October 31, 2016.

1430.

ITU.

World Telecommunication Standardization
Assembly.

(standing by).

>> CHAIR: Ladies and gentlemen, let's convene. I
know that you have just finished the previous session
and we have still informal discussion going on. But
we have to complete our work as soon as possible,

because other group depends on us. So we have first the agenda was given in administrative 28. Have you any modification to propose to the agenda? United Kingdom, please, you have the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chairman. Good afternoon. Chair, I would like if possible to move the report on the ad hoc of the numbering resolutions to the point earlier in your agenda, if that would be possible, please. I think that would be advantageous to get some text agreed, and to start the approvals process for them. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Does the meeting want to put the report in the numbering instead of point 9 of the agenda as point 5 of the agenda, escalating the other one, so 5 become 6 and so on. Can the meeting agree to have the numbering of the group as point 5 in the agenda? I see no requests from the floor.

So it is decided. Next point, with that, the agenda has been approved. We have to approve the report of the previous Working Party 4A meeting, if you can show the TD 23 revision 2, it is very quick one, I hope so. Yes. You see where it is history of what has happened, and the other one we have to look only on what we have decided on Friday, approval report,

Working Party 4A meeting, report to informal consultation. On this occasion, we have approved the, also new resolution. Report on numbering scheme in there, we have approved the resolution 40, it is correct? Yes, there is the report and approving resolution 40, so it is not reporting to the discussion. Report on international activities, resolution 52, on draft resolution new from Arab resolution 50 and any other business with the creation of the five adopt group.

So this is the reporting simply stating what has happened. Can we endorse this report? I see no requests from the floor. So that is done.

Okay, thank you. Now, we have the approval, allocation of Working Party 4A, TD 1, we can finally come to Phil Reston who is the first one to report on the activity of the ad hoc group on numbering. Please, Phil, you have the floor.

>> Thank you, Chair, good afternoon. The report of the ad hoc Working Group under your group Chair is in DT66. I will try and be brief, Chair, to enable progress to be made. We were given the responsibility for 7 resolutions, 6 existing resolutions and a proposal from colleagues in RCC designated RCC 4. We met Thursday evening, all day Saturday, and all day

Sunday and have made considerable progress on 6 of the 7 documents given to us, Chair.

The one that remains outstanding is TD 69, in relation to resolution 60 which we will come on to. Briefly, Chair, we are bringing to your group the other texts for approval. Some do have square brackets. But these can be, I think, dealt with quite quickly by the Committee, in order to achieve progress. Quite quickly, Chair, my meeting report outlines the documents that we considered and the progress that we made. Of the resolutions that you assigned to the Committee, we have achieved agreement on resolution 20, which is contained in TD 67, and that has a, as far as I understand, no square brackets, if that can be brought up.

It's put for your Committee's approval, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Let's start with the no observation in your report, I suspect that this is simply reporting the status fact. I understand that there is no such, 61 has no change so we take note of this also in our final deliberation. For resolution 20, we have TD 67 in front of us. Any observation on this TD 67? I see no requests from the floor. So resolution 20 is approved. Please keep on going.

>> Thank you, Chair. Resolution 29 on alternative calling procedures does have some square text, Chair, in two instances. One referring to NGN services, the other referring to OTT telecommunication services using telephone numbers, if my mind serves correct, Chair, because my PC has just decided to go to sleep.

It was working hard over the weekend. So TD 68, Chair, is presented, and I would suggest that in order to make progress, the text referring to NGN services would be deleted by this group, and I would seek direction as to whether or not the text referring to OTT services remains in what is a very specific resolution, for Study Group 2 experts to look at from a numbering point of view, or whether you would wish to or colleagues would wish to wait until the OTT debate in other areas have been addressed. Thank you.

Chair, in paragraph 5 on the screen, you can see the reference to NGN services. I would prepare where that occurs in this document, it would be deleted, and the reference to OTT telecommunication applications in this paragraph, and I believe the one above, which talks about over the top applications that use telephone numbers, would be accepted by colleagues in the room.

The alternative is to wait until the debate on OTT services going on elsewhere is complete, and to reflect that decision in this text. In your hands, Chair.

>> CHAIR: So does the meeting -- now is it more clear to me at least, does the meeting agree that the text on paragraph 5 instructs that group 3 really, we deleted the reference to NGN service. Everyone, there is no request from the floor. So we agree to delete NGN service, square brackets. After there is the possibility also to, the problem is there are still discussion going on, on OTT communication and its definition. So I don't know if really it is right to maintain here in square brackets and see the result of the discussion, or delete from numbering perspectives. It's up to you really. Any suggestion, requests for clarification? None. So can we delete this reference here?

Yeah, can I ask the convener to see what is your proposal on OTT, because you were saying we can maintain pending the solution of the problem, because the results of the definition are still in discussion. So what you propose, how do you propose to read paragraph 5, please go ahead, Phil.

>> Thank you, Chair. As I said when I introduced

the document, this is a very specific resolution, related to numbering. If the meeting agrees, I would propose keeping the text over the top telephony application that is use telephone numbers. I don't -- I know that it would not necessarily align with text elsewhere. But where we talk about in paragraph 4 and paragraph 5 where we talk about OTT telecommunication applications, that would also say that use telephone numbers and in both cases that would be very specific to this text, noting, or you could keep it as it is.

I would suggest keeping it as it is in this way forward. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: So you propose to have, to instruct Study Group 3 and this is the sentence to study economic effort of procedure, origin notification of spoofing as well as further use of DT application, stop. Is that what you propose?

>> No, spoofing of the origin identification or the calling line identification information and the evolution of alternative calling procedures including the use of over the top telephone applications that use telephone numbers that may render instances of fraudulent practices and develop appropriate

recommendations and guidelines. SOS So that is what I am proposing for paragraph 4, Chair. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Fine for me and for paragraph 5?

>> For paragraph 5, I believe that the issue of Study Group 3 is part of the other debate. So if that is the case, then I would suggest waiting for either the outcome of that debate, or if colleagues here are happy to use OTT telecommunication applications. I think my preference would be to wait for the outcome of that debate. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: You propose to leave paragraph 5 in square brackets.

>> Yes.

>> CHAIR: Without NGN.

>> Correct.

>> CHAIR: Okay. It's clear to the meeting?
United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair, good afternoon, colleagues. I think that our preference actually would be to retain, to keep the conversation open in both paragraphs 4 and 5, in relation to the term. It's possible that given the explanation of this ad hoc Chair that there may be different terminology appropriate for each paragraph.

But we think that given that the conversation is ongoing, it might be useful to wait until we conclude that conversation. Our preference would be to keep both sets of brackets at this moment. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: We will keep 4 and 5 on brackets, that is the proposal, with the amended text. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think we are with ad hoc, Mr. Phil proposal. And I think there is, there are many differences between mentioning OTT in this proposal and in the other proposal and discussed, because this proposal OTT are specified for fraudulent behavior with telephony. I think this is a different, totally different case. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. So this is the reasoning for adding as proposed by the Chairman of the convening group 4 without brackets, why 5 remaining brackets for all the reason. Is okay? Let's do like that.

Phil, you have other point on your text of resolution 29?

>> Thank you, Chair. I do not believe so. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Can we approve resolution 29, having in square brackets only paragraph 5 as I mentioned, with

the deletion of NGN already, you did agree, yes, and you put 5 in square brackets. Point 5 in square brackets. Because he is holding it. Okay.

Can we agree with that? With that only exception of square bracket we approve resolution 29. United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. I want to be clear about your proposal. We are keeping the square brackets on the phrase, related to OTT in both paragraphs 4 and 5. Is that the proposal?

>> CHAIR: Now, the proposal is to follow the Chair ad hoc group not to have square bracket in 4 but maintain square bracket in all 5.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you for the clarification. If I can explain one more time, we agree that the scope of paragraph 4 is perhaps a little bit different, but we think since there is still ongoing discussion about this concept overall as it applies to many different items, we would rather come back to this text once that conversation concludes. We don't see a harm in returning to this one as well. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So you want to maintain both square brackets with the understanding. Does the Chair of the ad hoc meeting agree with that?

>> If that, I have no objection, Chair. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. Just to question for clarification and perhaps also to ensure some consistency, if we could see the text. In 4, within brackets, where it says over the top telephone applications that use telephone numbers, by telephone numbers here, we mean numbers governed by E164, correct? And if we mean that, telephone numbers, could we hear also, because we have been discussing this in the other discussion, on the whatever a solution, what kind of reference or service definition we should have, so when we refer to telephone numbers, I would appreciate if we could have a reference to E164. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Can I ask the convener to respond, please?

>> Thank you, Chair. Thank you for the question of clarification. When you have a group of numbering experts in the room, they obviously know what they are talking about. It is a very special subject and we are awfully geeky about it. So yes indeed, we do in fact mean E164 numbers. We are talking, I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Anyway, I see that there are still some informal consultation going on, and I do not want the meeting stuck with this one. We have a lot more to do.

(coughing).

