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>> CHAIR: Good morning ladies and gentlemen, distinguished guests, welcome back to the second session of Committee 3. We're honored today to be joined by the TSB Director, second from my right and may later be joined by the conference chairman, so we appreciate the support from the officials. Today we have an agenda for our second session which will be held during the second and third quarters of today, we have a full agenda, we will try to get through as much as possible today, I hope we can get through most of the list although that's always dependent on the interventions to see where we go.

The agenda we have for today is posted in ADM document 12 and you will find that the on the screen. So this is a, let me say, stretch goal for the material we would try to get through for today. What we have is catching up on reports of activities in progress and then continuing from where we left off yesterday on the agenda. We had placed later in the agenda coming back to two of the resolutions that we were unable to make progress on yesterday because we were missing the contributors to present the proposals, and hopefully we can come back on those later in the agenda and make progress.

Can I have your approval to take this as the agenda for today? Thank you, I see no requests for the floor. The next item of business is to review the report of yesterday's session. You will find that in document DT15 and that she had now be on the screen in front of you. We will go through it quickly. The report of COM 3 overall will be a C document done at the end but we will make sure we do corrections as we go so let's simply identify anything that needs to be adjusted.

We find in clause 1 of the document, indicating the introduction that I gave yesterday, describing the format of the work, and then the extract of the ADM 4 as the intended agenda. Any comments on clause 1? Okay Resolution 11 is a brief discussion since we had none of the contributors proposing changes present in that session. We deferred that to a later session.

The next is clause 3, Resolution 18. Here we had only the proposal from TSAG and the editorials from TSB and the essential new content here was the provision of an additional mechanism for intersector coordination with the intersector coordination groups as proposed by TSAG and that was agreed and this willy go from here to the plenary for approval.

We are finished with Resolution 18. Discussion of Resolution 22 we tried to get into, we heard from the Arab States, and we decided after that discussion stalled that we should defer the continuation of the discussion to Resolution 22 to a future session.

Moving on to clause 5, Resolution 31, here, again, the only inputs we had were from TSAG and the editorials from TSB. This was easily agreed to and another document completed that will be sent via the editorial committee to the plenary for approval.

Resolution 33 had some proposals, we had some initial discussion and we decided to move further discussion of this to an informal consultation group. We held that consultation discussion this morning and we will prepare a report but since it was just concluded it's not available yet. I'll simply report that we came to agreement concerning how we would deal with the Brazil proposals, we have some adjustments under consideration that people need to go back and check relating to the Arab group proposals and we further noted that there is a resolution in Committee 4 for a review committee that may well have some impact on this resolution so we should probably not close it before then.

It was called to my attention on the break that the new proposed resolution in this committee from Canada may have some affect on this. So I think we have some resolutions under discussion for the two inputs and that's going all of pace but the other thing we will need to take on board as to how that relates to the two other resolutions that I mentioned.

Resolution 35 we had created a drafting group and after I'm done going through this report I will ask Mr. Lee to give a short status of where they are in that and their plans for continuation of the discussion, so they did hold their first session in order to go through these proposals, many of which are similar but not identical. That was what we did as far as Resolution 35.

I was asked, with respect to Resolution 33 to make a small amendment in the introduction of the proposal from the European administration to suppress Resolution 33, so after this was introduced to the meeting by a representative from Finland it received ‑‑ and I was asked to indicate verbal support from the U.K., so the administrations you see listed in this paragraph are those who took the microphone. We know, of course, since this was a regional proposal it came from a collection of Member States and presumably the sources of that proposal all support the proposal even though they didn't take the microphone so simply indicate that that was verbal support from the U.K. in the session. That was the only correction that I had noted to me before the meeting.

That is the report of the first session. Are there any additional corrections that anyone would like us to take on board beyond the one I just mentioned before we accept the report of the first session?

I see no request for the floor so the report of the first session with the noted amendment is approved. So we have a number of other groups that are underway. I introduced the report and I mentioned what was going on with the informal consultation on Resolution 33. We also have the two committees, or working groups, Working Group 3A and 3B which are underway. We will not ask for a detailed report. We will be shortly coming back to a document from Working Group 3A which they have completed but let me ask the Working Group chairman if they have a few words they would like to share, Mr. Dubuisson?

