

Raw file.  
November 2, 2016.  
1930.  
ITU.  
World Telecommunication Standardization  
Assembly.  
Hammamet, Tunisia.

Services Provided By:

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

\*\*\*

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

\*\*\*.

(standing by).

(standing by).

(standing by).

(standing by).

>> CHAIR: Well, good evening, ladies and gentlemen.

We have started the day with good morning, then good  
afternoon. Now it's good evening. I hope we will not  
say good morning because we have passed maybe midnight.

Welcome back to this third session of the day which  
is the fifth session of this plenary. I would like to  
start by the approval of the proposed agenda that you

have as document 36, where we will start with consideration and approval of the report of Committee 2, regarding budget consideration. Then we go through Study Group structure and questions. Then we go through revised resolutions and draft new resolutions that you have on the screen. And if we finish on time or in time, we could address the appointment of Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the Study Groups, TSAG and SCV. I would like you to approve the agenda. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Good evening, colleagues. We have a comment on the agenda. We see that one of the first items is approval of resolution 2. However in the current text we don't see amendments, the amendments which pertain to the previous discussion on OTT. As far as we recall, there were a number of modifications proposed to resolution 2, that is the first point.

Secondly, it's quite possible that on other discussions, there will be other proposals which may arise to amend resolution 2. Therefore, considering it at the beginning of the meeting, might not perhaps be logical. Therefore, we would propose that this agenda item that is 4A be moved on to tomorrow's meeting. Thank you.

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

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We do as well support Russia, their proposal.

>> CHAIR: I see that the proposal of Russia makes sense. However, considering the text related to Study Group 2 and Study Group 3 as agreed upon during our previous session was, I have it here in front of me, and the proposal was to approve resolution 2 considering those changes. However, you are right, Russia, we may have additional changes on this resolution 2.

I would like to make a proposal, not to send it to tomorrow agenda, but to consider it later in the agenda of today. If you agree with that, we can do this. I see no objection. So I see, I consider to remove this item, let us say after, before the appointment of Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen.

I have your agreement on the remaining parts. Let's go with this agenda. Thank you very much. Next item on the agenda is the consideration and approval of the report of Committee 2. I would like to ask Mrs. Weiling Xu to present briefly the report contained in document 77. Mrs. Weiling, she is there? I don't see her.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Distinguished guests,

colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, good evening. Now I'd like to make a presentation on document 77 in English, held two meetings and we finished our work as planned. To be brief for my report, in total, the potential financial implications that have been confirmed for Committee 2, in addition to the resolutions and decisions of the WTSA 16, received after the Committee 2 meetings, are estimated between 1.342 million Swiss francs, and 1.628 million Swiss francs, and between 2.602 million Swiss francs, to 3.788 million Swiss francs per biennium. Please refer to annex B of this report for details.

This estimated financial impact is indicative and will be further reviewed by the Council at its 2017 session, when adopting the 2018 to 2019 budget. Since the financial plan 2016 to 2019 approved by the Plenipotentiary 14 already setting the framework of the expenses for 2016 to 2019, the Secretariat informed Committee 2 that it will be difficult to balance the 2018 to 2019 budget with these decisions and the resolutions that require additional financial funding.

For 2017 TSB will endeavor to accommodate to the new requirements within its approved 2016 and 2017 budget although this may be challenging. The plenary meeting is requested to consider and approve this report which

will then be forwarded by the Secretary-General together with the comments of the plenary meeting for submission to the 2017 session of the Council.

That is the major part of my report. I'd like to take the opportunity of taking the floor to thank all the delegates, the Vice-Chairs and the counselors and the interpreters for working together to fulfill our task assigned by this Assembly. That concludes my report. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mrs. Weiling, thank you for your report. Are there any clarification required? I see no one. No ask for clarification. I propose to you that we approve the Committee 2 report, which is considered, which is included in document 77. I see no objection. So we consider it as approved. Thank you, Mrs. Weiling and I take this opportunity myself to thank you very much as Chair and thank also the Vice-Chairs and the team who have worked on this Committee 2 budget consideration.

Thank you very much. Let us move on the study, the next item, as we just decided to move the resolution 2 just before the proposal or the discussion about the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of the Study Groups and TSAG and SCV. Let's move on the approval of questions,

text -- (pause).

Okay. Sorry for my misunderstanding. So that means that the whole Study Group structure and questions including resolution 2 and approval of questions and any additional new questions is removed, at the end of the agenda. Thank you for clarification, Mr. Reinhard. Next item on my agenda is the draft revised resolution 52, on, what is this? Yeah, countering and combating spam, which is included in document 92 -- 111. 112.

Okay. 112. Please show it on the screen. I ask you a very short interruption. Sorry about that. Sorry for this short interruption. There was just a small mistake here, so I have understood or understand that we may have some compromise text on this resolutions, and I would like to give the floor to Fabio, Fabio Bigi to give us his view on that, before we can approve the text. Thank you.

>> FABIO BIGI: Thank you, Chairman. In fact, we have had some discussion, what we were blocking further instruct 4 was the only pending point for the instruct 4, because we were pending the agreement of the mandate of Study Group 3. During the discussion of Committee 4 there were pointed out that also other Study Group may be concerned. The compromise proposal is to replace

the present text with the following, without dictation speed. 4 will read all ITU-T Study Groups, all other ITU-T Study Groups instead of ITU-T Study Group 3, delete that, others, ITU-T Study Groups, to consider this issue within their mandate as appropriate. Thanks. This is the proposed text.

>>CHAIR: Okay. Are there any comments on this text? I see no one. So I propose that we approve this resolution. I see no objection. No one asking for the floor. United States, please.

>>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Unfortunately, we have not seen this text until this time, and it's not appropriate to duplicate this work across other Study Groups. So we couldn't support this proposal. Thank you.

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

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I understand that we are trying to find a way forward, and we discussed this issue in Committee 4. I raised the question that Study Group 3 in a new mandate when they address regulatory issues, they can look at the regulatory of spam from the consumer perspective, like we had adopted the resolution on the consumer protection. There was a question on the floor that if ITU, if Study Group 3 is

already doing any work, so maybe we carry word try to rewrite the text that to instruct ITU Study Group 3 to work on developing, not to continue, because they have not started any work. This text is only to instruct the Study Group 3. We don't have to have a wider instruction to all Study Groups to consider in their mandate. I agree with what was proposed that maybe the intervention from the United States that this will widen the scope, and so we need to focus on what is we need from Study Group 3. We need to instruct Study Group 3 to work on developing maybe not recommendations, they can only work on technical papers and publication related to spam.

So this is my proposal. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. Good evening, I'm speaking on behalf of CEPT. We think the colleagues have done good work on this resolution. Europe along with others brought proposals to our meeting. We discussed them. Not all of our proposals had consensus and so we withdrew them. We think that now we have a good compromise. But we must be clear that Europe does not support new instructs to Study Group 3. This does not have consensus support. We would ask that that is not included.