Sorry, maintaining these square brackets, can we approve the rest of the resolution, or you have still some objection? Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair, I'm wondering why our colleague from U.S. want to have a square brackets in item number 4. It may be logic to maintain it in item number 5, because it is a relation between what is written in number 5 and the other contributions discussed. But in number 4, it's clear, it is in the scope of Study Group 2. And in the scope, in the main scope of Study Group 2, to study what is related to telephone number, especially when you mention 164, E164. I think we can accept adding E164 according to delete the square brackets from the item number 4. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: I can try, if you want, because I tried before, so you make it a specific reference to E164, and deleted the text in the square brackets. Yes, telephone number, E164. So this is, with this

explanation, United States can accept to the paragraph 4, or they prefer to keep on discussion? United States? No request for the floor means, ah, yeah, the request for the floor. United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. I think that the suggestion is a very good one. We really do like the addition of E164. I think that right now, the only issue that we have with the paragraph is the phrase, over the top. I think that that is really the only piece of it that seems to still need some informal consultation. So maybe we could just put these three words in square brackets pending the informal consultation. Then we can come back to it. Hopefully this will be acceptable.

We would really appreciate just having, allowing for the conversation to continue. We think we are close. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. The text has started to change very much. So we would like to place a reservation with respect to our position on 4, 5, until we see the final version. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: The final version is according to me what you have on the screen, if you have corrected still.

Saudi Arabia.

>> Saudi Arabia: Thank you, Chairman. Good afternoon, everybody. At the outset, I would like to thank the Distinguished Delegate of the United Kingdom for all of his efforts deployed to help us achieve a consensus on this document. I would also like to recall that we will not accept this addition or this reference to the recommendations E164, we do not accept either the deletion of the mention of NGN services.

So, we are going to wait for the final result of the discussions and debate on the OTT services, and so I would like to keep this text, the whole paragraph between brackets until we can see the final result, thank you.

>> CHAIR: This is my decision. We stay with the original text. We delete however NGN because everyone, when I proposed, nobody opposed. NGN is deleted. With respect to the original text we have only the OTT, no mention of E164 and that is what will be further to discussion, and all 4 and 5 will be in square brackets.

You still have, want to have the floor, Egypt and Canada? Or you give up. Egypt, you want to reiterate.

>> EGYPT: Since we are going to accept the deleting square brackets we are not accepting to add 164.

>> CHAIR: What I say, delete 164 I say that, so come to the region and have the 4 and 5 in square brackets, so what is now on the screen. You delete E164, the reference? Okay. That is what you will still discuss. With these two remaining square brackets, can we approve the text of the remaining? Yes. Seems so. It is not a big progress, because the square brackets we pass over, in a given time, is the package you have to come to the conclusion and for agreement, not for square brackets.

Next move to the next, Phil. Please go ahead.

>> Next document for approval is resolution 65, TD 70, resolution 65 does have square brackets. The square brackets has, is around two pieces of the same text. One is in noting. Go back. You have gone too far. No, go down, down, down, down, more, more. Stop!

There. That text there, and there is text at the end that is the same. We are looking for an agreement or decision from your group, Chair, as to which place this text should remain in. There was, if you go to the end of the document, it is in invites Member States.

We would point out that invites Member States to implement clause 31B of the ITRs Dubai 2012 by the signatory Member States to those ITRs is inviting them

to carry out their responsibilities by the fact that they have signed the ITRs. It would suggest that that is not the place to have this text, but I give that as background. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the clarification of, at least for me, and really something that is automatic for those who have signed the ITR. So can we delete these instruct Member States, two at least because it is in the ITR, so is it wise to mention. It seems there is no opposition so we can act accordingly.

The other two quotation you mention is on considerings C and, I don't know the part, but there, it is, considering is no problem, but United Kingdom.

>> With that decision the square brackets in considering C can be removed and there is now no, I suggest, square brackets in this document and it can be considered for approval. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Can we approve this document as revised? It seems so. So it is approved. Sector Member, sorry.

>> Thank you, Chairman. Study Group Chairman and also representative of Africa, and I think before deleting the reference to ITRs it was generic term and if this referring to specific provision, as you have did this morning in com 4, again move this provision

and keep reference to ITR in general, it's applicable to either signatory or nonsignatory according to have been signed. Sorry to take the floor right now. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: The reference to ITR remains in considering C but is not invite member, member still have to apply ITR as was assigned as was explained by the convener. I think really is double talking if I can say so. With that we have agreed on the text of resolution 65, and Phil, can you proceed?

>> Thank you, Chair. The next document up for your consideration is a draft new resolution in TD 71, enhancing access to an electronic repository of information on numbering plans published by the ITU-T. There is one set of square brackets, and one editor's note, and there is also some further square brackets in noting E.

In considering A, the reference here is to assist in countering misuse of international E164 numbering resources, we put this in square brackets, Chair, because we had at this time not considered the comments on resolution 61. In our discussions on resolution 61, as you indicated earlier, we had done no change.

My proposal to your meeting, Chair, is for this

to be assist in countering misuse of international E164 numbering resources, that is the title of resolution 61, that we have, if you like endorsed in this meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. Looking at resolution 61 it says misuse of international telecommunications numbering resources. If we keep this wording, then we would welcome this. What we approved resolution 20 and the same words are used international telecommunications and resources. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: What you are proposing really, without quoting, what do you ...

((off microphone))

Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair, in resolution 61, the following phrase is used, international telecommunication numbering resources. We would like to keep this wording here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, now it is on the screen. Can the meeting agree on this proposal? I have no requests from the floor. So, yes, I have. Egypt, please.

>> Egypt: I think I don't agree with

international.

>> CHAIR: International was there already. So it was not one challenge. It was the insertion of E64 was the challenge. Any further requests? Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair, the inclusion of international is correct, and it aligns with the title. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: That we can solve, the proposal from Russia, international communication number results and with that we can, what was the other point, Phil?

>> Thank you, Chair. If you come down to noting E, we had a discussion in the group about trust in or accuracy of the information. We could not agree this text, Chair, noting that there was discussion going on elsewhere. I have no proposal at this moment to give you. The concern was if we took the decision to go with trust, then it presupposed a decision may be impacted in discussions going on elsewhere.

>> CHAIR: What is our opposition, there is some reason not to have accuracy on the information? United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: I think it is, trust is seen I believe as having a better value than just having the information as being accurate. You actually put a

value on it by it being trustworthy. A possible additional word could be reliable, that seems to sit in between the two, if that is acceptable to colleagues.

>> CHAIR: This is wording, reliable information to me is fine. But I am very simple, I use not English as you are aware, my mother found that, maybe I have a misunderstanding. So it's okay, reliable?

I think the Chairman of Study Group 2 is the one who is asking the floor?

>> Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'm now speaking on behalf of Africa. I think we can pend the discussion on the trust issue, because trust is very expressive in this area, and as did you in other resolution you can keep this specific word until we see the result of the other discussion, decide either this one or reliable.

Reliable maybe can go but trust is more relevant in this area. I propose that we wait to see what will happen at the other discussion.

>> CHAIR: You know, I think there are not really, they are not really linked. To me, reliable is fine. My understanding is clear. I am not a double minded, and if there is no real opposition, I go ahead with the reliable. We can always come back if you solve or you see other problem but for my poor English reliable is

okay.

Let's go with that. Let's propose the approval -- there is other point, Chairman on that?

>> No, Chair. You have covered it all. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Can we in this case approve the revised resolution, the new resolution, sorry, proposed by RCC? No requests for the floor. Thanks. Approved.

Next one, Phil.

>> Thank you, Chair. This is our attempt to revise resolution 60, the text in TD 60 is the current state of the text from the ad hoc group. Discussions are still under way. I had attempted today to continue with informal discussions. And as I indicate, the text here is still being discussed.

What we are bringing to you, Chair, is some assistance in trying to resolve the text in this document.

We came across references within one of the proposals to amend res 60, resolution 60, that made reference to specific trademarks and possibly products. In my report, Chair, these texts are presented for guidance. It's the question we had before us noting that there are trademarks, etcetera included, is

whether the manner with which these texts are inserted give preference to one particular technology, product or trademark.

If that is the case, then we would need to as part of the ongoing discussions around this, change some of the text. I hope that is clear, Chair. And look forward to your guidance.

>> CHAIR: It's clear to me, with my poor condition. But I don't know if it's clear to the meeting. Any requests for clarification? So really you are requesting that this part remain in square brackets, because it's really out of the discussion of the scope of this group. I know this matter is discussed elsewhere, and should be as soon as possible solved in order to avoid a problem.

So can we go in this way, or you prefer to continue on in informal consultation or to follow the result of discussion in the other groups who is discussing this matter later on? It is a question to you, Phil.

>> Thank you, Chair. As I said, we did have the ability to consult the legal department yesterday, and the question that does need to be answered is whether the text that is presented in 4, in my conclusion, for example, 4 A3, to study ways and means to overcome the

challenges of interoperability between or among heterogeneous identification schemes, taking into account the handle system in this context, the handle system is a trademark, is this giving preference to a particular technology or product, which is not something that the ITU, I believe, does. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So what you propose to replace the text with this Handle system or the text as you propose, can the meeting -- United Kingdom.