>> MR. DUBUISSON: Thank you, Chairman. Working Group 3A met for the first time yesterday. We made a great deal of progress. Resolution 32 on working methods was reviewed and say submitted to your committee today. We also made a great deal of progress on Recommendation 11, a number of informal consultations have been undertaken, there remain a couple of points to clear up, but it does appear that by ‑‑ that we have found grounds for agreement. Tomorrow morning, which is the third item on our agenda we will be discussing Resolution 1. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Dubuisson. Any questions on the status of Working Group 3A. Iran?

>> IRAN: Mr. Chairman, I didn't ask for the floor, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Okay, if I can ask Mr. Gracie about the progress on Working Group 3B, please.

>> MR. GRACIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Working Group 3B held a meeting yesterday working on the equivalence of all official languages in the union and the second on the clarification of the need to continue with the SCC to address various issues associated with vocabulary. Chairman, we did assign our time slot for the Working Group 3B which was the first time slot this morning to a drafting group to try to make progress on the issue of reviewing resolution 67 with respect to the SCV. That group did meet and a report from that meeting will be able to a future meeting of Committee 3. I do believe that progress has been made and that we look forward to the results of that discussion that took place this morning, so we will report on progress probably at your next meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Gracie. The final activity we charted was a drafting group on Resolution 35 which was under the responsibility of Mr. Lee and I understand some work has been made, could you report the status of that please.

>> MR. LEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Following yesterday meeting drafting session on Resolution 35 has been conducted yesterday first quarter, extended one more hour, we finished our discussion, first discussion at 6:30, a lot of participants, you can find the documents in working document under the COM 3 you can find working documents 1 and 2, some collection of other work and based on this we can make progress, and we review agreement and I want to say main text in annex A and B has been agreed, and that this lunch time for 1:30 to 2:30 in Room E we will meet again hoping to finish rest of part on annex C and also give you the completed text of the Resolution 35 so hopefully this will come to conclusion for this committee end of today. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Lee. Any questions on the progress of this work? Okay, the next item of business is Resolution 32 as mentioned by Mr. Dubuisson. So Working Group 3A has completed one of the three tasks assigned to them and have submitted revised Resolution 32 in DT 12 for our approval. Mr. Dubuisson let me give you the floor to highlight what we should be aware of in this proposal.

>> MR. DUBUISSON: Thank you, Chairman. There are not very many substantive modifications in the body of the resolution. The principles governing the information, encourage participation by meeting with other groups within the sector. I would, therefore, like to make clear that for those French speakers using the French version of document DT12, I should point out that the translation of the second bullet point of instructs is incorrect and I imagine the translators were working very late last night, I don't know if there are any problems in other language but certainly the French version does not reflect what was agreed and what appears in the English version of the document produced by Working Group 3A.

We also noted that it might be useful to inform COM 4, which will be working on Resolution 32004 and in Document 38, Addendum 3, it is proposed that a subparagraph dealing with the issue of remote participation and other e‑working methods that we use the same language in both texts.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Dubuisson. Any questions of clarification on this text? Let me ask one question back to Mr. Dubuisson. You suggested coordination with Committee 4 and was this on the assumption that they would align their text by ‑‑ with our decision or do we need to hold this open until we hear back? Okay, so we can take a decision on this text as it is and we will inform Committee 4 of this so that they can align their results with what we have decided.

Is there agreement ‑‑ can we have agreement to accept the proposal back from Working Group 3A for the revision of Resolution 32 and pass this to the plenary via the editorial committee? Any objection? I see no requests for the floor so that's agreed. Thank you.

We can move now to the next in our agenda which is Resolution 38. We have two proposals but, in fact, the TSB editorial proposal in 29, if I read correctly, does seem to be fully included in the text proposal 38, addendum 13. Do we have someone to present that proposal for us, please? Yes, Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you were saying, this proposal, regarding Resolution 38 also includes the proposed modifications from the standardization bureau. What we have thought to do is update the Resolution, which was approved in Johannesburg with a view to better harmonizing and providing better work between the three bureaus bearing in mind their usefulness in the developing countries. I don't wish to speak at great length but we have concluded to considering some resolutions which have been approved in the same area both by the BR and by the development sector in Hyderabad and under resolves, we have indicate that we need to pursue the effective communication between IUT, R&D to harmonize the road maps of the three sectors. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, very much. It has been called to my attention that there is one amendment that she had probably be made concerning the responsibility of our sector vis‑a‑vis the other sectors and that is perhaps in two occasions where the proposed text talks about allocation of spectrum, instead it should be talking about identification of spectrum. If that's okay for everybody, if we could consider perhaps paragraph by paragraph this proposal, in light of those two updates, that would save a little bit of time.

