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 >> CHAIR: Good morning, everybody. Welcome to the fourth meeting of Committee 3 so welcome, Ladies and Gentlemen, distinguished guests.

 I might ordinarily on a Monday morning say I wish I hope you have all had a good weekend but of course I'm aware that many of you spent a lot of that time here. But nevertheless I hope you have had good success in your efforts and that at least a few of you were able to take some time to enjoy the city and its surrounding areas.

 I have prepared an Agenda for this morning's session and you'll find it in ADM26 also displayed on the screen. We have reached the point where we will have to be a little bit flexible with the order depending on document availability so we know for example the drafting group on Resolution 68 just finished meeting. We don't have the document yet but we hope perhaps by the fourth quarter we have something to come back and look at.

 The thing I've done with this agenda, all topics on progress, perhaps we can get through most of the Committee 3 work today. I think we'll have Resolution 1 pending because 3A doesn't finish that work till this afternoon but many of the other items I hope with your cooperation we can examine quickly and close to the extent that we have clean text coming from some of the drafting groups. With your permission, can we take ADM-26 as the Agenda for today.

 I see no requests for the floor so the Agenda is approved.

 Moving on the next order of business, Item 3 which is the review of the report of the third meeting of Committee 3. This is in DT64. We had only one session. We spent a good deal of that session reviewing the results of the drafting group on resolution 35 and so that's -- sorry, so this is 64. We did review some of the consultations coming back so the informal consultation for Resolution 33 allowed us to move forward with that work. Working Group 3B gave us an interim progress report and we'll look at the revised resolution 67 today and then as I said most time we spent on Friday was in fact on the results of the drafting group on Resolution 35, you'll find those discussions reflected in Clause 2.3 so this is what occurred on Friday and then the final order of business we had on Friday was the review of the input documents for recommendation A.7

which was delegated to a drafting group which met over the weekend and we'll see the results of that today.

 So this DT64 is the report of the Friday session.

 Any comments to that report? I see no requests from the floor so that report is approved. So moving into the more substantive parts of the work, we then turn to the reports of the Working Groups so Working Group 3A has completed another Item of business with draft text of recommendation A.1 sent to us for consideration so this text is in DT40.

 Mr. Dubuisson, will you introduce this for us, please?

 >> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Chairman. I'm going to look at substantive amendments first and dwell

(Waiting for translation)

(Internet problem, standing by for audio)

 -- so seven does reflect practice as followed in the T sector for a number of years where we have the Study Group work programs which appear on the website of the Study Group in question. There is a template proposed in the annex which makes it clear how this should be done. Then we have 1.5 bis on correspondence activities on page 5 of the document, again we have not changed anything from this proposal. Then we have definitions included in 171, definition of terms.

 For the definition of "question," here we refer to the definition to be introduced in 1 which you will be looking at a little bit later as the Chair of Committee 3 mentioned earlier the other definitions have not been amended. They are as proposed by TSAG in document 24.

 Then there are several pages where there are no changes at all. But if you look at 23.3.3.3.10 on page 13 of the document we do have amendments again to a large extent this reflects the TSAG text in their document 24.

 There are, however, a few changes, just to make it clearer.

 The role from the TSAG was slightly ambiguous, I have to admit, or it could have given rise to ambiguity of interpretation. So 3.1 is proposing on this that you include wording in your report stating that we recommend that the TSB should add...

(Internet problem, standing by for audio)

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. I'm not quite sure I caught your point. What section were you commenting on?

 >> Thank you. I'm looking at the Russian text, an editorial point, and here it says 2, after the heading it says at 2, seems to me in fact we have decided not to have 1. This just considers the Russian text. It is simply an amendment. It seems to me that either we should be talking about one and not two, purely editorial point for the Russian version. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. And also I think from my side, just editorial, I noticed what I think is the same discussion. I see an adjacent clause 2310 and 23311, one case two months and eight another with an interesting spelling of the word "8" in the English version so perhaps we could choose one formulation of another.

 >> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, in fact, I had already detected that mistake in the English version. I detected it myself and pointed that out to Committee 5 who will take it into account.