>> This text is seeking guidance from the meeting as to whether it is giving preference to the Handle system. If it is, then we have to go back and is part of the ongoing discussions with regards to res 60. I should point out that the other parts of res 60 will be impacted by the decision on resolution 2. And we should bear that in mind as we look at this text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Now it is clear. So what is the understanding of the meeting? These are some impact on the system. Can we have a text without square brackets, deleting all these reference, what is the solution? Any guidance? No guidance. No preference. The only thing I can suggest to you is to follow the discussion going on because I know the discussions are

going on, and we can approve this resolution with these text in square brackets pending the final text on that, if you agree.

>> Thank you, Chair. This resolution is not actually up for approval at this time. We had, that was one issue. The other issue that will impact the text in here will be the discussion on the structure and responsibilities of Study Groups going forward. We had to stop at the appropriate point when we decided to come to your Committee yesterday, because of the time taken and required for other activities.

This text cannot be seen as in any way, form or shape stable. But rather, the subject of ongoing consultations, and I would encourage people to come speak to me later to see if we can make further progress. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So I charge you to come to informal consultation in order, when to solve the problem, if possible, before I report to the Committee 4 tomorrow afternoon.

And that is the possibility. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to wish you a good afternoon. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, we would like to thank the delegate of the

UK for the efforts he exerted within the ad hoc group.

Mr. Chairman, in our opinion, we would like to support your idea to have this resolution adopted by leaving square brackets within the text, and then this document could be sent to Committee number 4 where it could be discussed, taking into account certain themes and subjects. In our opinion, Mr. Chairman, this will help us to gain time, and at the same time, we will be benefiting from the results of discussions within other committees. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: United Kingdom.

>> Thank you, Chair. Yes, as I stated at the outset of the presentation of this document, DT69, this is not agreed text from the ad hoc. This is my giving you and the Committee here the context in which we were seeking guidance on DOA and Handle. As I've also stated, there are statements in here that will be impacted, for example, by decisions of resolution 2, about roles and responsibilities of Study Groups. I think it would be premature and therefore would support your proposal, Chair, to carry on informal consultations. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, so that is the decision. We continue in informal consultation, if, hopefully,

since in these items there are other talk going on, you can provide before I'm reporting to Committee 4 tomorrow afternoon a solution to this, but for the time being, we encourage continuation of informal consultation.

With that, I think we have concluded our, your report, or there is still something missing? United Kingdom, Phil.

>> Thank you, Chair. Only to thank colleagues (overlapping speakers) thank you, Chair. Only to thank colleagues and the TSB Secretariat for their help and support.

These are fairly specialized resolutions, and thankfully leading a group of experts in this area was a very enjoyable and fun time that was had by the weekend, and making them work hard was unfortunate but thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: I thank you, for the work done. I remind that we have also noted that resolution 61 is no changes, and so we will also say that in our final report. That is the beginning but I say that for the convenience of the meeting.

With that, thanks, Phil, and good information and continuation. We can pass the other group on IMT, the

related resolution, can I ask the Chairman of the ad hoc group to present the report. It was the nice lady from Tunisia, please. Tunisia, you have the floor.

>> TUNISIA: Thank you very much, Chair. Good afternoon to everyone. The ad hoc group on IMT discussed resolutions APT 1, R TC 5 and resolution 49. We met on Saturday, the 29th at 1430 and the outcomes of these documents are contained in document DT48. As regards the draft resolution, we had informal discussions, and we reached an agreement between different delegations on the different amendments proposed. We would very much like to thank the different delegations for the efforts that they made.

The outcomes of the discussions are as follows. For new resolution APT 1, the honorable delegate from China presented a revision APT 1 following informal discussions between the delegations. The financial implications and the responsibility of ITU including ITU standards strategy on IMT introduced in item 3 instructs ITU Study Groups was highlighted. We agreed to the changes introduced in new resolution APT 1 and decided to submit the text in DT63 for consideration of Committee 4A. For the new resolution R TC 5 the delegate of Russia introduced a revision of the

proposal to this resolution following informal consultations. The ad hoc meeting introduced additional challenges in annex 2, given what was discussed and agreed upon. For resolution 49, a DT62 Algeria introduced modifications to resolution 49, following informal consultations, with those delegates present. We also confirmed that the proposed changes are A B4 3A41 those people who brought those are in favor of this. The meeting agreed to the changes introduced in resolution 49. We submit the text in annex 3 for consideration by Working Group 4A.

Chair, honorable delegates, it is now up to you to decide if it is now the time to submit these draft resolutions, best finalized by the Working Group, they are in annex 1, 2 and 3, annex 1 is APT/44/A10/1. Annex 2, 47 A2 2/1 and then annex 3, AF CP 42A/A23/1. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for presenting that so clearly.

Now I will open one by one. One resolution by each other.

Sorry. So we have first resolution APT 1 within TD 63. I was told that there were some remarks from ITU-R representative. Please, you have the floor.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, just a few very minor editorial corrections in considering F, the reference to the recommendation 207, we delete the words, afterwards of the Radio Communication Assembly, and that is on the future development.

>> CHAIR: Just a second, that you can put the document, so, and the meeting can see the modification. Can you do? Because in your case, we see you but not the documents (chuckles).

Go on with the modification.

>> In considering F, it's just that the recommendation 207, you delete the words, after rev WRC-15, delete the words, of the Radio Communication Assembly, RA, comma, that, and just add the word, on. So this is a conference recommendation, it is not a Radio Communication Assembly recommendation. So you would delete the words, of the Radio Communication Assembly, RA, comma, that, and replace that by the word, on.

>> CHAIR: I got but I need to be put on the screen.

>> If you wish, I can hand this to the Editorial Committee directly after the meeting.

>> CHAIR: Yes, also, but I prefer also the meeting to be aware what are the modification. Okay? Because

I took note. So okay. Next one. That is no problem.
Next one, please.

>> The next one is simply in the new text in considering I, there is references to IMT 2000 and IMT advanced, IMT 2020. They need to have a hyphen between the IMT and the subsequent denominator. So that is just an editorial addition of the hyphen between IMT and 2000 and between IMT and advanced. That was all. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Fine. Any other observation on this resolution? United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just also editorial. I think the reference 207 recommendation we normally write ITU-R recommendation 207, just to differentiate. I think ITU-R before the recommendation. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Colin.

>> Mr. Chairman, that is in fact the point, there are two types of recommendations. There is recommendations from the conference, where we just say recommendation 207, and then it's rev WRC-15. Otherwise, it's ITU-R recommendations which are recommendations of the Assembly. But that is not the case here.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So you propose to, your text really, okay. No problem. It is editorial. We give the final text to us. Any other question? China?

>> CHINA: Thank you, Chair. At the outset, I would like to thank the Chair of the ad hoc Committee and the Secretariat for their efforts on this resolution. We are pleased to see that to the resolution and can reach an agreement by all parties. In the report, there is an issue about ITU-T Working Group item 3, to be responsible for the research and annual publications of ITU-T standardization strategy on IMT.

I think maybe this will cause some financial implications or issues. Therefore, on behalf of China, we have a revised version to replace, a new publication, with annual report. With this modification, maybe it can address any financial implications. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your proposal. To me it is acceptable. I don't know if there are any remark, report is better than duplication anyway definitely. Report instead of publication.

I think the Chairman of the, the convener of the group agree also. Tunisia, can you agree on that?

>> TUNISIA: Yes, we are in complete agreement.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So with that, can we finally approve this resolution? No requests for the floor.

(sound of gavel).

First approved, we passed the second one.

Finance, international mobile telecommunication ... (pause).

Secretariat was in doubt, either to come first to resolution on ENUM 49 existing or the new proposal from RCC, in your reporting, quote was first resolution RCC, so any question or requests of clarification on the proposed text? I see no requests from the floor. Can we approve this new resolution? It seems so. So it is approved.

Last one is resolution 49 on ENUM. In TD 72, you have the text in front of you. There are no square brackets. Can we approve this text? No requests for clarification. So we approve also resolution 62. I would like once again to thank the group Chair and everyone who worked with her. Thank you for the excellent results you have achieved.

Thank you, Madame Chair.

Tunisia, you have the floor.

>> TUNISIA: Thank you, Chairman. And I thank you, but I would also like to thank all the delegations who participated in our informal consultations, and during the ad hoc meetings. Thank you for your efforts, cooperation and coordination. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Now we pass the next point in the agenda and I have to ask the convener from Germany if he is present to present his report. Dietmar, you are there or you are in another meeting? Germany, he is there.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, good afternoon. Yes indeed the sequence and parallelism of the meetings of this assembly is a point of concern. Chairman, this ad hoc group was tasked to look at several Internet related resolutions. We met twice during the weekend. We worked in a good atmosphere of cooperation. We have exchanged the different opinion and in many, many cases, we reached consensus. Mr. Chairman, we reached agreement on a revision of resolution 64. This is published as temporary document 46. We all reached agreement on resolution 69, published as temporary document 59.

After some discussion, we reached an agreement in the ad hoc group not to suppress resolution 48. The

resolution 48, no change. With regard to resolution 47, there was a general agreement that the protection of geographical names and general top level domains is a concern for many countries.

It was noted that this is a matter that is discussed in the government Advisory Committee of ICANN. And there were some discussions whether it is appropriate to discuss those issues that relates to national sovereignty and trustworthy environment of a international organisation, in this case the International Telecommunication Union and here in particular in ITU-T Study Group.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, with regard to this draft amended resolution, the group could not reach an agreement. There was also the proposal to suppress resolution 47. This was also discussed in the meeting. There was no agreement reached on the suppression, either.