Let's start from considering, the first proposal strike out "considering" any opposition to that proposal? Okay then a few edits in what had been considering C were now renumbered B. It's not future development of IMT but current text, seems straightforward and study group 5, of course, since study group 8 no longer exists. Then new considering C. Still no request for the floor, let's move on down to the next, considering E? We were just reminded we should remember wherever it says "allocation of spectrum" it should read it as if it says "identification of spectrum" so updates to considering E? Okay, considering F? I think we're down to F, right? Okay considering G? Okay, H? I? And J?

Okay, moving down to "noting" so we have a newly inserted but then simply renumbering Resolution 59 of Hyderabad in noting B, new item. And then what becomes renumbered F updates to ITU‑R, taking into account the latest radio assembly.

Then I think we're done because, in fact, there is no change at all to the resolves, so the meaning of the resolution is exactly the same. Since we have agreement to that in the amendment in two cases changing "allocation of spectrum" to "identification of spectrum" do we have agreement to this Resolution 38? Yes, Cuba, please.

>> CUBA: Thank you, Chairman. I would like to clarify two points. I don't know whether under subparagraph E of "considering" we refer to the radio assembly. I think, rather, we should specify which radio assembly we are referring to, are we talking about 2012? We should specify which year the radio assembly we were referring to was held in. And this may be a translation problem, in subparagraph of noting ‑‑ no, I apologize, sorry, subparagraph H of considering, which refers to Resolution 43 revised in 2010 of the World Telecommunication Conference, we are not clear whether it's Resolution 43 of Hyderabad of the WTC? Subparagraph H, when reference is made Resolution 43 it is not clear whether it is from the Development Conference or the Telecommunication Conference. I would like that clarified and it may be a problem of interpretation, the interpreter notes there is not a problem in the English document.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Cuba for that intervention and indeed I think the second point may be a problem of translation because as though of us who are looking at the English version on the screen, it does say Resolution 43 rev Hyderabad, 2010, WTC, and I think that's clear in English, so I hope we can check the Spanish translation but I believe that's clear in English and if anyone disagrees I invite you to ask for the floor. If we go up to the earlier point, 2012 may indeed be the correct reference but let me ask Argentina or other countries ‑‑ okay, we can add, Mr. Jones as typed in the black text here with the question mark, we will remove the question mark and make the additional amendment to clarify that was from the radio assembly of 2012. With that amendment in addition to the two occurrences of identification of spectrum, can we accept this as modifications to Resolution 38 ready to approve by the committee and send via the editorial committee to the plenary? Okay I see no requests for the floor so that's agreed.

Next we will move on to Resolution 43, and given the nature of this, these are all slightly differing proposed amendments to the list of areas for potential coordination, so what we have done, and you'll find it posted as a working document of COM 3 on the web site and shortly Mr. Jones will get it up on the screen, we do have a compilation of those, and we can simply go through the list and one by one see if there is agreement or not to add a particular item to the list. Let me find a working document number. Just a moment.

For those of you following along on the computers if you go to working document 6, that's where you will find this compilation of proposals, under COM 3. Okay, as I mentioned, the existing resolution has some text, bearing in mind and then a list of important high‑priority areas. We already have in the list next generation networks. There are two proposals, one from the Arab group and one from Korea about trying to capture future networks, which is the current activity underway in Study Group 13. Simple from my own examination, the way the future networks is phrased it seems more a parallel of what is in the way next generation networks is phrased but I'm happy to hear other opinions from the floor, could we agree to how we identify future networks from this list? My chairman's leaning is toward the Arab phrasing, but I'm welcome to hear other opinions from the floor. United States, please. Congo, please?

>> This is Korea. We propose to add rather than ‑‑ we propose evolution.

>> CHAIR: I'm sorry, one opinion in terms of evolution and future networks and perhaps we could accept the bracket FN, would that work for everyone? Merge the two proposals? Mr. Dubuisson, please?