Regarding the new text, like the United States, we have not seen this new text until this very moment, we are concerned that there is a risk we are duplicating work even more widely, and for that reason we are not able to accept the new text at this time. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Sorry, UK, can you be more precise, what do you consider as new text?

>> New text that has just been proposed at dictation and written on the screen. We are not able to support that. We have only just seen it a few minutes ago. We are concerned along with the United States and others that it risks duplication of work across many Study Groups. It's very unclear what the scope of it is. We are not able to support either that new text or the instructs to Study Group 3. We don't have consensus on these. We would like to ask that they are withdrawn. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UK. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, we support our colleague from Jordan in having Study Group 3 to work on developing recommendations and technical -- I think this instruct part is very clear, precise. Also regarding, deleting to continue, yes, because Study Group 3 has no, currently there is no work related to spam. But in general we support having the

instruct to Study Group 3 in this resolution. Thank you.

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

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. This proposal is one which came from the Arab States and African countries. We share the same position as the Distinguished Delegate of Jordan. The issue of spam is a crucial one, particularly for developing countries. This is in line with the usual tasks and mandate of SG 3. Therefore, we support keeping this sentence here. Thank you, Chairman.

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

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm sorry to request the floor again. The issue that there is a duplication is not there. It is only Study Group 3 who are in charge of Study Group I didn't think policy, regulatory and economic issues and to analyze the impact of any issue on it. There is no other group under the T sector that involve in studying regulatory and economic policy issues. I don't see any duplication of work. This instruction is only related to the work of Study Group 3. The issue that we have discussed that there is no work item currently but in the future, we are talking about for years to come there could be a contribution related to study the impact of the spam from regulatory

and economic and policy issue. Thank you. We support this text.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We think there are other forms to discuss this topic. If we are going to go through this conference we are into the last evening, we have is to start making decision on text that has been discussed over and over and for which there is no consensus. We clearly support the striking all the text in yellow as well as the new proposal which also will not find consensus. Let's move on to other important topics. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Australia, like others including most recently Canada would also propose striking the text in yellow as well as the sentence that was just added under dictation. We feel that it's not appropriate for spam to be included in this Study Group 3 work programme. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia. Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Chair. Although UK made the CEPT view clear, I would just like to express our support to the CEPT position and maybe all other members might do if we go this individual approach. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sweden. Zimbabwe.

>> ZIMBABWE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Zimbabwe supports the retention of instruct 4, along with other countries like Jordan. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Zimbabwe. Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. Last time, we discussed this issue, it was at the Committee and the Russian Federation requested the Chair and delegates to work on it in order to come up with a compromise text. Now we have heard a proposal from the Chair, and we are a little disappointed because the informal consultations led us to believe that we more or less were getting close to a text which would instruct Study Group 3 to carry out studies on the economic consequences of spam. We thought that that would be the text which will be read out by the Chairman. If other colleagues are in agreement, we would like to concentrate our work, sorry, the work of Study Group 3 on the economic aspects of this issue as it is most important aspect. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Japan will support the proposal from Canada and others. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan. Kuwait.

>> Kuwait: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We support the statement that is highlighted in yellow. We understand from that it says a very focus group which is group 3 to look into the spam issue. Spam have to be looked at that. We cannot I think to be widen and keep it to all Study Groups, we have to be focused on one of the Study Groups that could be 3. If we go with our dear colleagues by crossing the statement, my question is how spam is going to be looked at, where is it going to be looked at? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Kuwait. UAE.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Very briefly, we support keeping the text in yellow, deleting the word continue to and also deleting regulatory. Perhaps if we delete regulatory as well maybe this would, I'm not saying a way forward but maybe that text will be clear, since referring to the previous debates with regards to having Study Group 3 or so expanded to Study Group regulatory matters. We are, we support the text highlighted with this modification. With regards to the new text, we are still considering that. We don't have yet a position on that. But according to the discussions, we will see how things will go. Thank

you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE, for your proposal. Kenya.

>> KENYA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It seems as if all the efforts towards compromise not leading us to a exact position but we would like to support the position expressed by our colleagues from Zimbabwe and from Kuwait that we retain the text and remove the word continue it, if the removal of the term regulatory would enable the others also to come towards accepting the text as it is on the screen, then that will be most appropriate. But we would like to join the others in supporting retention of that text and regarding the additional text by the Chairman, that the Chairman has articulated to us, we do not yet have a specific position, because we need to review it, because it is new. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Kenya. South Africa.

>> Thank you very much, Chairperson. To be brief, we would like to support our colleagues from the UAE, Saudi Arabia and others, who are supporting the retention of the text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, South Africa. Argentina.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chairman. In this case, we would like to align ourselves with those who are seeking to come up with a consensus text, and not looking to

see which one of the proposals has weight behind it. Looking at what is written in instructs 2 we could include Study Group 3 as well as Study Group 17 to support Study Group 2 on countering and combating spam. Then the text would follow as it is. We would add this in. We believe that this would allow us to delete instructs 4. We are proposing this as a solution to see whether or not with this we can come to consensus on the work.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the proposal. Are there support for the proposal of Argentina? The proposal I just remind, you have it on the screen. The proposal of Argentina is just to add with SG 17 to add SG 3, in the second paragraph. We can read it, ITU-T Study Group 17, so further instructs ITU-T Study Group 17 and SG 3 to support ITU-D Study Group 2 on countering and combating spam in its work, maybe in their work, providing technical training sessions, workshops, activities, in different regions, related to spam policy, regulatory and economic issues and their impact.

I see Jordan asking for the floor. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In fact, ITU Study Group 17 they were already impacted in our work related to spam. This is why they can provide the support. So

we are instructing ITU Study Group 3 to start working on this.

However, if this will satisfy our colleagues, we don't mind. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. I see that no one else is -- no, there are more requests for the floor. Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: I'm struggling to understand how SG 3 could support without a mandate. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sweden. Singapore.

>> Singapore: Thank you, Chairman. Regarding the proposal to add Study Group 3 after Study Group 17, looking at the instructs carefully, the intention of instructs 2 and instructs 4 is actually not quite the same. Instructs 2 focuses on training and workshops whereas instructs 4 is on developing recommendations, technical papers and other publications. The overlap with instructs 4 is really within instructs 3 and while I have the mic, may I also say that instruct 3 at the moment doesn't really say what Study Group 17 should work on. It just says develop recommendation, technical papers and related publications but doesn't say on what.