The African telecommunication administration, the African telecommunication administration submitted a updated text of their original proposal which was based on some informal consultation held between some countries. This proposal is attached to my report as annex 1.

However, as I mentioned previously, there was no agreement to go ahead with this particular text.

Chairman, I would reiterate again that despite the interesting and hot topic of Internet, the atmosphere in the group was always very friendly. I would also like to thank the Secretariat for their valuable contributions and support to our work. With this, Mr. Chairman, I leave it to you how to deal with the two draft revised resolutions which we agreed upon and we also may have to discuss how to go on with the resolution 47.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, for the clear presentation of the situation.

We can first endorse the agreement not to suppress resolution 48 with the present, remaining with the present text of resolution 48.

Any requests for clarification? No. That is the decision.

Now we pass to resolution 64.

(coughing).

Sorry.

In TD 46, you have the proposed text. My understanding, with no square brackets. Can we agree

in the revised proposed text? No requests for clarification. So, resolution 64 revised is approved. We can go to the resolution 69, in temporary document 59. And there again. I don't think there are square brackets. Can we agree on this revised text? No requests from the floor.

So resolution 69 is approved, revised.

Now we go to the pending item, resolution 47. There are, I understand, two camps, one who has proposed revised text with annex 1 of your report, and the other camp stands for the suppression of this resolution completely.

I don't know if it's worthwhile to spend all the time in our plenary. I can tell you if there is no agreement on one side or the other side, I will offer the proposal but first, there is a possibility to come to an agreement of one or two proposal, question to the meeting.

Silence, means that there is no possibility to reach an agreement. So my proposal in this case as in my normal habits that resolution 47 -- South African republic.

>> Thank you very much, honorable Chairperson.

As you indicated, that we tried to discuss and

debate and resolve issues, and we still are optimistic that we can reach some form of agreement. Therefore, I think that given that you have allowed or given other groups the further chance to still deliberate on the issues, we would like to also request the same, so that we can do some further consultation.

Therefore, we would appeal that you, if there are no further meetings in your Committee, in your Working Group, that you put the proposal across to the Committee 4, which means allowing us time to do some further consultations, because we feel quite strongly that we need to still get our message across, because we have quite a number of concerns. And I think that the amendment that we have put forth is within the remit of this particular conference.

So we would appeal that we have some further time, rather than coming to a decision at this point. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I am always for the reaching consensus, if at all possible. So that is what your intervention come to my favorite solution. However, I don't know if the point people or members will request suppression of resolution 47 are agreeing to have continued discussion. If that is the case, no problem. I have

Tanzania and Saudi Arabia and United States.

Tanzania.

>> TANZANIA: Thank you, Chair, as South Africa has put it, we do think we have still time to come to the conclusion and to, through further discussion, come up with agreement on the matter. Indeed, we have concerns as it has been spoken many times. But again, we are coming to, close to the agreement. So give us time, Mr. Chair. We may do the justice to the resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In brief, we concur with our colleague from South Africa, to grant the group some further time, so that they can discuss this point further. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair, for offering us the opportunity. It is with a certain amount of regret that I cannot be as optimistic as colleagues who have just taken the floor to ask for more time. I believe we did make best efforts in the ad hoc Working Group and I'd like to thank Dietmar Plesse from Germany for helping us talk through the important issues.

I think the meeting was useful, in outlining some basic facts that helped the two sides, which are fairly far apart, by the way. But it helped establish some of the issues that do need to be discussed.

As a proponent of suppression on the basis that no work has actually been conducted or very little, that concerns identified in the original resolution have largely been met, our thinking is that in terms of the new proposal from the African Group that has been amended as a result of their further informal consultations with some other members, the proposal would inappropriately expand the scope and the mandate of ITU-T, and Study Group 2. So we continue to endorse our proposal to suppress.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. The Russian Federation objects against allowing resolution 47. We consider that work in this area must be continued, just as under resolution 48, under which a decision was taken not to make modifications to it.

These resolutions concern very similar aspects, and this is why it is not clear why one of them is to continue to be active, whilst the other will be

liquidated.

As regards the proposal of the Arab States, we consider that the language in this proposal can be modified in such a way that this proposal could become acceptable to all.

We are ready to continue working in this direction, in the hope that through our joint efforts, we will receive an acceptable modified text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Japan, Australia and that is the end of the list because I have to take, and Mexico, and after that is the end of the list because I have to take a decision. Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, everyone. Regarding this resolution, we had a long discussion in the ad hoc yesterday, and however, we cannot reach consensus to start discussion on this new text. Japan would like to keep the position to support to suppress this resolution, because we have no discussion on the text. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: ..

((off microphone))

(no audio).

>> Excellent Chair, Mr. Plesse, and I'd also like to thank the Secretariat for document DT78, which I

think shows the very low level of activity on resolution 47 over the last four years.

We did not, as others before me have said, come to any kind of a consensus on whether to continue work on a revised resolution 47, or whether to go with our preferred option which would be to suppress. So for that reason, I would have great doubts on the ability to progress this matter with any further meetings.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Mexico.

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chairman. As I explained before, we are supporting to reopen discussions about the resolution 45. However, Mr. Chairman, if we continue discussing about this, we don't try to find a solution, I believe that the consensus is oriented to not change of this resolution, and in case that some colleagues insisting to make some amendments in that direction, Mexico will support supreme the resolution, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Canada, finally we make a decision.

>> CANADA: Thank you, my colleague from Mexico perfectly expressed our thoughts. We support their position. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: My proposal is, South Africa, is to have

the text of resolution 47 unchanged, and remain as such, and contributions should be addressed to relevant Study Group in order that activity is increasing.

So not to spend extra time, as I save your evening, and we stay with the present text of resolution 47.

South Africa.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you very much, honorable Chairperson. I pressed the button before you made your proposal. I pressed the button to reserve our right to make a statement on this issue at plenary to come back to it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: You have the full right, I am trying to find a line that arching equally both sides because one was for the suppression, the other one was for new text, and nobody can challenge this in text, and with the existing text, we can contribute to everywhere in Study Group 2, for example, and so on.

I'm pretty sure that I, with this decision, nobody is pleased, but at least you are all equally displeased, and you can continue informal discussion, whatever you want, outside this meeting. United States, and after we close this meeting, this exact point. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair, we are not supporting the proposal for, the African proposal for

47. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. I wanted to take the floor to thank you for your efforts, and for your, what appears to be a very practical and very sensible solution. Thank you.

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

>> NIGERIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is just a sad thing that upon all the articulations and all the arguments put forward about concerns of a region and all the developing regions that even to go through the text because if we have gone through the text, probably we would have even the issues, the fears, the proponents of suppression had, probably they have been addressed in the text. But all through the discussions would, through the informal and then during the presentation, nobody went through the text. We want to just say that this is a very clear case of people not really feeling sensitive to what others are suffering. Where you go through and then you will start asking, who are beneficiaries of such things, and who are not, but be that as it may, as the distinguished, my colleague, colleague from South Africa had said, we will just make a statement in the plenary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, I understand perfectly your problem, problem of your region. However, what I offer as a compromise, the continuation of present resolution number 47, will be not suppressed, so a country can make a contribution to the relevant Study Groups, and increase the awareness of people, and can at the end maybe come to the Study Group level without naming the Study Group, it can come some solution of your problem, because question 1 of Study Group 2 deals with this point. Really, you need to contribute to that and to solve and to obtain solutions.

So I encourage you to, not to be discouraged, because you have all my support, but to contribute the technical body in order to have the necessary support.

Resolution 47, as I said, remain as it stands. Okay? And I am pleased that make both sides equally unhappy, hopefully. Thank you.

We move, with that, to the next group, and I think now we have on the agenda the group on solution 52 Arab 6 and 50.

Can I ask the convener, my dear friend from Brazil to report to us, so the result? You have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Good afternoon, all colleagues. Secretary.

This ad hoc group on resolution 50, 52, and Arab 6 had three meetings on Sunday. We started our meetings on 8:30, and went to midnight 30 on Sunday. The meetings were chaired by me, and assisted by Secretariat Martin. In the agenda we had three resolutions, resolution 52 on countering spam and resolution 50 on Cybersecurity, and the new resolution from our Arab States.

As the results of the group, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to introduce document DT84. This DT84 holds the results of the deliberations, and as you can see, it remains only one square bracket on further instructs number 4.

Further instructs number 4, Mr. Chairman, relates to Study Group number 3, and it is in square brackets for consideration of this plenary.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Jeferson Nacif for your clear point of presentation.

So you have TD 84, and there is, seems there is only one square brackets. Can we solve the square brackets in point 4, dealing with the ITU-T Study Group 3? Can we delete the square brackets so delete the text, what is your proposal, Mr. Jeferson.

>> JEFERSON NACIF: Yes, Mr. Chairman, my proposal is in this direction, is still related, since we are

here establishing a mandate for Study Group 3, indeed it seems more appropriate to deal in resolution 2, not in this resolution countering spam. It seems more appropriate, Mr. Chairman, to delete this here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. That is the best solution. Can we with this editorial amendment, approve the text of revised resolution 52, I hope Saudi Arabia will concur with that.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. We are finding some difficulty in supporting this proposal. We would prefer to keep this text, and just delete the brackets. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, but really this is not the place to put what the Study Group 3 should do. So I am inclined to follow really the suggestion of the convener and to delete here this text.