 For Mr. (indiscernible)'s comment, I'll do the same thing; I'll check up and again point out to Committee 5 that this has to be checked and properly taken into account and if you have any other problems, anybody, with alignment in your language, please bring it to my attention or to the attention of Com 5. I also know what you have said about the two months in 5.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Now I'll invite any comments on the substance of the proposed update to recommendation A.1. Any requests for the floor?

 Mr. Lee.

 >> CHAE SUB LEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 As the Chairman, I want to have some (indiscernible) on the deadline of TD. With our understanding during the meeting we produced many of the TDs and specifically our Agenda and the report from the other groups so TD is for us means not only for the document status but temporary means in a timely manner. We temporarily produced some document to reflect the Agenda as well as some of the report from each of the groups even the working parties so we need a flexible way how to produce this TD.

 Look at this 3.3.3, simply with a matter about the event might be very difficult to reflect our practical situation of the management.

 So I need some clarification what is the real intention of this 3.3.3, how we can handle this TDs to timely meet of the Study Group, operations of the study groups. I ask for clarification on this subject. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Lee.

 Mr. Dubuisson, would you care to respond?

 >> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Chairman.

 If I have understood your point correctly, and you were speaking as the Chair of Study Group 13, you were talking about administrative documents and you were saying that there was a question about them but actually I think the second sentence in 3.3.3 covers your point because it states in the second sentence of 3.3.3 on 16: "This deadline shall not extend to administrative documents or reports on events which have taken place less than 21 calendar days before the start of the meeting."

 So I think that should satisfy your concern. I hope so.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. I see a request for the floor from Spain and I also saw a hand raised from the U.S.

 Spain first, please.

 >> SPAIN: Well, I'm not Spain and I am speaking as Study Group 9, Chairman, but if it's okay, I'll go ahead.

 >> CHAIR: Okay.

 >> I also have concerns on this section 3.3.3 as a Study Group, Chairman, because on the last section of this, we talk about reports of events which have taken place less than 21 calendar days before the start of the meeting and need be to be posted two days prior to the discussion of the Item in question. I have several cases in my Study Group where a working party will have a Friday Plenary after a week's worth of Rapporteur meetings and often the Rapporteur meeting report will not be ready till late Thursday night and that would not give time for the two days prior to it being discussed on the Friday morning or the Friday afternoon the next day.

 So I see that there is some text, unless otherwise agreed by the meeting, which perhaps would cover that case but I would like more assurance and perhaps a little more clarification that that situation would not cause us to slow down our work.

 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Webster.

 Just to do what we often do in these sort of situations, I wonder if we could perhaps use not quite so many "shall" in this clause but should normally be posted by the indicated deadlines to allow reasonable management team discretion for cases such as the one you had described.

 Clearly we don't want to force those Friday Plenaries and we have got those in several study groups I'm personally aware of where we hold it after a series of Rapporteur group meeting. We would not want to force them to be on Monday so we could wait the weekend for the text to age, if you will, before they are allowed to be considered. Of course in these situations it should not be a situation with agreeing to it but you don't want to have to be stuck in that situation. Just offering one possible suggestion.

 Other opinions on this particular text? Okay. I'm seeing no more requests for the floor.

 What I would suggest, I think, is that I wait to take a final decision here until after the coffee break and give an opportunity for some of the Study Group Chairmen to confer with the Chairmen of Working Group 3A and see if, without changing the spirit of this text, we can ensure that we don't inadvertently do anything that would get in the way of appropriate consideration of documents within the meaning of the Study Group.

 If we could hold off on taking a final decision on DT40 and see if there is some small accommodation for the concerns expressed by the Study Group Chairman.

 United States in the queue again. Thank you.

 >> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Good morning, everyone. I think this is the first time the United States has spoken.

 Study Group Chairman from 9 spoke. I have a question. If we could have through you an explanation from Russia because I think this text comes from Russia, as to what is inferred here. Your explanation just now does not -- I'm not understanding because it says the deadline should not extend to administrative documents or reports on events which have taken place less than 21 calendar days before the start and two proposals of Chair Monday or ad hoc groups so there is a caveat for Chairmen but I guess I'm not understanding your explanation. I know that we have a lot of work to do. So I would like to try to solve some issues and confirm and move on. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Mr. Dubuisson, please.