But my main point was that 2 is workshops and training and 4 overlaps with 3. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Singapore. I see no one else



asking for the floor. We have on hand three proposals. One is to keep the text as it was discussed but not agreed during the adhoc meeting. We have a proposal of removing the word regulatory from this text. We have the proposal of Chairman limiting or extending it to all other ITU Study Groups, and we have finally the proposal from Argentina, to include SG 3 with the paragraph 2 with Study Group 17.

I see United States requesting for the floor. I wish that you give us your approval on one of the proposed text. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair, there was actually another proposal and that was to delete the text in square brackets and we would certainly support that. The technical aspects that can support spam are already being studied in Study Group 17 and ITU-D has a lot of work under way on spam. We would support deleting the text in the square brackets. Thank you.

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

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair. I was going to point out to the same omission that you had forgotten the option of just striking this text in square brackets. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. UK.

>> UK: Thank you, Chair. Again speaking for CEPT, we would prefer to strike out all of this new text. We don't believe it's appropriate to give a mandate to other Study Groups, and this work ought to include Study Group 3 here. We think that Study Group 17 has done good work on this. There is best practice available. We think that the task we face now is to implement this best practice and support developing countries, and we should be focusing on the work, the good work that is being done in the D sector and support that. And not undermine it in any way by spreading the mandate on this work to other Study Groups. There is very good best practices available. We think we need to focus on the D sector and we don't wish to see any additional mandates or involvements of other Study Groups beyond the good work that Study Group 17 has done. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. What I see that we have instruction clear, instruction almost clear and instructs to Study Group 17. It looks like we don't or at least a part of our Assembly doesn't want to give any more or further instruction to Study Group 3. This is what I hear from the room. Even though what we have proposed or what the Chair proposed is a text covering

globally all Study Groups that may be involved in this regard.

I would propose now to this honorable Assembly to consider the easiest proposal which is the proposal made by Fabio Bigi as Chairman of the Working Group is to consider the wide one other ITU-T Study Groups to consider this issue within their mandate, as appropriate. I propose to you that we consider this text as final position. If I can have your agreement on that, we can move on with this proposal. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm sorry to disappoint you, but the problem we had with the Study Group 3 text was that it was duplicating work. If we assign that work to other ITU-T Study Groups, in general, it is expanding that problem with the text. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, U.S.

United Kingdom.

>> Thank you, Chair, like the U.S., CEPT has the same concerns. We cannot accept this text I'm afraid. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UK. Zimbabwe.

>> Thank you, Chairman. We believe the proposal by Fabio is, may be appropriate given where we are in

the conference. Mr. Chairman, Study Group liaise amongst themselves, there is coordination. To say there will be duplication of work I think will be applying a blind eye to how the Study Groups work. We believe that could be a good compromise.

>> CHAIR: Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Australia would not be able to support Mr. Bigi's proposal. We feel that as others have said it would open the door, I think, to duplication and kind of effort that would potentially be wasted, I think whereas at the moment it's currently being done as others have said very good work in Study Group 17 and in the D sector. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia. UAE.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, we have heard from a number of distinguished colleagues that this will have a duplication of work. But today which Study Groups mandated to study economic issues, it's Study Group 3. I don't see how this will duplicate the work of other Study Groups. Our preference, Mr. Chairman, is to keep the text highlighted in yellow. However, in the spirit of compromise perhaps the text that was proposed by Dr. Bigi could help. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. When informal consultations took place, it was said very clearly that of the technical groups who are working on the standardization sector Study Group 3 is the only one which addresses economic issues and policy issues as well. We don't know where there might be duplication with Study Group 17. And with regards the development sector, we participate in the activities in this, and we understand that within the mandate of the Study Groups in the development sector, there are no questions which address economic impact issues. For these reasons, we would like to retain this text with regards to Study Group 3 within this resolution so that the standardization sector addresses this question, but also to support the work of the D sector in this sphere. We think that this would find the spirit of collaboration between the sectors of ITU. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In response to the previous spokesperson, I note that ITU-D Study Group question 3 does work on spam specifically concerning the economic impact for the end users. We are in a situation where we have just heard from com 2 that we

are already three million Swiss francs into new promises, we have to I think take a strong stance around work duplication and recognize that there is clearly no consensus on any further work on this in other Study Group, and strike this text and move on. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. I would have loved to, but I need to hear from all of you. Kenya.

>> KENYA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If you recall, we just passed a resolution on consumer protection. Spam is a major menace on most of our customers in developing countries. Mr. Chairman, the word duplication has been used here technically but we know for sure there is no other place where economic and policy issues in relation to international telecommunications and other aspects of international telecommunications is studied except in Study Group 3. Mr. Chairman, therefore, we would have wished that we retained the text in yellow with the removal of the word, continue. But with the proposal from Mr. Bigi that seems to be of good compromise, we would go with that, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Kenya. I would like to close the list. I have four more requests for the floor. I would like to close the list there. I cannot close the list because I see additional requests. I would like

now to maybe make it another way. I see that we still have this Ping-Pong game. I see that the subject is not the text itself. I understand that the question is whether SG 3 or any other Study Group should be involved in any activity or works related to spam.

This is my understanding. I have here six requests for the floor. Either we continue debating and I almost expect the position of all who have requested the floor, and we probably don't add anything else to the debate, or you withdraw your request and you allow me to make a proposal and go forward. We really, we are really spending much time about this subject, whether we consider it is a key one and we spend the rest of the meeting on it, or we move forward. I still see some requests from the floor. I would ask them to withdraw.

Some withdraw, others still not. I see only one request from the floor. I'm waiting until this request for the floor withdraws. Please. I won't tell who is requesting for the floor. But please withdraw. Thank you for withdrawing.

What I propose, I see no consensus at all on this subject. So, I would go forward, removing the whole text the word proposals and keep it as it is because I see no consensus on that. Thank you for that.

(sound of gavel).

Let's move on the next item, and I would like you to maybe to come back to the good spirit that we had at the end of previous session, and look for a compromise. I didn't see any wish of compromise on this subject. So next item, I see Jordan requesting the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair and I thank you for your ruling on this. But you are giving a signal to the floor that when we come to discuss other issues, and we will not be able to reach consensus, you are going to be ruling on the same way, you will delete any text, you even find that there are some country supports, there are countries that do not support. I hope this won't be a signal to the floor when we discuss the remaining.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. I will give the floor to Ghana and tell you what is the signal I will have or I try to convey to the floor. Ghana, please.

>> Thank you very much, I speak as com 4 Chair, and sorry for this inconvenience of not dealing with this thoroughly and bringing it to you. But to appeal to you and to, again, go to the proposal of Mr. Fabio Bigi, the Chair of Working Group 4A, what we have in this resolution is that Study Group 17 is taking leadership on combating spam, so it's even reporting



to TSAG on the progress of this resolution. If you look at further instructs 2, it goes on to the last sentence saying spam policy regulatory and economic issues. And here if you take off the entire text without involving any other Study Groups which deal with aspects of this mandate of combating spam, let's note that combating spam cannot be a one Study Group item. It has to be collaborative. Here I see the lead Study Group on policy and economic issues missing in the equation. Not necessarily that their name could be mentioned but I think that the text as proposed by Mr. Bigi completed this further instructs comprehensively.