Okay. Saudi Arabia. Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. Japan's position is the same with convener's proposal. This issue should be discussed, in resolution 2. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: With the explanation given that this is really a matter of the resolution 2, term of reference,

can Saudi Arabia agree on that?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Chair, as I have just indicated, we are finding it difficult to support this proposal. There are consultations under way as regards the mandate of SG 3. Therefore, we would prefer to maintain this text, at least until the end of the consultations regarding SG 3's mandate. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I propose an alternative. Delete now, and after if the result of the consultation they are not satisfactory, you can reintroduce, because really it is out of the scope of this resolution, to me. It is really, but -- please, Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Australia supports the Chair's suggestion to delete this text. We expressed our view yesterday in the drafting session that we did not feel that this resolution is the appropriate place to discuss the mandate of Study Group 3. Therefore, we support the Chair's proposal to delete this text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, I am the Chairman. So I am neutral. Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair. We would like to support the proposal to keep this for the time being, because currently, today at the

Committee 4 meeting, we agreed on work of the Study Group 3, where we had the words, issues of policy, economic aspects, and it would probably be best to wait then, when we can see the draft terms of reference then. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. We support your proposal to suppress this text, as we said yesterday during this discussion, that Study Group 3 currently does not have a mandate in this area. So the phrase that is up there, to continue its work is not accurate. It is a new mandate that is being proposed, which as you said belongs in resolution 2.

We also note that although there are technical provisions that can assist in spam, the technical provisions, there is not a need for technical provisions related to policy. The aspects that have to do with regulation and policy already are occurring in the ITU-D. The ITU-D as we learned from the Secretariat has a very robust programme to support developing countries in implementing relevant policy and technical measures that are well-established. We note that the ITU also signed a MOU with, The Internet Society, and they are doing workshops together,

including one in our region CITELE.

We would propose suppressing this clause as it's not necessary and it's a new mandate. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Brazil would like to support your proposal to remove the text on number 4, but the reason that we believe this is, there is no discussion right now in Study Group 3 regarding this topic. We believe this is not appropriate to have this text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chair. The UAE supports the European group and Saudi Arabia -- and Russia, and we support Russia and Saudi Arabia to keep this text and then to review this after our discussion on other issues. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Very briefly speaking from the European group, we do not support the inclusion of this text on Study Group 3 in this resolution. Reluctantly perhaps we are willing to go along with the suggestion of the Chair but to be clear we do not support this here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: My initial suggestion was to delete and

eventually come back, if there is no agreement in Study Group 3, at Study Group 3 level. But this offer was not accepted, I understand, by Arab, Saudi Arabia, and we can continue on the discussion round without progressing. Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. Chair, currently we are working within the framework of another focus group, and we are studying the mandate for SG 3. Why are we in a rush to suppress this part, some topics are not accepted by some delegations, and we could keep them in brackets. When we speak of regulatory, perhaps this term could be in brackets, but the rest of this sentence is entirely part of the mandate of Study Group 3. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, so to be included in resolution 2. Not here.

>> Thank you, Chair. There are some topics which are important, and that we are referring to them in the resolution on IMT, and therefore we are giving them all the necessary importance within the fabric of the next study period. The mandate is specified for each Study Group. There is no contradiction here, this is a method we have adopted for working with a series of resolution. Why should this resolution be any

different. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Germany.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Distinguished Delegate of Saudi Arabia has rightly pointed out that there is another group maybe still talking about the mandate of Study Group 3. This is a very unfortunate exercise, because normally I should be there, but I should have been here also to present my report. We will address this in the Steering Committee of this conference.

Now, talking on the subject, we support the United Kingdom who spoke for the European group. We are for the suppression of this sentence. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, I do not want to have the Ping-Pong game. So I will not give back the floor to Arab States. I will put this in square brackets. And we will, with the understanding in the report that there is a request for suppression, if the solution of Study Group 3 is made. That is my decision.

(sound of gavel).

Thank you.

Please do not Ping-Pong, because if you speak, I can continue on. Saudi Arabia, go on.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, it's

our right to defend. I think this proposal came from the developing countries, Arab States, and African countries. So why there is, I mean why there is, I mean why should we not include it? (overlapping speakers).

>> CHAIR: Please listen to me. I was saying we maintain the square brackets. That's what is said. Please listen to me at least.

((off microphone))

Please listen to me, and not complain before I, I say we maintain the square brackets.

And decision will be taken, with then understanding that really if the mandate of Study Group 3 is adopted, will not be in the resolution because this is a specific resolution, and this is my plea to you later on.

With that, sorry, Jeferson, I tried to solve your problem. I didn't succeed. But I hope that instead of having Ping-Pong game, and conflict, we come at given time to solution, because that is my aim. Can you continue with the other resolution on your responsibility?

>> JEFERSON NACIF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's fully understandable. We made the same efforts in our previous meeting as well.

So, let's move to resolution 50 on Cybersecurity, the output document is DT83. We can find the results of the discussions yesterday. We have eight square brackets on considering further D, on recognizing E, recognizing F, recognizing G and H, resolve 3, 8 and 9.

The square brackets, Mr. Chairman, are highlighted as well in the yellow, for deliberation.

>> CHAIR: I am doubtful that we can solve now because there are all the discussion going on, on these aspects. But we can always try. As someone can propose in resolution, the deletion of square bracket in one way or the other on the considering, on the recognizing and any possibility to remove the square brackets? All this is pending on other subject discussions. So I don't think the meeting is agreeing to have any solution here.

So it is useless. But it's like that. It is only constitution of fact. United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. Perhaps if we could ask for this first square bracket on D, the importance of security of distributed data considering their whole life cycle, we had a little time to think about it. Yesterday, the concern was not so

much with the concept but that we did not have the language correct. And some colleagues thought it was important to include because it's relevant to a specific question in Study Group 17.

When we went back to look we found that there is some language related to life cycle but we couldn't exactly find this term. We wonder since this is within the scope of Study Group 17, and this is a APT proposal, perhaps we can just solve at least this one square bracket by requesting if APT can possibly agree to suppress this, so that we don't have to, we don't have to discuss it further now. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I will be pleased if APT agree to suppress this little d, fine for me. Korea, please.

>> KOREA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Actually, this text is introduced by the APT proposals, so I think still informal consultation within the APT is under progress.

So I think that the consultation will be very finished in very soon. So simply, we keep SCTs and wait until informal consultation is finished. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Sorry, United States, we cannot solve this little point, it is minor to me, but okay.

The other point I think that we need more in formal

consultation and need to solve may be at higher level, however, I give the floor to the convener to any further comments. Brazil.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would ask if we can go to the next one, and then I can make an explanation. The next one.

>> CHAIR: Yes, go ahead.

>> JEFERSON NACIF: Letter D, in here we find two possible phrases for the question of making security by design. The group decided, has not decided on which would be better, better fit here in the text. So you can see the phrase is starting with the importance of building security, finishing in the next page there, development, or the other one, which is more simple, considering that security aspects throughout the whole life cycle of the standards development process.

>> CHAIR: You propose the second one as a solution? Or the first one? Which one do you propose?

>> JEFERSON NACIF: Mr. Chairman, the second one is simpler and it's better.

>> CHAIR: That is in my understanding, the second is simplest. Can we agree on the second text? No requests for the floor. So this is solved. At least one is solved. Thanks, Jeferson.

(chuckles).

So, we have only the second simplest text. Any further offer, Jeferson for these pending item, or the other need consultation?

>> JEFERSON NACIF: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, for the next related to these two object architecture I would suggest to delete this reference, and let just the reference to ITU-T X1255, but not mentioning digital object here. And for the next two paragraphs, I would like to offer a new paragraph. But it may take a long time to read it on. Maybe we can have more consultation with my colleagues, explaining the modifications that I have, and then may come back to you later.

>> CHAIR: So maybe in your case, we can solve all the pending items, if the meeting agree on your proposal, and in the time being, APT finish the informal consultation, agreed to the little little, considering d.

So go ahead. We can go on with your proposal on suppressing reference to Dona. Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I recall in the morning meeting of com 4 we had discussion on issues of common position. So I urge you, Mr. Chairman, to

keep the square bracket reference to the DOA, because even though the Chair has requested the floor to delete that, he did not explain why. So I think this is an issue of package for reference for the DOA, and the entire of the document and in other documents that will be submitted to com 4.

I do not agree with this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I think the Chairman has given the reasoning because he has proposed to make reference if my memory is correct, recommendation X125 is correct or something like that? Can you, Mr. Jeferson Nacif repeat your proposal?

>> JEFERSON NACIF: Sure, Mr. Chairman. The proposal is just keep the language as it is in the text, but excluding what is between the brackets, and the reason is because X1255, there is a heated discussion about that, but it seems that by reading it there is only one reference to digital architecture, and it is not really based on this technology, but make just one reference in the bibliography of the recommendation. So that is reason why we would ask to our colleagues to delete the words inside brackets. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Jordan.