 >> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Chairman.

 Well, perhaps I would add a further point. You referred to the word "should" earlier and that comes in the last sentence. Where it says "Reports on events that have taken place less than 21 calendar days before the start of the meeting should be posted." At least that's what it says in English.

 So I'm really not sure we can relax the rules any more than that; it says "should."

 >> CHAIR: Thank you for the clarification, Mr. Dubuisson. Indeed it does say "should be posted." The particular example raised by the -- by Mr. Webster was the case of the co-located Rapporteur group meeting and a stand-alone working party Plenary session where obviously one would happen shortly before the other. I see that should be posted on the relevant page of the website not later than two calendar days before the beginning of the discussion of the Item in question at the meeting.

 In that particular scenario, the document would never be available. But as you have pointed out, it does say "should," so one presumes that this would not give grounds to any party to insist that the documents from the Rapporteur group meeting could not be discussed in the working party Plenary meeting.

 So if that is satisfactory for the Chairman and let me look, Mr. Lee, if you would care to take the floor, thank you.

 >> CHAE SUB LEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 If in the case my preference would be made at normally as well as should normally be posted because we have -- I don't want to say this is a normal case but some cases we have the very specialized case like the finishing the GSI, then we have the Study Group Plenaries while working party Plenary. We have a certain case during the last study period, also we have a certain concern about e-mail meetings or other meetings. After that we have prior two or three days meetings and then we continue about the Study Group, normal Study Group, so in such kind of case, and then the I'm not quite sure in case of this we produce the draft recommendation. This should be treated as administrative document or treated as a report. I'm not quite sure in what sense. So to take into account of this, those cases, I want to have some preference that we say "should normally be posted" so we can try to post as much as possible but in special exceptional case we also take into case.

 That's my proposal. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Lee.

 Russia, please.

 >> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman.

 Chairman, the idea behind this proposal was this, it often happens that we get documents not directly prior to their discussion, despite the fact that the meeting itself has been held earlier, maybe two week earlier, yet the Rapporteurs -- and I know this myself from experience, I know, I'm working on a report right now myself.

 The fact is that the participants can only read something which has been prepared earlier. Naturally none can apply to documents being prepared directly prior to a Study Group meeting. Clearly that is not possible. If I'm in a group and working party and it finishes Thursday, then obviously I can't wait a few days and then the Plenary will be the next day.

 We're trying to be flexible and that is why it was written in this way but we're talking about reports on events, on meetings that were held earlier should be prepared earlier.

We should be disciplined. That's the purpose of this proposal. We are trying to make people more disciplined. We are not saying we want a huge number of documents appearing just before the meeting, especially reports on things that happen perhaps two weeks prior to the meeting. They should be available, not just right before the meeting, but obviously naturally if something happens at the very meeting itself, right the minute before the meeting, clearly they will only be posted when available. There is no concern whatsoever about that.

 Of course I understand the preoccupation expressed by these Chairmen of the study groups here but we have to be reasonable. We have the word "should" and also it says at the end "unless otherwise agreed by the meeting."  As we see it, there is no restriction. Work will be done where it should go forward normally in the appropriate way but when things are prepared well in advance, then we would really urge people to prepare them in advance and make them available well in advance. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. I appreciate your explanation and indeed I did not hear any quarrel with the idea that an event that occurred long before the meeting should have its report prepared well in advance of the meeting and I think the 21-day issue was not something that was being questioned but, rather, the concern was some of these juxtaposed meeting situations where the two calendar days might be an issue.

 Now, I heard a suggestion from Mr. Lee that perhaps that difficulty, while the word "should" is not normally understood to be obligatory, I think the words "should normally" have in fact the same meaning but perhaps gives the Chairman a little bit more license to decide in a particular circumstance. This is one where the two calendar days does not or cannot be observed.

 Would the meeting agree with the insertion of the word "normally" so less than 21 days before the start of the meeting should normally be posted on the relevant, so with that, could we agree to the update? So Mr. Dubuisson, did you want the floor?