Thank you very much. This will be my comment, even though you have ruled on it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Kwame. Zimbabwe.

>> Yes, we support this, Mr. Kwame's position. We wonder if it's wise to continue where there is no consensus, we maintain the status quo, which disadvantages developing countries. Is there no other way of proceeding, rather than, we maintain the status quo because it's working in their favor, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Zimbabwe. South Africa.

>> Thank you very much, honorable Chairperson. I think, you know, we have been working here in the spirit

of compromise. We do know the rules and regulations of this union. But because we want to really have a cordial meeting, we have been trying to meet each other halfway. But we are not getting that sense. We get the sense like Zimbabwe and the Chair said that somehow the position of consensus is not being fairly utilized, and I think that we need to sit back and do know that there are other provisions that we can use to actually get exactly where we want to go. But we want to make sure that all of us receive the due consideration, and I think we should operate from that rather than operating from a sense of, if there is no consensus, then we just go back to the text, because we made this proposal because they are important, and we feel that they need that due consideration rather than being viewed as from the standpoint we don't agree so let's go back to the status quo. That is not what we came for. We tried to articulate as much as we can and try to get this room to have a sense that as developing countries we have major concerns that we want addressed, and we are trying to open a dialogue here, so that we understand each other properly.

I think as the Chair said, you know, com 4, I think he actually articulated this very well, in terms of what it is that we want to get out of this conference, what

it is that every other country comes here to get in terms of getting recognized in terms of the challenges that they face, and would like to proceed with that good spirit in mind. Thank you very much, Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, South Africa. I still have three requests from the floor. I appeal to you again that you withdraw. I will try to answer and to explain my decision, which is already taken. This is why I would like you to withdraw, if it is on this subject. First, we have had time to discuss during the days before and that was in order to reach compromise in the committees and the ad hocs session. I see today that there was no compromise. If you have spent it, spent all this time without reaching compromise in my opinion it will be hard to reach it in the plenary with the limited time we have.

As for my decision and the position of the question of Jordan, the only message I would like to convey, that we need to come close to a compromise in order to allow me to propose a decision that will probably be a consensus based. When I see there is no possibility of consensus, because we have almost very far positions and a kind of balanced position for and against, I see that there is no change and that is why I took this decision, and

the message is that I will see for each question for each item, I will make my mind about the balance we have, about the position we have, and my decision will be according to that. There is no specific message other than this one, that I want to convey.

Now I ask the two remaining members states, the one remaining Member State to withdraw. Thank you for it. And let us move on. I would propose before moving on, that the consideration I have heard regarding the importance of this issue of spam and the economic aspects of the spam, I would propose that I include in my summary report a remark on this subject. Thank you for that.

Now let's move on a more maybe probably, more complicated and more hot topics. Now the next item on the agenda is the draft new resolution on counterfeit. I have here the text of the new resolutions, and I would ask the convener, Mr. Isaac Whiting to give us the status, that will be the Chairman of com 4 will give us the status of this draft proposal new resolution. Ghana, please.

>>Thank you, Chair. We had proposals for this draft new resolution, yet members accepted to waive their rights to present them and they went into an ad hoc, they went into a new formal session and later they sapped to go to a drafting session.

>> CHAIR: Sorry to interrupt you, Kwame. I made a mistake. On the agenda the next item is not, sorry, Kwame, on the agenda the next item is not the resolution counterfeit but the resolution on strengthening the role in ensuring data privacy and trust in ICT infrastructure. Sorry, Kwame. This is based on, maybe you can continue proposing something. Let me see this proposal was proposed by Arab group, it was presented briefly in the ad hoc group. But there was not enough time to discuss it in fully in com 4. Therefore, this is why it has come to the plenary.

>> That is the case, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Kwame. I open the floor for comments.

UK, please.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would like to thank the Arab group for introducing a resolution on privacy which we regard as a important subject. WTSA 16 has made a major step forward in its consideration of this very sensitive issue, after many hours of patient negotiation we agreed compromise text as a footnote to resolution 2. We believe that the footnote represents a significant advance in the clarity of privacy related work in telecommunications standardization which is the

principle activity of ITU-T.

We believe that a new resolution would result in a lack of clarity on the issue of privacy due to the risk of confusion between the resolution and the footnote and the difficulty of interpreting two different texts on the same subject. We also have concerns regarding the impact of a resolution on the remit of ITU-T in a very sensitive area. We believe that the footnote on its own provides adequate and clear guidance to ITU-T. We believe that a new resolution is both unnecessary and undesirable. We therefore oppose the new resolution and at a earlier drafting group we asked for the entire text to be placed in brackets. That remains the position of the UK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UK. I see no other requests for the floor. I see them now. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. The Arab countries presented this draft resolution given the importance of this issue in particular with regards to OTT and the issue of trust and privacy. These are issues which really call for highlighting their importance. Chairman, when we study this draft resolution, it only asks to highlight the priority of these issues and their importance.

We are really surprised to see that some delegations are opposed to this. Therefore, we ask that the drafting resolution which we had prepared is discussed and we are ready to accept some of the amendments which have been put forward on the draft text.

In fact, Chairman, we have really undertaken great efforts on this text and we are ready to collaborate and cooperate with others in order to improve the text as it stands. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia for your proposal to discuss the text. Mexico.

>> MEXICO: Thank you very much, Chairman. With regards to this proposal, we would like to thank all of the efforts undertaken by people with regards to this text, but as we have already expressed previously, not only Mexico but also as CITELE, we think that it's not necessary to have a new resolution with regards to data privacy.

I'd like to point out all the arguments which we have put forward in order so that we can find some solution with regards to this draft resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mexico. I understand that you could still look for some solution with regard to the proposed resolution, this is what I understood. Am I

right? Mexico?

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chairman. As you mentioned to us, we need to find a way forward to address this, but nevertheless the position of CITELE is that we do not need any resolution with regards to data privacy. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mexico. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will not repeat an interventions supporting the importance of that, of that in our view very important topic. We think to stress the, highlight the importance of privacy and trust in ICT is not only important for administrations. I think it is also important to companies. Companies in our views should also understand that the trust and the protection of the privacy of the users could actually be potentially more valuable to them on the long term, because gaining that trust would actually promote and develop their business.

So, this is a message that we highlight and we have stated that previously in other venues and we think this is a very important angle to be handled. We support that new resolution, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Finland.

>> Finland fully supports the views expressed by



the United Kingdom. This draft new resolution is not needed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for being brief, Finland.  
Jordan.