>> MR. DUBUISSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wondered whether we really need to keep the term "NGN" particularly after Korea's statement. If we are to keep NGN for the second proposal from an editorial point of view, we should remove all the capital letters, the beginning of these phrases, because that seems to indicate that they are a brand, and they are not proper nouns but simple nouns.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I certainly think that's something that would be taken on board through the normal activity of the editorial committee, but just as next generation networks is not capitalized, I would expect future networks is not capitalized either, by the time that editorial occurs for the reasons you mentioned.

Neither of the proposals indicated removal of NGN. I guess these names should remind us when we are coming up with new names for things that we should think how they age over time so when this becomes the previous generation's network it's maybe not the write word, but that would be a different proposal to, perhaps, say future networks and evolution and replace NGN, would be a different way we could deal with this.

I hesitate to take too many proposals other than saying yes or no to the proposed edition but let me take that one exception whether we should make that a replacement rather than an addition. Emirates, please?

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman. Where this proposal is concerned, I would like to recall one point, and that is that each administration be allowed to make its presentation individually and then we look at the compilation. That is the usual practice, that is to make the presentations individually and each of the administrations originating these proposals should have been given the floor. However, since we have started discussion of the working document, so be it.

We are willing to continue to discuss this working document. So to return to Korea's proposal, we would second that proposal. That is that the evolution of future networks and next generation networks or future networks. We don't believe it is necessary to delete the phrase any "next generation networks" since we don't need the capital letter identifying in brackets after all we can delete since we have the future phrase and then next generation networks afterwards. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I certainly didn't mean to prevent anyone from being able to present but considering that in this case all of the proposals were adding things to a single list, it seemed like we might be able to save a little bit of time by simply honing in on the words that we wanted to use on the list so I appreciate your indulgence in this particular case.

Let me propose with your intervention, since we had no proposal to delete next generation networks, we will accept the Korea proposal with the adjustment of capitalization and if that's normal practice and I will see if Mr. Lee will nod to put it "FN" as an abbreviation for future networks, should we put that in brackets? If we can be consistent, is "FN" a well understood abbreviation in Study Group 13?

>> MR. LEE: We use "FN" for future networks and in my view because this is resolution we can use future networks without capitals, it's much better because we are looking for the future we need a more flexible base not to date ourselves. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Then we will leave it as proposed by Korea with the adjustment of the capitalization. The next proposal to take on board is whether under security which currently has in brackets "including cyber security" Arab proposal combatting and encountering spam. Is there any objection or discussion on including that in the coordination issues? Seeing no requests from the floor that item is accepted. Oh, United States?

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. Sorry to take you back but perhaps I missed ‑‑ the purpose of the document on the list is to effectively list the items that need to be coordinated across the study groups in TSAG. I'm just concerned that we have a list here that's going to start getting ‑‑ a long list of issues, but in any case, the issue on encountering and combatting spam, I would need to check with my expert who is not in the room right now so can we hold off on accept this gone issue? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, let's see if there are others we can close so we will hold that in abeyance based on your feedback. I realize it's a long list and a growing list, and I think that what probably prompted many of these contributions was the fact that there were certain issues called out and others that were perhaps equally as important that were not. So if we're going to have this list at all, the feeling that some of these should be present. It doesn't change the meaning because there is a preceding phrase "high priority standardization issues including" but we do, in fact, have these several proposals for adjusting the list.

So we should consider whether we want to make these additions. The next proposal, "disaster relief" is perhaps too broad and "disaster relief systems in preparedness and recovery" any concern as adding that for coordination? Mr. Dubuisson?

>> MR. DUBUISSON: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, I support your proposal, in other words, I support the idea of removing the acronym. I don't think this is a commonly used acronym in the sector anyway. It's an acronym that was used for the focus group for a certain period of time but that was a time‑bound group so I think we should accept this is time‑bound use of the acronym and I don't think we should put it on a permanent footing.

I would note in Resolution 2 we have a number of terms or expressions used where we talk about the elite study group, and I think we have to be sure that all of this is consistent. At some point we're going to have to check. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, and indeed that was one thing that I wondered. I think TSAG doesn't give up its coordination responsibility but, in fact, we do delegate some of this coordination to particular lead study groups for particular topics, so unless something is escalated to TSAG the normal work‑a‑day coordination we would expect to happen where there is a lead study group identified for these topics and rather than for everything to come to TSAG. So I didn't hear any objection other than agreement to remove the acronyms for the proposed modification to item C. So let's move on. I think we have two that other than the capitalization, which should not be there are identical, smart grid and home networking, so the additional existing home network item. United States, please?