 >> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 I have no problem with adding the adverb "normally." What I wanted to add was that another thing we could do would be to mention in your report understanding of this paragraph and I remind you that your report will appear in the final Minutes of the Assembly, so we can do that, too.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you.

 So I would be happy to include the remark and perhaps even a description of the specific example in the Com 3 report and so with that I'll move back to the text itself. DT40 coming from Working Group 3A, the proposal is to add the word normally, "should normally be posted on the relevant page of the website not later than two calendar days before the beginning of the discussion of the Item."

 With that amendment can we agree to forward to the editorial Committee for Plenary consideration the text of revised recommendation A.1 from DT40? Can I have your agreement, please? I see no requests for the floor. That's agreed. Thank you very much.

 So as I mentioned when I opened, there will be one other Item of business to be expected from Working Group 3A later in Com 3. Working Group 3B, however, has completed its work and has sent us two documents. One is a report that you'll find in DT28 and then also text of Revised Resolution 67 that you will find in DT29 Rev 1.

 Mr. Gracie, could I ask you to give us the report in DT28 of Working Group 3B, thank you.

 >> BRUCE GRACIE: Yes, thank you very much, Chairman. Good morning, everyone.

 Chairman, in DT28 we have outlined the report of the two meetings which took place of Working Group 3B and as you can see the term, the terms of reference of this group was to examine proposals with respect to the equality of languages as well as proposals for the review and update of Resolution 67 or otherwise. In the second section, Chairman, you'll see background information that provides context for the discussion and in section 2.1, the various proposals that were put forward are outlined.

 Now, of particular importance and interest here is the discussion that took place on the current TSB practices relative to translation of I 2 T recommendations and as you can see in this report, since the 1st of January, 2001, the TSB has published all TAP-approved documents in six languages and that with respect to AAP-approved I 2 T recommendations, he was, the Secretary of the meeting was unaware of an instance within the budgetary limits in which a request to publish in other official languages was ever refused.

 This was a very important point that was highlighted during the course of the discussions. Mr. Ratta, the Secretary, also emphasized it is not TSB who decides when to translate but, rather, I2T study groups that indicate particular recommendations or supplements should be translated.

 As a result of that discussion the following points were highlighted. Number one, that the TSB does not currently include an indication in a circular announcing the approval of a recommendation, whether it is intended to be translated. Secondly, the most recent meeting report of TSAG was translated into all languages of the union. Third, concerning one of the proposals put forward, it was agreed that the matter affected -- this was with respect to the website of I2T, that all ITU Web pages, not just those of I2T were affected.

 It was also agreed that this particular aspect requires the consideration of the Council before any action can be taken given the fact that it affects the entire ITU, not just the T sector.

 Now, concerning another proposal, it was agreed that coordination with the CCD was appropriate. If there was agreement to continue the SCV and of course the CCV is the mechanism established in the radio sector. Now, we also received a number of proposals with respect to resolution 67, and although there was a proposal put forward by CEBT to suppress this particular resolution. Now, there was considerable discussion concerning this matter but in the final analysis it was decided that it would be appropriate to try to find a compromised text with respect to Resolution 67.

 Now, we also discussed the financial implications of the work associated with the SCV and with respect to one particular aspect, translation of all TSAG documents into all six languages, perhaps this needs to be put to the attention of the budget control Committee. Because there would be certainly financial implications in that respect.

 So, Chairman, with respect to the revision to Resolution 67 as you mentioned this is outlined in DT29 Rev 1. So perhaps I'll pause here, Chairman, to see if there are any comments with respect to the report itself. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Gracie.

 If we can have comments to the report of Working Group 3B which now has completed its work, this will be integrated as part of the final Com 3 report. I don't intend to open the individual piece parts up again after our initial review, so if we can have any comments or questions concerning the report of Working Group 3B in DT28. Any questions or comments?

 I see no requests for the floor so the report of Working Group 3B is approved. Thank you.

 Moving on, then, I'll give the floor back to Mr. Gracie for introduction of DT29 Rev 1, Revised Resolution 67.

 Thank you.