>> Jordan: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We support this resolution, and to respond to the concern of UK regarding the footnote, just to mention that this footnote has been considered as well in this resolution. So the footnote on the privacy has been inserted in the text of this resolution, to remove any concern from other colleagues on the meaning and the use of the word privacy. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. We support the CITELE position, and also join with the comments of the United Kingdom and others that we cannot support this new resolution. We had extensive discussions over the weekend. We came to this Assembly with a proposal that would strike privacy from the mandate of Study Group 20, and we negotiated a footnote instead, and it was as far as we could go on this issue. We don't believe it's appropriate to have a new resolution on privacy in the context of this Assembly. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, U.S.

Portugal.

>> PORTUGAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the reasons expressed by my UK colleague CEPT considers that considerable efforts for a compromise has already been developed during this Assembly. Therefore, CEPT is supporting the position also expressed by CITELE. We think that it's not necessary to have a new resolution with regards to data privacy. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Portugal. Zimbabwe.

>> ZIMBABWE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Zimbabwe would like to express appreciation for the draft resolution as submitted by the Arab States. We are fully behind the resolution, and would like also to express the fact that we believe the topic covered here by this resolution is broad, and cannot be fully addressed by a footnote. Thank you very much, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Zimbabwe. We come to a point where I would like to close the list, because we have heard sufficiently the positions. Thank you. I close the list now. And we have -- thank you. Please can I close the list. Thank you. I have Bahrain, Emirates, Australia, Sudan, China, Senegal, South Africa, Rwanda, Kuwait, Russia and Egypt. Thank you. Thank you for

being brief as brief as possible, please. And I have also Sweden. Sorry.

>> Bahrain: No one in this room can deny the fact that privacy is extremely important, especially in light of the innovation and advancement in the field of telecommunication and ICT services. Although developed Member States have privacy issues tackled in various forms, developing members, Member States look up to the ITU to address this matter, and bring together the Member States and Sector Members towards a view that unites the industry. I therefore would like to support this resolution and the importance of its existence. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Bahrain. Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We know it's very late, and we need to move forward. Mr. Chairman, we fully support this resolution, and I do understand the concerns from other colleagues, and this resolution specifically, there is a part in this resolution which refers to ITU-T X .1255 and Dona. I would ask you, Mr. Chairman kindly, that this resolution be discussed under the same when we go to the issue related to DOA, and we don't make any decision now. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. We have here a proposal from Emirates which is to postpone the discussion on this resolution after we tackle the discussion on counterfeit and other resolution, where DOA is involved.

I would like to ask those who have requested the floor to express their opinion about the proposal of Emirates. Thank you. Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. I think we can cover the fact that we do not support the proposal by the UAE because we do not support, we do not see the need for new resolution. So I think that that is kind of fundamental issue that we need to take a decision on. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia. Sudan. Again, please, if you can give your opinion about the proposal of UAE to postpone the debate on this resolution after we have tackled the subsequent point of the agenda. Sudan, please.

>> SUDAN: We would like to support the proposal of the UAE to postpone discussion on this resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sudan. Senegal.

>> SENEGAL: Thank you very much, Chairman. Well, bearing in mind that this issue will be important in

the future we support the proposal of the UAE.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. South Africa.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you very much, honorable Chairperson. Just to be brief we would also like to support the proposal from UAE, and we would like to indicate the fact that we are in full support of this proposal, because we do believe that the protection of consumers is key, and also we believe that the ITU will actually help us as developing countries in establishing best practice, when it comes to this issue and bring more awareness. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, South Africa. Rwanda.

>> Thank you, Chairman. We believe this is a subject of high importance for developing countries and for developed countries as well, and considering that, we believe that we should maintain this one, and continue improving it as we go. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Rwanda. Kuwait.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We do support this new resolution. However, I haven't, we haven't heard from the opponent any proposal on this resolution, and the alternative of discussing the privacy except from colleagues from the United States where they said it's been, it's a mandate of Study Group 20. And we have heard

from the Chair of Study Group 20 saying this resolution is extremely important.

So I'm really lost now. If there is any proposal other than, you know, the not agreeing on this new proposal or at least discussing this proposal, we would like to hear from the opponents on their proposal on this. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Kuwait. Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. We would like to support this new resolution. I'm now speaking on behalf of the RCC countries. We also support the proposal of UAE on continuing discussions on this resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Study Group 20 is not mandated to raise awareness or hold workshops or giving priority at large at this important topics. We support the proposal of UAE, that grounds based on which the opposing proponents that this new resolution is not important because it is redundant or unnecessary, we do not share these views exactly for these particular reasons. This draft new resolution focuses on stressing to give priority to these important topics and we have illustrated why, to raise awareness and to hold workshops

among in cooperation also with other important sectors like the D sector. We see no contradiction here. This is a complementing effort. This is a priority. I plead Mr. Chairman to postpone that until we convince our colleagues with the importance of that and move forward. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. But please, if it is to agree on the proposal of UAE, please let us stop the debate on the substance, and agree on moving it after we would have tackled the coming points on the agenda. Please let's not use our time in continuing debate, while we will postpone it by all means. Now the list, I have five interventions required, I would like to close it, and please let's consider the proposal of UAE to postpone the debate until we go through the other coming topics. And then we come on this privacy proposal. Please, please, I would like to close this list. And just to have your opinion on whether we postpone the debate or we spend the full evening on it. So please, Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We would oppose postponing, and we would ask you to actually discuss the individual issues on their merits. As we have been discussing, there is no way to address this as a package. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sweden. Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you. We don't see any rationale for postponing a decision on this topic.

>> CHAIR: United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. We are of the same opinion as Sweden and Canada. As one of the delegates that spent all night on Saturday discussing this resolution, although the discussion is not reflected in this text for some reason, I'm not sure why, there were many modifications that were proposed, many brackets, some possible agreements, when we spoke that night, when we spoke that night we even talked a bit about how the, for the United States it might be possible to accommodate some of the views in this resolution through a different vehicle. That request was not accepted by our colleagues. We feel that we have been trying very very hard to find a way short of a resolution which we do not support, and so we do not think that further discussion is needed. For us, we do not believe, we do not support the new, a new privacy resolution. We are of the same view as our colleagues from CITELE that there is not sufficient time to discuss right now, and therefore, we do not believe we should postpone. We do not think that postponing will change



our decision in any way. And do not, and view the issues as much broader than the DOA issue. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, U.S.

United Kingdom.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to support the comments of Sweden. We would like this to be taken without a delay and to be taken on its merits rather than as any kind of package. We would also note the extensive work that the D sector does on some of the related concepts. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UK. Jordan.