>> Jordan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the clarification. If the reason to delete this from the paragraph will not be a reason to delete it from the remaining paragraph, because the remaining paragraph between square bracket I don't know, we did not yet dealt with it, so I request that we postpone the discussion on the conclusion until we finish with the remaining paragraphs. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So I understand you are not opposing what, depending on the resolve the remaining paragraph. Mr. Jeferson, can the remaining paragraph go ahead.

>> JEFERSON NACIF: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Regarding the next paragraph, both paragraphs deal with handle systems. It's the view of many in the group that we should not deal, we should not express a specific technology here. But instead, we should try to capture the words and the meaning of having the concepts of the handle system a certain way.

So if I may, I don't know, Mr. Chairman, if you wish me to read the text that I have, that we can propose then. So maybe the Secretariat could write it out on the text on the screen. Okay.

>> CHAIR: Yes, please. Saudi Arabia, is it on this point?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. A comment, regarding paragraph, the previous paragraph, and the deletion of the part in brackets, we would like to keep the brackets as well as the text. We would recall that this text has been extracted from a resolution from the Plenipotentiary Conference. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Yes, in light of the explanation given by the Chairman, now we see what he propose and see if we can come at least on that on some common agreement. The Chairman has big a big effort. I think we have to pay attention what he is proposing. So, Chairman, please read so the Secretariat will be able to cope.

>> JEFERSON NACIF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That is the proposal that I have.

That identity management plays an important role in many telecommunications/ICT services, important role in many telecommunications/ICT services and that it can be implemented using a range of technologies and solutions, comma, including PKI, including public key infrastructure, PKI, and others. I think, Mr. Chairman, this is much more simple than we had. It is not making references to specific technologies, and we are trying to bring the idea of the importance of identity management.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, is the meeting satisfied with this Chairman proposal? I see Russia, Jordan and Saudi Arabia. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. The first, first a editorial change, the second word it's not at, but an, probably. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As my colleague from Saudi Arabia has indicated, this text is really used in PP resolution. So we don't support it at this stage. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: But is very good proposal to me, because it's general. Okay. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. We would like to thank Mr. Jeferson for his many attempts and efforts made yesterday during the meeting and during this meeting today.

But Chair, unfortunately, we are not able to support this proposal at the moment. We would prefer to maintain the text with the square brackets. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. I would like to thank the Chair of our ad hoc drafting session for

suggesting the new proposed text. Australia is supportive of the new proposed text as we stated yesterday during the drafting session. The ITU's role is to be technology neutral, and our concern in specific one technology over the other in this resolution is that that would be contradictory to this position, but not only that, it would be potentially limiting in dismissing other possible solutions and options.

So therefore, we thank the Chair of the drafting session for this new proposed text, and we would like to support it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. First, we thank the Chair of our ad hoc group for all of his efforts yesterday. We were all together for many, many hours, and we really appreciate his work. Second, we thank him for this proposal. I think that it is an interesting proposal, and it addresses many of our concerns.

Just to clarify because I don't think it was clear, our understanding of the proposal is that the complete package is that the, in E, the reference to digital object architecture is removed and then this new sentence F replaces the old paragraph F on the handle

system. For us, this would be acceptable, and for two different reasons. In E, we support removing the term digital object architecture because the, although we recognize that it was found in PP text from resolution 188, that resolution was on counterfeit.

And the ITU has explored the DOA as a solution for counterfeit devices. So in that context, it may have been appropriate to reference it. This is not the case when it comes to Cybersecurity solutions.

For F, we think that the proposal is much simpler and much more clear. We like it that it's not, that it's product neutral and solution neutral. The handle system is one of many. We can also name that Cisco has an IOS PKI service at Mozilla has a product, so do many other companies. We don't think it's appropriate to call out the handle system explanation. This is much clearer, we thank him for the proposal and we can support the deletion in E and new sentence for F. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I have requests from South Africa, Russia and Jordan. South Africa.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you very much, honorable Chairperson, like the speakers from Saudi Arabia and others have indicated we would like to support the text

in brackets, we are not in favor of the text proposed by the Chair.

Chairperson, we would like to share some thoughts on the deliberations that occurred in Council at 2015. There was a Council Working Group report which was quite comprehensive and answers most of the concerns that have been raised here, as to why the Secretariat, why the ITU chose this particular DOA.

Some of the reasons that the Secretariat advanced for choosing this particular technology was the fact that in the quote from the Arab report is it a open architecture which means it's vendor independent system based on official and popular standards, as described in recommendation ITU-T X1255.

They further motivate for the fact that it's a open architecture which allows all vendors to create products that increases flexibility, functionality, interoperability, potential use and useful life.

The fact that this technology is precise and it provides a lot of flexibility that makes it quite useful for countries to actually use, so Chairperson, with the motivation from the ITU Secretariat we would like to have the text that is in brackets retained. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, South Africa. I was present

myself at the Council, so you have not to tell me something but for those who were not present, they can learn something.

Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We also actively participate in this effort, and so on this issue, we fully share the opinion that in reviewing at this meeting the resolution which will govern our activity over the next four years, during which we will have to focus the work of the sector on key areas, well, we must not be guided by the goal of simply making the text smaller or even larger, shorter or longer. There are many resolutions which refer to specific technologies. There are even references in them, in mentioning new draft resolutions in our own work, we mention specific technologies, although this is with respect to different issues, and in a nutshell, our proposal is to focus in our work on the essence and not on the mere format. So we propose leaving this text and working on it. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: The list is growing. And I don't think we come to the solution. I will give the floor to, it is growing, growing, growing. And sorry, but I know

what everyone will say. I read the list, but please be very consist, because you have not convinced me, neither the other, the two parties are separate and are different. So should be very short in your intervention. I will conclude with Brazil at the end, because although they asked before the floor, but they will be the last one to speak so I have Jordan, United Kingdom, Japan, Canada, Brazil but Brazil will be last, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, United Arab Emirates and Sweden. This is closed. Brazil will be the last one.

Jordan, please.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To be brief and specific, we support to keep the text between square bracket and to bring this resolution back to Committee 4, because not all the members states that participated in the discussion are present in this meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United Kingdom.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I speak for CEPT. Mr. Chairman, these have been very long hard discussions. The UK stated a clear preference on behalf of CEPT that we wish to have a technology neutral resolution. We thank the Chair for his excellent proposal. We fully support it. I endorse the

comments of the United States, which covered some wide use on this and also Australia. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Chairman's proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman. Japan also support the ad hoc Chair's proposal, because we could not reach the consensus, yesterday, so this is the best way to resolve this problem. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. As many of the speakers before, you can notice there is a discussion about the topic, Canada wants to express strong support to the proposal from the Chair which has been endorsed by a number of administrations such as U.S., Japan, and UK too. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: I would like to associate myself with the previous speakers regarding returning this text between square bracket. Mr. Chairman, we heard about the word that technology neutral, and we in fact do not understand what do we mean by technology neutral. In fact, many standards are technology oriented, and specific company technology based, and I believe that is why IPR is important in this case. And examples for

those technology oriented is G fast, recommendation G fast, recommendation H .264, NGN, the IPTV. I mean we can say that there are those standards which are produced by this organisation are not technology neutral. I mean this is, Mr. Chairman, not clear to us, and we associate the previous, with the previous speakers to keep this text between square brackets. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Kuwait.

>> Kuwait: Thank you, Chairman, we would like to support to keep the text between brackets.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would like also to associate ourselves with other colleagues, actually, Mr. Chairman, as highlighted earlier in the com 4 the same subject is being discussed in different groups. I think the proper way here to take the text within square brackets to the com 4, then this will be discussed in specialized group, that cover the subject across every and different topics. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I say I closed the list, I have another request for the list but please do not -- Sweden and Brazil will be the last one. After that we will make

my decision. Brazil -- Sweden and Brazil.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair, since the voice of Europe has already spoken I withdraw my request to speak.

>> CHAIR: Very kind of you. Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Being very brief we support the suggestion of Mr. Jeferson Nacif. We believe that resolution should be technology neutral, especially because we could not close doors for future developments that could be even a better solution than what is proposed. So we propose for technology neutral resolution.

>> CHAIR: My decision for the time being is to have the old text in square brackets, the proposal, and the text proposed by Mr. Jeferson Nacif because we have not to lose neither these proposals. So both texts will be in square brackets, and hopefully by the plenary, the problem, may be com 4 but maybe at plenary problem is solved. Please do not lose neither the text proposed, good text and thanks, Mr. Jeferson for your try at least.

Any further point, Mr. Jeferson.

>> JEFERSON NACIF: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there are a few more questions. Now we move to resolves 8.

Resolves 8 square bracket is on Dona. Here the text makes references to some organisations, so there was a discussion in the group if we should maintain the whole list of organisations, including Dona or if we should strike just Dona or remove all the organisations, as specified here in the resolves 8, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: If you ask me my preference is to strike everything (chuckles).

>> JEFERSON NACIF: So is my preference, Mr. Chairman. As we can spend more time debating which organisation made into here and the list, even though including Dona, the list is not extensive enough, it is not full and not completed enough.

>> CHAIR: My preference is to strike everything, does the meeting agree on my proposal? And your proposal at the end, understand your preference also. So we delete all the reference to the organisation.

Thanks, Mr. Jeferson Nacif, go to the next.