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. I guess I'm going to repeat what I said before. U.S. has concerns with this approach. We're not sure why telecommunications item C ‑‑ deleting telecommunications changes the mean and go we don't support that deletion. Also, I have to caution we're not sure that this is the right approach in listing the items for coordination. It seems to give a priority for certain issues in the study groups and that is not the intention I know, so I will have to say that I'm not sure that I can clear on any of this list at all. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you for that. So I think ‑‑ let me propose that we quickly go through the list and if there are things that we can agree to delete or can agree on one formulation where there are two, the ‑‑ we could shorten the list but it does sound as though we are going to need to revisit this and if necessary assign it to a drafting or break‑out group.

I think let's finish going through the list just with the view to any obvious deletions or consolidations, if that's okay. Finland, please?

>> FINLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Full Al low I had one question for clarification concerning this point P on "security."

There is addition, proposed addition saying countering and ‑‑ spam but I think cyber security is broad enough to cover these aspects so I don't see any need, why we would add these two word and I fully agree with what was said by USA that we are coming to the problems if we add these items because it is endless list of items and we ‑‑ they always cause confusion if we add something and not add something else. I would prefer not to add this list or perhaps we would not need the list at all, we could leave it to decide highest priorities. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Emirates, please?

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you Chairman. As you know, in this section bearing in mind we are dealing with the coordination of standardized activities and it is clear that we are referring to high‑priority standardization issues, issues for which standardization is important. We are talking here about high‑priority standardization issues and NGN and security and so on are top priorities but you always have to be ready to update your priorities. We all agree that these are priority subjects for everyone and they're particularly important for developing countries. This brings me to a question about our procedure. I thought that we all agreed on B. Now the representative of the United States said that she was going to consult with capital on this or consult with her head of delegation but we have, in fact, already dealt with a number of items on the list. We have already dealt with A and B and I don't understand why we're going back to B again this is a procedural question. Could you explain how you are proceeding here, Chairman? Are we going through the list one by one? Are we going to examine everything on the list? Is that what we are going to do? Or are we going to take a different approach? Could you just please explain the procedure that you are following here, Chairman?

>> CHAIR: The intent I had when I started into this list would be that we would choose from among some candidate new items to add to the list. That was my expectation of the direction of the discussion. Now, the discussion doesn't always go in the direction anticipated by the Chairman. I can appreciate as this list grows the concerns that have been expressed by some Member States, and I think you have indeed raised additional concerns for me that there will always be high‑priority standardization issues and while we can say what is high‑prior to today we can perhaps not say what will be high‑priority one year from now and we won't be updating this resolution again for four years.

One of the questions that was asked was do we need this list at all, so a question for everyone to consider would be whether we might be able to simply take that introductory sentence and say "coordination of standardization activities is particularly important for high‑priority standardization issues" full stop, whatever the high‑priority issues of today are.

I think when this resolution was first prepared, perhaps people thought that wouldn't be understood what that meant and some examples were given. But the examples, as you say, will change over time and new high‑priority issues will come up as we move forward. So if this list is no longer helpful for the reason it was here, then that would be something additional I would ask you to consider. I was going to complete going through it to see if we had any obvious deletions or consolidations, but I think given the interventions, one possible thing to do would be to stop and let people reconsider and ask the question whether we drop the list all together, if we could agree to that, or agree to a group to go draft a solution for us here outside of the plenary. We can take either of those approaches. Is there value to continuing to the end of the list to see if there is an obvious deletion or consolidation or should we stop here? Canada, please?

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I tend to agree with you, and I think the objective is to coordinate among different groups. The objective of this resolution is to discuss how do you prioritize a different issue and address the topics addressed. Perhaps that is still a separate matter. I tend to agree, bearing in mind the rapid change of technologies and all the different things that we need better coordination. Just make some general sentences, there is no need to have a detailed list of the different topics, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, we consider that this kind of list is quite useful. It's not exhaustive, after all we have the word "including" here, and it seems to us that the additions that are being proposed are indeed additions that add to what we already have, they reflect changes that have taken place over the past four years, they reflect new directions for study, new developments, new evolutions that have emerged so we think it's useful to keep this section. Of course the context of the section could be discussed in a drafting group as you have suggested. In order that we don't waste time on the plenary we could have a Working Group to agree on it separately, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I'm inclined to follow that suggestion and will ask for a volunteer shortly to lead such a drafting group, and the terms of reference for that drafting group would be to consider what to do with this, whether we can eliminate the list, whether we can change or shorten the list, maybe it's a different set of examples today rather than simply adding, and some of the examples of years past are not top issues to be included in this.