>> Jordan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to support postponing discussion on this matter. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan. I remind to, dear colleagues, dear delegates, that I have proposed to close the list, so please those who have requested the floor after I have closed the list, please withdraw your request. Otherwise we will not finish on this subject this evening. Please, those who have requested the floor, thank you. Germany.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We also think that it wouldn't help to postpone. We would like to have it now. Thank you.

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

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The themes with regard to privacy and trust are not concerned with one SG exclusively as some of the speakers have said previously. These are interrelated subjects, in many ways. And therefore, they are highly important. And it is highly important to discuss them at the level of the ITU as a whole.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, we would like to support the proposition of the UAE with regard to postponing discussion to a later time. Thank you.

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

>> PORTUGAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to refer that CEPT does not support the postponing decision. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Portugal. China.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Chair. We are of the view that ITU has already organized many workshops to talk about privacy and trust related issues. At GSS last week, we also talked about these related issues. With regard to our industry, many experts have already expressed that privacy and trust are very important directions for studying the future. We believe these topics for ITU represent great opportunities. Therefore, China still

suggests that we should retain these resolutions. I thank you. And also, with regard to our divergent opinions at this stage we should respect each other and understand each other, continue our discussion, and hopefully we can reach a solution that can be acceptable to both sides. I thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China. So I have heard the proposal of the, I haven't seen any consensus on the resolution itself, but I have heard the proposal of UAE, proposing that we postpone the further debate or decision regarding this proposed draft new resolution after item 11. I have heard views pro and views cons. I just want to remind to you Distinguished Delegates that the arguments I have heard make sense let us say from both sides. I would like to give a chance to this subject to be considered maybe in different way you are considering it today, or at this moment, either totally against or totally for. This is why my opinion or my proposal would be to postpone this decision until we have tackled the agenda until number 11.

This would be my proposal. I would appeal you to accept this proposal so that we go forward, and then we will have to decide on this resolution later on.

United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chairman. As we stated earlier, we would like to consider this matter now. If we don't consider this matter now, we find it inappropriate to package it with other resolutions on DOA that have been discussed and previously identified together. At this late date, we need to keep this a separate issue. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Egypt requesting the floor.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And we appreciate and respect your ruling to go forward and we are more than happy to open further discussions to reach to a consolidated decision which would bring consensus between all the parties. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. South Africa. Sorry.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, Chairman. It's not South Africa, it's the Central African Republic.

Thank you.

I fully support your position. This will allow us to have more flexibility and then make progress in the debate.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Central Africa. I still have much request for the floor. I would like again to propose that we postpone this decision after item 11. And I would

like the request for the floor to withdraw. Again, my proposal, and I appeal to you in order that we can move forward, otherwise we will spend all the meetings on this subject. Please, Canada, Portugal and Australia, please withdraw your request for the floor. I would like to go forward to move on next item, and then we will come to this item later on. Please. Canada, Portugal and Australia. Thank you. No? Thank you. At least one of you. No. Okay. Gentlemen, I think we need a break by all means. I have a proposal to postpone the final debate and decision on this issue. And I see that there is no cooperation, in this sense. I see that we cannot reach any consensus, if we continue this way.

I have been making a soft proposal which is only to postpone the decision on this issue. I'm not proposing any packaging or anything else. I'm willing to find a way out and appropriate decision for all the items that we have ahead of us, and I see even for let us say soft proposals, I see again the opposition on that.

Of course, it's your rights. But please, help me, help us to move on. We will take decision on this resolutions, but please cooperate with me in order that we reach decision on all the items ahead of us. I appeal on you and would like to thank you if you would draw

your request for the floor, and that we move on to the next item. Please. I see Canada, Australia requesting for the floor. Please, Canada, Australia. So I see Canada, Australia, still requesting for the floor. I give the floor to Canada. Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I apologize for not being able to acquiesce to your demands. Nonetheless, this topic has been discussed over and over, you have been given the background on the compromises that were made. We haven't reached an agreement. We have shared with you the great number of countries that we don't see a path to an agreement on this. This is a very sensitive topic, with national responsibilities and legislation, whenever the ITU-T tries to expand its scope, it is a very sensitive topic and it needs to be dealt with accordingly. All the things that have been said on this topic, there is no agreement to be reached. We see no reason to postpone this decision, without putting the outcome of the entire meeting in question. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Just briefly, Chair, to associate with the comments from our colleagues from Canada.

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

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would like to support your proposal to postpone discussion. We have showed as an Arab group great flexibility with regard to this resolution, and we think that postponing discussion could help us to reach an agreement with regard to this resolution, especially if we take into account the footnote. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. United Kingdom.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chair. We remain with our position that we think these issues, this agenda item should be handled on their merits and not postponed. That is the view that was expressed a few moments ago by my colleague from Portugal on behalf of CEPT. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom. We are coming to a point where we cannot move like this. What I would propose now is to have a break, a coffee break or tea break or whatever, but we need a break to make my mind more clear, and then we can move forward after that. I suggest now that we have a break, and we come in 15 minutes, it's okay? In 15 minutes to come on this subject. Thank you.

(break).

(standing by).

>> Ladies and gentlemen, ladies and gentlemen, may I have your attention, please. We are resuming the plenary. If you can regain your seats, please. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Welcome again, ladies and gentlemen. We were on a very hot topic, which is related to privacy, and as I suggested I would like to move on to the next item and to postpone the decision on this item.

So, we have another very hot topic, which is related to the DOA, but we will address it through the first proposal of new resolution, related to counterfeit. I won't go into details regarding the major issue which is DOA. I would like to give the floor to Isaac Beutang, who ... (pause).

To raise the open issues in this counterfeit resolution, from Ghana, please, you have the floor.

>> Thank you, Chairman, for the opportunity to present to you the outcomes of I will say the informal consultation that was also turned into drafting session as far as this subject is concerned. Mr. Chairman, due to the lack of time, and the fact that there were many parallel issues or meetings which was organized during this Assembly, we had a lot of challenges with the conclusion of the work that was given to us to do, but



we believe that as we have this opportunity during this plenary some of these issues have been forwarded for you to resolve it as for us.

The first issue as well as the subject and content of the draft new resolution contents of it is concerned is on the title. We did not discuss the title at all. As a matter of fact, in fact we received four proposals from the regions, from Africa, from the Arab and also from RCC and the CITEEL group. But with this, what I will propose is that if the Assembly will agree with me, we should go by the title first, after that say that ITU-T studies for combating counterfeit telecommunication ICT devices. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pause here for you to address this issue before I proceed.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you, Mr. Boetang.

I now open the floor for discussion regarding this item. The first item is about the title, and similar proposal that have been received but not discussed. So we have here four proposals, the initial one and three counterproposals.

So, if there is no comment, I would proceed with the initial proposal, which is ITU-T studies for combating counterfeit telecommunication ICT devices. I see no comment from the floor.