>> JEFERSON NACIF: Next one, Mr. Chairman, is right below, is number 9.

>> CHAIR: Allow the Secretariat to delete the reference to the organization. Now, next one, please go ahead. Is done?

>> CHAIR: Delete all the reference, point 8 he was

referring, ICT, etcetera. Delete all that. All that,
all that.

(laughter).

Sorry (chuckles).

Delete everything.

(laughter).

(applause).

(pause).

After we will give the editorial, but you clear
understand my thinking.

So, Mr. Jeferson, please.

>> JEFERSON NACIF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The
amendment would be the deleting just after field, so
we would delete everything after field. After field,
we start, yes.

>> CHAIR: Yes, that was my proposal.

>> JEFERSON NACIF: So, Mr. Chairman, the next is
number 9, resolves 9. Here again, just like the other,
the previous resolution, there is a reference to Study
Group 3. And we couldn't find an agreement for the same
reasons, Mr. Chairman. For this as well, my
suggestion is the same. We should not keep this here
for the reasons that I've mentioned before unless
resolution 2 says differently. But up till now it

seems resolution 2 is not expanding the mandate of Study Group 3. In this regard, specifically on terms of Cybersecurity, and that is why Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if other colleagues agree with. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: We can make a trial, but okay. I have my doubts.

But please, we try. Can we delete. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We share your desire, Mr. Chairman, to make progress with regard to this resolution. However, we have difficulty with suppressing this text, and we would like to keep it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: In this case I propose to maintain the square brackets, Jeferson, we will come back when it's linked to the other and that is the way we avoid Ping-Pong game. Next one or there is nothing more?

>> JEFERSON NACIF: There is, Mr. Chairman, it is in the instructs TSB. Actually, this is a point that is missing in my report. After the publication actually we saw this is under instructs TSB number 6, and we did have this discussion in our meeting. And the result was to delete this reference to resolution 45 because the resolution is already under recalling

part.

This reference must be deleted as well.

>> CHAIR: You propose to maintain to cooperate within, with BDT in relation with any item concerning Cybersecurity, stop and leave the rest.

>> JEFERSON NACIF: No, we delete all number 6. All number 6, yes, because it's referenced in the recalling parts of the text.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Can the meeting agree on that? It is editorial in my mind, because it's in the recalling part. But I see the meeting, can the meeting -- Jordan is asking the floor.

>> JORDAN: Just to have a clarification on the proposal. Is this, for this under recalling and this is under instruct part now, just to have clarification on which text we talk.

>> CHAIR: I think the remaining in the recalling part, but it is deleted in the instruct part, because this is my understanding. Maybe Jeferson can correct me.

>> JEFERSON NACIF: Yes, Mr. Chairman, you are correct. Since there is a reference before, we don't need this in the instructs TSB. In the recalling, we have a reference to resolution 45 dealing with the

cooperation with BDT and TSB. So there is no needing to reiterate or duplicate this provision in the instructs TSB.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, it's clear to me. Jordan, it is clear to you also?

>> It is not clear because there is a difference between if you are recalling something and if you are instructing. Instruct it means that after you have recalled, every resolution you require something, you are requiring, you are instructing to work within the resolution. I don't think there is repetition. We require to keep it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Perhaps we can offer clarification about yesterday's discussion. APT came in with many new proposals proposing various kinds of instructions related to development activities and collaboration with the BDT. So we felt that the combination of the recalling, of the recalling having resolution 45 up in that part and then the new references reference which is now in 8 to support the BDT on assisting Member States, as well as some additional changes to the resolves section which if I can show you number 4, that ITU-T should work closely

with ITU-D on specific activities, we felt like there was sufficient instruction that the TSB should be collaborating with the BDT. We felt that this particular reference was unnecessary. Hopefully that helps you understand the proposal. We tried very hard to eliminate text, even as we added them, so as not to add to the length of the resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Furthermore there is internal Intersector group that is ensuring everything is taken care. I have Korea.

>> Actually this text is introduced by APT. So we simply associate with the previous intervention made by United States. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: We can delete in this case. Okay. Thank you. By the way as APT there was still one point pending for consultation was, you remind me, of whether APT has to consult was in Jeferson, there was one tech point of APT has requested, please go ahead.

>> JEFERSON NACIF: Yes, Mr. Chairman, is it under considering further D the importance of security of distributed data, considering their whole life cycle. That is a consultation recommend.

>> CHAIR: Has APT had time to consult and we can follow the proposal from the Chair, the convener? No

request for the floor, means agreement. China.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Regarding the lifetime distributed data, China is in the view that in the considering part we need to maintain this proposal, because we have also mentioned in the recognizing part that the security is an important element of Cybersecurity. Considering the data and its accumulation in the process, therefore, from the life time perspective, we should consider the security issue. And also in this regard, the proposal did not mention any specific technology, which is therefore neutral.

It is also satisfying the requirements of resolutions. Therefore, China is of the view that we need to keep this proposal. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Understand need further informal consultation or remain in square brackets, and I hope that China will join the informal consultation, APT and come to the solution to the problem. For the time being it remains in square brackets, Mr. Jeferson with the other point decided. This is over. Next one, I think.

>> JEFERSON NACIF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The next document is ARB6, the output document of reference for this document is published DT85, holding the

results of the deliberations, the group decided to discuss from invites to resolves. Due to intense exchange of views and time limitation the group could not have time to discuss the introductory part of the text, where additional exercise will be needed.

The remaining brackets on the text are actually on the entire text, since the beginning, the first paragraph, the title, on the word resolution as well in the title, because there are in the views of many concerns regarding the existence of a new resolution about these matters.

Within resolves 1, resolves 2, resolves 4, instructs TSB 2, instructs TSB in close collaboration with BDT director, instructs ITU-T Study Group 1 and invites Member States 1 and 2, so Mr. Chairman, this can give a glimpse of how difficult it was for this Chair to try to come up to some results in this proposed resolution ARB number 6. But maybe we can put more efforts and try to come up with some conclusions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: We have very limited time because we have still to go with another group, and we have little bit enough of an hour left but let's make a trial.

Any requests? Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to clarify one thing. Is this resolution among the ones that have been discussed today, within Committee 4, and have been referred to the group under the leadership of Malaysia? Am I correct by this understanding or not? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: That is very likely, in this case we will not discuss any longer here, and Malaysia will take care, and that we will be more than happy, because they release me and Mr. Jefferson of further problem let's say. United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. Our understanding of the mandate of the ad hoc group that was created, that Malaysia is leading is related to the mandate of Study Group 20, and the privacy and trust issues located in there, although this new resolution is also in reference to privacy and trust and the terminology here is similar to what is found in Study Group 20, this new resolution is a new mandate for the ITU-T at large. It is not only limited to Study Group 20 and in fact, it includes instructions for the TSB, for the, for other Study Groups within the ITU-T, and also for the union as a whole. Therefore, Chair, we are not sure that this is something that we are going

to be able to resolve in the same context as the group that will be led by Malaysia. We fear that that group which already will conclude its proceedings at 11 :50 to 9:00 p.m. tonight, it has enough work, so we request that maybe there is a different way we can proceed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I have no proposal. I want to release Mr. Jeferson from spending other time. But if the meeting agree, I'm willing to ask him to continue this work. But I don't know if that is a good solution, because to continue discussing in the round, I am doubtful, so -- (pause).

I received a E-mail from Mr. Bilel Jamoussi saying this resolution will be discussed in any case in the ad hoc of Malaysia.

So, seems it is not my decision. It is Bilel decision. I don't know. And in any case, I don't think it is wise to use time of Mr. Jeferson on that. Com 4, yeah. Com 4.

>> BILEL JAMOUSSEI: It is not my decision, Mr. Chairman, it was com 4 agreement with you this morning that if this ad hoc does not reach consensus, that the work would move into the new ad hoc chaired by Malaysia. This was a decision of com 4 this morning.

>> CHAIR: That was, very pleased that Saudi Arabia remind me, because that is my favorite solution, that will ease my work really, and the work of Mr. Jeferson who spent already a huge amount of time on this draft proposal. So does the meeting with this explanation agree on that? Yes, Mr. Jeferson, this conclude -- oh, you have something, please.

>> JEFERSON NACIF: Yes. Well, just to conclude some remarks, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank you for the trust you put in me on this task. It was again a great honor for me to lead some of our colleagues, spending very good hours with them. I learned a lot. I would like also to thank the Secretariat staff, Mr. Martin and Mr. Mark for their invaluable support they gave me on putting everything together in the documents for our discussions yesterday. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: I thank you, Mr. Jeferson. This is the problem when you are my friends, I immediately find a victim. So I thank for the very efficient work you have done, you tried really to come to a solution of the problem, and I count on the spirit of cooperation of all delegates to solve the remaining item and to come to a sector conclusion on this respect. Saudi Arabia.

>> Saudi Arabia: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We share with you your appreciation of Mr. Jeferson's work. We all appreciate his work greatly. We spent a long time over the past day working on several resolutions, and we managed to get good results. So we thank him very much.

>> CHAIR: You express I think the feeling of all the meeting. I think now, we pass another group I ask my Brazilian friend, because when we are friends, I always burden him. So may I ask my friend from Brazil to present the result on, let's call ad hoc group, please go ahead.