 >> BRUCE GRACIE: Yes, thank you, Chairman.

 As you can see, Ladies and Gentlemen, this revision to Resolution 67 is presented without any revision marks. The main reason being is that the resolution was extensively revised, including the title.

 It is now entitled "Use in ITU-T of Languages of the Union on an Equal Footing." In effect, the focus of the Resolution has changed substantially given the fact mainly that the resolution in the first place was to establish the SCV and of course that had taken place so the focus of the resolution has accordingly changed.

 So I won't read the recognizings, reconsiderings and notings. These are simply ensuring that there are updates in accordance with Resolution 154 of the plenipotentiary conference. In the "resolves," we have a number of resolves and essentially, Chairman, the bottom line is that the work of the standardization Committee for the vocabulary should continue and that close collaboration should take place with the Coordination Committee on the vocabulary in I2R.

 Now, there is an instruction to the director of the TSB to continue to translate all recommendations approved under the traditional approval procedure in all languages of the union. To translate all TSAG reports in all of the languages of the union and as I mentioned earlier this may have financial implications that should be brought to the attention of Committee 2.

 And to include in the circular that announces the approval of a recommendation an indication of whether it will be translated. The Council of course is invited to address the issue of the websites and the -- in the assurance that the websites are made available in all official languages on an equal footing within of course the budgetary limits established by the plenipotentiary conference and the Council.

 TSAG is instructed to consider the best mechanism for deciding which AAP-approved recommendations shall be translated in light of the relevant Council decisions. Now, subsequent to the meeting, Chairman, we added an annex which outlines the terms of reference of the standardization Committee for vocabulary and we consider this mainly editorial so that the activities of this group were clearly indicated as part of the resolution.

 As a final point the SCV is asked to report at least once a year to TSAG on its activities and of course to report its results to the next WTSA

 With that, Chairman, I present document DT29 Rev 1 for your further consideration. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Gracie, for this work and for the proposed revision of Resolution 67.

 Can I have your comments to this proposed revised resolution, please?

 Seeing no requests for the floor, can I have your agreement to the proposed text of the resolution which we will forward via the editorial Committee to the Plenary for approval?

 I see no requests for the floor so that is approved.

 One other decision for us to take here as was mentioned by Mr. Gracie. We have some -- Russia, please.

 >> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman.

 Now that the decision has been taken on this resolution I asked for the floor because I wanted to draw attention to one point. We have Chairs of study groups here and we also have the Director with us so I want to point out the work of this Committee is first and foremost based on proposals that come from study groups.

 Now, in the last study period, this did not work appropriately so through you, Chairman, I would like to ask that you either reflect in your report or in some way the fact that study groups should send to the SCV new terms and it would be desirable this would happen before they are actually approved at a time before they are set in stone.

 Before that happens they should be sent to the SCV and then they could decide upon the appropriateness of these terms and all this would happen before the final approval. That would allow the SCV really to work. This is in the resolution, it's true, Chairman. If you look at resolve 2 that is reflected but I want to make sure it is actually also implemented.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Indeed we'll make sure this resolution is called to the attention of all study groups in TSAG, so thank you for that intervention.

 The remaining point that Mr. Gracie raised is that we were requested as Committee Chairmen to call attention to the budget control Committee of anything that may have budgetary implications and as Mr. Gracie also mentioned the final report of TSAG on I think an exceptional basis since it was the final meeting before WTSA translated but this was one of five whose reports were translated so perhaps it is not a huge amount of money but something that the budget control Committee will take into account, that additional expenditure, so can I have your agreement that I send that, or call that to the attention of the budget control Committee?

 I'm seeing heads nodding and no requests so that's great, also.

 That closes the work of Working Group 3B and so I want to extend a special thanks to Mr. Gracie for his work in this area.

 With that, we'll move down our Agenda and taking things where we do have documentation.

 So the next order of business is the report of the drafting group on Resolution 45. So we have a document DT45. So, Mr. Mukhanov, if you could introduce this for us, please.

 >> ANDREY MUKHANOV: Thank you, Chairman. Could you give me literally just a minute.