So we can go on with this title. The second one is related to mobile equipment identity, international mobile equipment identity. I see Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. Question for clarification, about the title. Can you scroll up, please? The three choices provided include the word or the ICT acronym, I don't believe ICT could be in the title without spell out but perhaps Secretariat can confirm that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. We have just considered this subject a few hours ago. ICT was replaced by information and communication technologies, so I would propose to do the same here.

Thank you. Let's move on. Next item. Isaac, can you please present it?

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The next item is recognizing further A, Mr. Chairman, here requested to remove the references to IMEI as this was not supported at the drafting group, so Mr. Chairman, I would like to propose that we remove the square bracket and keep the text which is also in accordance with the plenipot resolution on the same topic.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. This is the proposal. We remove the square bracket, as it is the same reference

considered in PP resolution, 199. Thank you. Next item,  
is --

>> Issue is actually related to Study Group 20,  
and I believe that as there is a resolve as far as the  
issues of Study Group 20 mandate is concerned, I also  
propose that we remove the square bracket, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Isaac. I see request for the  
floor from United Kingdom. UK, please.

>> UK: Thank you, Chair. Just a editorial, the  
wording of the second part of the phrase, and the potential  
raise of the importance of IoT devices doesn't make sense  
in English. I think what is meant is the increasing,  
well, I've forgotten the text now. Let me read again.  
And the increasing importance of IoT devices to society.  
Instead of the potential raise of, the increasing  
importance. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UK. You know, most of them,  
most of us who are not natively English speakers, so  
we will listen to you in this substance. Thank you, UK.

United States. Another native English speaking  
also.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chairman.  
I just wanted to go back to the recognizing further.  
I assume that everything between, after recognizing

further A, is all in square brackets, based on the other discussions we have been having. But I wanted to confirm through you. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. This is the point we will come back to later, I suppose. Now I propose that we proceed with the proposal made by UK on this editorial point. Next, Isaac, the floor is yours again.

>> Thank you, Chairman. I think the last point is as you may know the sensitive one on the DOA. Mr. Chairman, it can be found in recognizing B, further recognizing C, further recognizing F, and second recognizing C. Instruct the TSB Director 6, instructs Study Group 11, 3, 5 and 8. Mr. Chairman, most of these paragraphs have been removed as they were harmonized from the various proposals received as during the drafting group. The participants decided not to discuss this issue as a result of the sensitive nature of it during the drafting session. However, there is a opportunity to discuss even if can, at the com 4 level, but we didn't have time to do that. I'd like to submit it to you for your consideration.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for this additional hot potato you are sending to me. Now we have this hot potatoes and we would like to hear from you on this subject of the DOA, in order there have been much discussion on

this subject, either during ad hocs or during the committees, and also informal discussion. I hope that today during this session, we can have comprehensive debate and useful to go forward.

So I would like to hear from you on this subject. I have no request for the floor. That means -- United States, requesting for the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. As you are well aware and colleagues are well aware, we don't think it's appropriate to refer to the digital optic architecture in resolutions in the outcome of this Assembly. This particular technology is a particular technology, rather than a general category of technologies. I find that in this resolution and in many others, it points to a direction that favors its use in this context, whether it be on counterfeit or whether it be on Cybersecurity, everywhere it has appeared, it has appeared in order to give it a privileged position.

For that reason, we can't support this, Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, U.S.

I see Germany.

>> GERMANY: Chairman, it's a policy statement of

the United States very strongly, we do think time is right to strive directly to a certain scheme for identity management and counterfeit identifying, so I think we should delete that part and we can go ahead with the recommendation. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Australia for similar reasons to those expressed by the U.S. also don't agree with the way that Dona and the Dona Foundation are included in this draft resolution. We think that it's very unusual, I think, to be putting so much focus on a particular application when there are many others available in the market. We think it is sending quite a strange message about the ITU and its work to Sector Members and potential Sector Members. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia. Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Along with the people that preceded me, we are also concerned about specific references to technology, architecture or commercial products. We think it's extremely important that as a unbiased standardization organisation, we stay away from these references in our work. Thank you.

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

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, we have been debating this aspect during the past two weeks. We have been hearing a lot of arguments, and we have responded to many of them, and we have hearing many of our colleague' arguments, I mean answer all they raise questions. I think Mr. Chairman, we have to take into account the position that was taken by the Council 2016 when decide that the D.O.A.s is a, technical aspect of DOA is a matter for Study Group. And that the Council so decided that the memorandum of understanding between ITU and the Dona Foundation shall continue.

Mr. Chairman, I think one has to distinguish between the architecture as an architecture and the implementation of this architecture. The DOA is considered as an open architecture, that can accommodate many technologies. In fact, Mr. technology, in fact, Mr. Chairman, that the ... (chuckles).

The argument that the ITU should be a technology neutral is not requirement in the standards of ITU. I mean we have given an examples that the standards are technology oriented. And we have also given example for example the G.fast which was approved by Study Group 15, H .264, which was approved by Study Group 16, and also the NGN.

I think, Mr. Chairman, in order to move forward, we have to hear the arguments and try to find the answer for each one in order to move forward.

This is a debate must be stopped and we have to respond to each one.

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

>> MEXICO: Thank you, Chairman. This time I'm speaking on behalf of Mexico. We would like to join those other delegations who made comments in particular we would like to indicate our concern on including specifically issues which could be addressed, and which are certainly addressed by the T sector of the ITU in a general way. We have to analyze what the best options are that we have in order to be able to develop our telecommunications in each one of our countries, and of course in regions and on a global level.

But, this very objective can be achieved when we talk in general terms and expressing in general terms the need to analyze various technologies and not emphasizing one specific technology like DOA. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.



We were speaking earlier about the matter of compromise, and I want to say that in many occasions, in the lower level groups and drafting groups and in Working Groups and even at the Committee level, we consented to giving up some of our proposals. We gave up our proposal with respect to critical infrastructure, on resolution 54, regional groups, on the abolishment of Study Group 9, on removing privacy and trust in the Study Group 20 mandate, on suppressing a number of resolutions, our no change proposals, our proposal for resolution 1 to work by consensus. And we accepted proposals from others like the OTT text we adopted earlier, text on IoT identification, text on new resolution on ITRs, the five Study Group recommendations.

We didn't send any square brackets up to your plenary, with proposals that we made. We handled them all at a lower level, and we are under a great deal of stress, all of us here, trying to deal with all of these issues that weren't dealt with at the lower level, and so I think we must be very, very careful as we proceed.

As the Chair of Council this year when we treated this issue, it was quite contentious, and it didn't get decided until the very last day. But I can tell you that the recommendation made by ADM at the Council had to

do with a very specific matter, and that was the digital object architecture and the master framework agreement between the ITU and the Dona Foundation.

We had talked for, I believe it was two Councils, about this MOU, and it was time to come to a conclusion on those discussions.