>> Thank you, Chairman. Good afternoon, everyone.

So, at 29 October, 2016 meeting Working Group 4A decided to, that received proposals which contain draft new recommendations on OTT and IMR. And the new ad hoc group was established. We met on 29 October, from 2:30 to until 7:30. And in 30 October, from 2:30 to 9:30.

The ad hoc group was attended with 76 participants, and first section, and in the second section, with 63 participates. Regarding to the new resolution on mobile roaming, the ad hoc group examined their received proposals in establishing a new resolution on

IMR and the document is found in IAP 46 addendum 8. The document was agreed with some editorial changes. The output document is available on DT54. Regarding the resolution on OTT the ad hoc group examined the received proposal on establishing the resolution on OTT, and the participants agreed to discuss the text, and there was a very long debate over the title of the draft resolution. And there was no consensus. Participants agreed to indicate in the ad hoc group report that the title needs to be discussed, and it's annex 1 and 2.

Another disagreement it was related to the definition of services, which are not, which are subject of this document, were not considered. Several options were discussed and one of them, OTT services, alternative voice and messages services and on-line services for voice and messages that requires access to public resources. There was also a request to add a definition of the reference of the ITU-T E164.

In addition, in the part of instructs, there was a disagreement whether to keep or remove reference to ITU-T's Study Group 17, and relevance reference on security in the resolves parts.

In conclusion, so there is a consensus in relation

to the resolution on IMR, and there is no consensus on OTT resolution. After the discussion, most of the text was agreed, except three parts. The definition of services, the security issues including reference on Study Group 17, and the title of the resolution, and need to status if it's a resolution, a opinion and recommendation. This document is in my report in annex 1 with revision marks. And without marks, in the annex 2.

I'd like to thank Mr. Dennis Andrew for Secretariat and I would like to thank for all participants in this ad hoc group. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the long time you did also dedicate to that and try to solve this important question that to me is very important question, and we will see if we can progress further at this meeting, or if you have to wait some resolution at higher level for some aspect.

My understanding that's for resolution on international mobile roaming maybe can go, and we can make no major problem. So can we start with that? I always like to start with the easy one. I see no square brackets. There is only square brackets in D97.

Deleted. Okay. So there is no square brackets.

So, can we agree with that? I was requested to raise the point that to organise a issue in coordination with Director of communication and development, consumer benefits of international mobile roaming rates, this can have financial consequence, but we will, when we will approve this resolution, we will pass the relevant information to the Committee 2. Any request for clarification?

No? Can we approve this resolution? Approved.

Thank you.

Now, the other one, I am afraid that this is more complex, because after different solution and furthermore, I am afraid is also linked with some definitions that I cannot decide here, but I offer the floor to any possible way forward. Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Actually, as everybody knows, we had a very tough discussion on this issue on OTT, ad hoc group, it was a really productive discussion, and we agreed with almost all the text of this new resolution. We have, as you mentioned, we have some text in terms of the title, the terminology, the issue about security and in SG 17 in brackets, and also the nature of this document, if resolution or

opinion, it's also in brackets. May I suggest something as a package in order to try and solve all these issues?

In the title, we would like to suggest as a compromise to use the wording, promoting digital transformation, and the convergence of services. Promoting digital transformation and the convergence of services. Yeah. Regarding terminology, we would like to suggest to use in the whole text the same terminology I will say now, on-line services for voice and messaging that require access to international public numbering resources, including international and deleting the E164 recommendation.

>> CHAIR: Can you repeat, so the Secretariat can take care.

>> BRAZIL: Yeah.

(off microphone).

>> CHAIR: Go ahead.

>> BRAZIL: Also I'd like to suggest to remove the wording security in the resolves part. And the instructs SG 17 in the instructs Study Groups. I think after all this discussion that we had during this weekend, I think it's something like nine hours discussing this, in formal meetings, yeah, we had a lot

of other discussion informally, but I think this should be a good compromise and that is why I'm proposing this, thank you very much. Just something, my proposal is also to keep this text as a new resolution, and not opinion or recommendation. Yeah. That's the compromise that we are proposing. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your proposal, very appealing to me. But I am very simple man, you know. (chuckles).

All those that, let's see what are the reaction of the meeting. Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me thank the distinguished colleague from Brazil, trying to have a way forward. In fact, regarding the title, we prefer that the title consider the terminology used and the reasoning of the resolution, I don't think that the target of the resolution is to promote digital transformation and convergence.

Basically, for the title, we cannot accept this. Regarding the reference on the terminology to the access to the numbering, international numbering scheme, we did explain in our meeting several times that not all on-line application services have access to

international numbering scheme. I draw several examples. For example, you have Facebook, Facebook messenger, they do not need numbers to receive or originate international calls.

Regarding the reference to the security issues, we had a long debate on what aspect of security we need Study Group 17 to focus on. I don't know how this can be a compromise package. So this is why I say we cannot accept this at this stage. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I hope we can accept at a later stage. But anyway, Senegal.

>> SENEGAL: Thank you. As regards the title first, Senegal does not agree with a new title as proposed, because Senegal and the African Group we would like to talk about OTTs and it's not for promotion and transformation, but digital. It is a problem that is under OTT.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Senegal. Russian.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair. We are also grateful for the proposal. However. We are somewhat concerned that all of this terminology from on-line this essentially will be new for us. So what we should do specifically, would we not end up rather than stop the work that has been started in SG

3 and SG 2 and SG 17 in terms of security, perhaps we could note SS7 protocol for example, would not that be put in another area of study, rather than OTT? Would not we be changing the understanding of them?

We have checked our documents as a result of the work particularly the Plenipotentiary Conference, would draw your attention that in the work we already have referred to the term OTT, in resolution 71, in terms of recognizing this field of the market, in comparison to traditional telecommunication services.

Therefore, we would prefer not to confuse our work, and as we said earlier, define the key areas in it, and then give indicators to the necessary relevant Study Groups, because when our technical specialists come to Study Groups meetings, they could be a little lost with all, with this. What are we instructing them to do? I thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Cameroon.

>> CAMEROON: Thank you, Chair. While respecting the proposals from Brazil, we would support the proposal made by the African Group, the African Group would support the proposal from Senegal and Jordan. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. This means -- United

States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chairman. The proposal just made by Brazil, I think it brings us closer together than we were this weekend. If we had a little bit more time to discuss, I think that we could come to a compromise. Thank you, hopefully.

>> CHAIR: That was my hopes too. But I am afraid we are again diverging instead of converging. Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. Well, on behalf of CEPT, we would accept the proposal as a compromise that was presented from Brazil. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I think however on the light of the discussion I have had still may be too early to come to this Brazilian proposal. I have to thank however, it was not the convener, it was one other delegate from Brazil who made the proposal to make it very clear. The convener is neutral as usual as the Chairman is neutral. But it was a very good proposal, to try to come to a solution. There are two possibilities to me.

Either to maintain the report of the convener as it was originally or to allow some further discussion, informal discussion prior reporting to Committee 4, and to try to come to a solution on this particular very important to me resolution. Is linked with other

discussion going on in parallel, I agree. But at the same time, if we can solve for this particular case, it will be a good success and a good result from what Brazil has undertaken on that. May I first ask the convener if he is willing to continue informal discussion or if he is already at the end. Brazil, please.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chairman. I think that we can continue discussing informally, and in the next meeting of Working Group 4A we can return.

>> CHAIR: There is no meeting of 4A, you will report to me. When we report to the Committee 4, I can report if the agreement has been reached. As I said, the meeting of Committee 4 where I have to report is tomorrow afternoon.

I don't know, Bilel can provide time for this discussion informal? Okay. Please.

I think he is checking. He is checking, but I hope it is feasible. There are a lot of activity going on this evening. I don't know when you intend to convene, but maybe there is a possibility and Bilel Jamoussi will let us know before the end of the meeting. Bilel, you think you have a reply for us? Okay.

Any other point, convener on part of this pending

item?

Any other point in general, now in our discussion.

Really, at least we have come to almost a conclusion with no conclusion in some part but this is not to my pleasure but nothing to do to solve pending items.

So we will announce maybe on the screen or Bilel what timing, you have no idea of the timing? Because that is useful for you to know the timing. Immediate after this meeting is possible? Bilel.

>> BILEL JAMOSSI: Thank you, Chairman. If you give me five minutes, I'll get back to you with a proposed time and room. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So what you have more to discuss in five minutes? I think we have.

We have to me practically exhausted our agenda. But I can make a short break to allow you to five minutes breaks and come back and if the interpreter allow me five minutes break and come back and make the decision on the timing. You can stay here. But I give you five minutes to decide on the room and the timing. Okay. Understand that the informal consultation on numbering is going on. Five minutes break.

(break)

>> Is it possible we could have 30 minutes break before start informal discussion?

>> CHAIR: The informal discussion on OTT, will start at 6:00 in this room. No, 6:00. Because they want to have -- you have half an hour break. With that, the meeting of Working Party 4A is closed. Thank you.

(applause).

By the way, since the meeting is over, I have at least to thank my Vice Chairman, my assistant and all the staff who has worked for me, the interpreters and the delegates. Continue with the spirit of cooperation and come with good result. Thank you. Now continue to work in the informal consultation. Bye.

(session adjourned at 1728)

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.