I'm inclined to handle that this way. I think before we charter that drafting group I should invite opinions on one more proposal that's contained in this document, and there was, in fact, another edit in resolves 4 in the Arab proposal that we should have a short look at and see if there is consensus or if that needs further discussion in the drafting group. Emirates, please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, I entirely agree with the idea of setting up a drafting group to work on this in order to discuss this list, the list that we have in the resolution, Resolution 45 and we stand ready to cooperate with you, Chairman in order to assist you in producing a good list of priorities, the priorities that should be included here.

As for paragraph 4 under "Resolves" this, in fact, came from a resolution submitted by a group of Arab countries. We have noted that the reference here to developing counties appears to have been deleted and yet in Hyderabad it was decided that we should refer to developing countries and it was made clear what was precisely meant by that expression so we feel that there is a definition that has been decided upon in Hyderabad and that was the reason for our proposal. That is why we have the proposal that we have in 4 under "Resolves."

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Why don't we put both of these into a drafting group and perhaps Canada or Russia would be willing to volunteer to lead this for us? Anyone who would care to help us in this matter? One of our Vice Chairman? Emirates?

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, I think one of the Vice Chairs should chair this group that's going to work on the drafting.

>> CHAIR: I think we have agreement from our vice‑chairman to chair and there was some possible slots. Tomorrow at 8:30, is that a possibility for everyone? The room will be announced on the screen. So this is Andrey Mukhanov will lead this group, so thank you very much. Okay, new proposal, I'm sorry, we forgot tomorrow is Friday so we have an earlier start time for the normal session so 8:30 is not practical. 10:45, Room F is the proposal so if that's agreeable for everyone that's where we will hold this drafting group. Albania, please?

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, it's Algeria not Albania. Thank you for giving me the floor, Chairman. I note the progress being made this morning and I thank you for conducting and taking care of a number of matters in the course of the meeting this morning. Under the coordination of the standardization sector it is important to look at the level of coordination. What would also be useful, Chairman would be to look at what, in fact, we have referred to here in Resolves 2 the issue of cooperation between study groups. I myself am the chair of group 2 and we have noted the issue of standardization especially in developing countries and we're interested in expanding cooperation, and cooperation between study groups is also good but I would also like the study groups to be included in the development sector. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I'm afraid we have no proposal regarding Resolves 2 so I think we would have some difficulty to take that on board. I think that's outside the normal scope of this resolution. I think this is, in fact, the title of the resolution is effective coordination of standardization work across study groups in ITU‑T and TSAG and there are resolutions dealing with coordination across sectors and first of all we have no proposal, second of all, it's not the right resolution to deal with across sector coordination because it's a different subject. So I think I'll take that ‑‑ I'll consider that to be out of the scope of the drafting group. I appreciate the comment, and I would invite you to bring it up in the context of one of the other resolutions, if that's okay. Mr. Dubuisson?

>> MR. DUBUISSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In response to Algeria, if you look at Resolves 5 this, in fact, refers to cooperation and coordination with other sectors so I would draw that to the attention of Algeria.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. We're reaching the time when we will have to conclude, but I see one more request for the floor. After I give the floor to Russia I think we will close for the morning and then reconvene at 2:30 and resume with consideration of Resolution 53. Russia?

>> RUSSIA: Thank you Chairman. Chairman, I asked for the floor because I wish to support what was said by the chair of the study group 2 in the development sector. It is important to have coordination between the sectors and it would be appropriate to look at what Mr. Dubuisson said and to look at the formulation here and of course we have every right to come back and look at this in this resolution, all, and to make additions or amendments as required but you're right we have a number of resolutions that refer to the Your Honor use of coordination among the sectors.

If there are any specific proposals, then I think we certainly could consider them also within the framework of this resolution in the appropriate section. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. If there are other comments we will take them immediately after lunch but for this morning's session, due to interpretation, we are recessed. No more requests? Okay. After lunch. Thank you. We will see you at 2:30. Bon Appetite!

(End of COM 3 meeting. )
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