So the recommendation that Council made had to do with the MOU and confirming that the technical aspects of DOA is a matter for the relevant Study Groups and there was no need for Council to intervene on those matters.

And that neither these studies shall be linked to the general MOU signed with the Dona Foundation. Everything has its context, and this was the context for the Council decision. It was simply about an MOU and the difference between the Council responsibilities and the Study Group responsibilities. I don't believe it's appropriate to place that text in this context. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. South Africa.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you very much for giving me the floor, honorable Chairperson. Chairperson, we find ourselves in great difficulty. I think there is something called a matter of perception when it comes

to viewing issues, and perception is quite important but it varies. For instance, we can have a glass in front of us, and you will ask me my view of it, and I will say it's half empty, and the person next to me will say it's half full.

I think we are actually finding ourselves in that position, because I've listened carefully to the comments from our colleague from the United States, actually expressing the view that, you know, they have considered to a lot of issues but being on the other side, we can also say on those issues we actually have considered even more, that is our view, Chairperson and we can even expand on the list she's given but I won't go into that. The text in front of us is recognizing something which is a fact. The fact is that there is a MOU, we cannot run away from that, which has been signed between the ITU and the Dona Foundation, and the text which is in front of us is actually recognizing that. I haven't heard from the other arguments that actually there is no such MOU, you know, that this is not a reflection of the reality. That goes the same with the recognizing further C, Chairperson, that you know there is that framework agreement between ITU and Dona Foundation, and part of the functions or the deliverables that we are expecting

as Member States from the ITU is to ensure that when we have needs as developing countries, as Member States of the union, those needs are met. And what we are trying to enforce here by this particular resolution and actually proposing the particular text is to enforce those needs. I don't think that in the text there has been anywhere, where it says this is to the exclusion of anything else. I've heard several arguments being put forth that there are so many other technologies, but they are not being cited, what are these technologies. There is no specificity in terms of what it is that those who are counter to this text really want to see. I think Chairperson, if we are to move forward, let's really make a real effort to meet each other halfway, because I don't think that we will go forward if we oppose a text just because we do not want to see a certain concept, which in reality has been embraced by the union. Thank you very much, Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, South Africa. I think we have heard many opinions, and here again we have two sides, two different views. I would like now, I have still some requests for the floor. I would like to close the list now and make a proposal for going forward. So I have the four requests for the floor now. I would like to

close it. This is UK, Egypt, Emirates, Ukraine, Russia and Kenya and the list is closed. Thank you. UK.

>> UK: Thank you, Chair. Just as a preliminary, because of the remarks from South Africa, I think we need to understand that, what the master framework between Dona and ITU is.

And this matter has been considered substantially in Council and in Council Working Group FHR.

It is not an agreement for ITU to promote the work, the services of the Dona Foundation or of DOA. I think that has to be clear. We don't have time to look at the master framework agreement. At the moment, it has been made available to Council and it has been discussed.

I think also, we ought to bear in mind, and I was involved in the discussions on combating counterfeit ICT goods and services and in relation to mobile theft, we shouldn't propose solutions in new resolutions before the matter has been studied.

We shouldn't be proposing particular ways of seeing what the answer is, before we know how to tackle it. We have the advantage of the ITU legal advisor attending the ad hoc group on combating counterfeit and tampered ICT goods and services and he was asked for his legal opinion.

He pointed out that ITU should not prefer or promote particular products or services. Reading this text it seems exactly what that is doing. And it goes against the role as set out by the legal advisor. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UK. I see the major concern of some Member States is the promotion being given, being done for DOA. Egypt.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have come to a particular level of understanding that obviously both parties, I mean Study Group 20 was presented with inputs, which demonstrates the importance of the digital object architecture in a wide range of applications which we think would be very challenging in our near future.

We have also been presented with concerns related to whether that particular technology or architecture belongs to a specific company or specific product, and there have been questions raised whether such technologies or such products as they portray it can actually solve the problems at hand, and there are no proof existing so far that such technologies would work. These in principle are the core issue. These are the two different views.

It has been argued that the whole purpose of

introducing this draft resolutions, is to open a way forward to demonstrate, if you see the different text, the different text refers clearly to invite relevant Study Groups whether to further study on specific angles of the proposed system or proposed technology or proposed architecture. In addition, other requests or other instructs parts, instructed the TSB, for example, to conduct pilots related to also that particular technology, and I would presume the rationale for this is to exactly address the raised concern. When you are promoting and by promotion here I do not mean advertising, I mean when you are proposing, when you are proposing a technology to solve a particular problem, you take it by steps.

So this is point number 1. With reference to the digital object architecture, there is a recommendation, a published recommendation which clearly, it's agreed, it's consented, and it addresses challenges that we are going to face in the world of connected devices and connected things. While we were suffering from counterfeit on the large scale currently on our mobile devices, imagine a world where your car would have potentially unsafe sensors, parking sensors, or sensors which might prohibit or prevent accidents. In that particular angle for example, in that particular

resolution, we needed a technology to address these problems. This is how the DOA and technologies related on that is perceived.

With reference to handle system whether that is a technology or not, this is a legal matter and I will leave that to legal experts with that regard, but with reference to that particular technology it addresses three main features which we haven't seen something similar so far present in the industry which could actually do the same thing. It provides an identity management technology plus service management plus embedded security features. If we can find something similar, it's okay.

So in a nutshell, I say that we understand both parties and we understand both views and I think that we could work together to look for something which might be agreeable to both parties. Thank you, Chair.

>>CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. So I can summarize where we are now. We have, as I said, two different, globally two different opinions, one opinion which is saying that this technology, this architecture is much useful for combating counterfeit which is the main subject, first subject we are tackling, and let us say the environment of ITU doesn't prevent using this technology, considering



this technology's architecture, while on the other position is that I say it again, we can't at ITU make promotion for specific solution or specific technology.

Now, I have four, three more, now, I'm not taking additional requests for the floor. Emirates, please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, as you know that during the head of delegation meeting, TSB Director, he proposed to us text. That text was not a good text for many or it was not accepted, it was not acceptable to us according to many. However, in the spirit of compromise, we agreed to the proposal of the TSB Director. So I would ask, Mr. Chairman, perhaps if you can go back to the TSB Director proposal on the resolution, perhaps with adding some words or amendments, we might, can find a way out. But having this discussion again which was in the Working Groups and also the Committee level, I'm afraid this will take very long time, Mr. Chairman. So this is my proposal, Mr. Chairman. That we go, if everybody agrees to the text proposed by the TSB Director, on this specific point, to see a way forward. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(end of captioning at 10:30 pm)

Services Provided By:  
Caption First, Inc.  
P.O. Box 3066

Monument, CO 80132

800-825-5234

[www.captionfirst.com](http://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.

\*\*\*