 Chairman, I am now submitting the draft of a revised version of Resolution 45 and Resolution 45 is entitled "Effective Coordination of Standardization Work Across Study Groups and the Role of TSAG."

 Now, the text is submitted for your consideration. A few editorial amendments have been made and if we look here at A, where we have "bearing in mind," "bearing in mind," A, we talk about next generation networks, evolution future networks, then in C under "bearing in mind" we talk about telecommunications for disaster relief systems including network resilience and recovery, then in D, small grid and home networking, and moving on intelligent transport systems, "bearing in mind" E, then the Internet of Things in F, and a proposal made by our colleagues, we have also made some additions here.

 We have talked about M2M, M2M communication and then talk about cloud computing and Internet-related issues remains as in the original text, and then there's I, conformance and interoperability testing.

 In discussing these items, consensus was reached; however, the wish was expressed by some of our colleagues that this list should be further expanded. However, we came to the conclusion that in fact adding anything to this list went beyond the mandate of our group and for that reason, we left the list as it now stands and as it is shown on the screen.

 Now, the next issue upon which agreement was reached is in the second part of the document. Here consensus was reached by the parties concerned, again, you should be able to see this on the screen, the final wording that we decided upon.

 Thank you, Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Mukhanov, and of course a lot of this work was working on a list of items for coordination and it is an exemplary list so it begins including, for example, any comment to the proposed revision of Resolution 45 which has some amendments to take into account some high priority items that perhaps were not on our radar screen as of four years ago. Emirates, please.

 >> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman.

 Just a small amendment to the definition of "Developing Countries." That should include countries, landlocked countries.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. I would trust that the Editorial Committee will take on board to align this text which I think appears in many of our resolutions.

 Other comments to this proposed revision of Resolution 45? Okay. I see no requests for the floor, so with that small amendment to be taken care of editorially, the revision of Resolution 45 will be sent via the Editorial Committee so that text is agreed.

 Thank you. If I move in our Agenda to the next point which has an allocated number, I think the work is done but not sure the document is available yet so we don't have DT56, nor do we have a document yet for Resolution 68 which we know was done 8:30 to 9:30 this morning.

 So I think the next topic where a document is available -- and we'll be sure to come back pending availability to documents to the other topics -- is Resolution 70. So the convener of the group here was Ms. Saks so if I can ask for an introduction of DT57, drafting group on resolution 70, please.

(Pause)

 Thank you, of course. It's not Spain. It is Andrea Saks, please.

 >> ANDREA SAKS: Okay. Can you all hear me? There was a very successful drafting group that occurred for an hour and one of the things we did point out is that the TSB might have to check some of the text because there might be some errors and sure enough we have had some changes that have come back which are corrections to some references and some of them were updated which I was not aware of.

 Do you have the document that we have, the original, or the document that was agreed and then I believe I have sent the document the changes from accessibility Secretariat corrected some of the errors. If we could look at those, and I'm going to ask your advice. Should I go through them one-by-one or should I just generally say what they are? There are about six.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Perhaps as you lead us through the text you could mention where there are updates. I'm not sure whether Mr. Jones has that update available to him for projection on the screen.

 But why don't we work from DT57 the report of the drafting group and we can mention where changes are.

 >> ANDREA SAKS: Okay, it's up on the screen anyway. Briefly, in recognizing it's very simple WTDs 10, the number 10 was added and also there was another resolution that was added which was applicable which was WTDC 10 Resolution 70 Hyderabad, that was an omission and I have spoken to the author of the original contribution, Victoria -- I'm sorry, Victoria, I'm going to mess up your last name, I won't say it right, so raise your hand so we know it's you -- she has agreed to the changes that we went through and I have not heard back from the others of the group to the negative. So that was added.

 The other was a bit on C, just adding text as well as all the other specialized United Nations agencies. I have also had an agreement and editorial "and" so that was in recognizing, if that is okay with everyone.

 The next one is in -- still in recognizing which is L. Do you have that on the screen? After J. Mr. Chairman, I'm...

(Pause)

 >> CHAIR: Okay. I think I see the problem. I think the edits use the letters of the alphabet I am familiar with and so K in fact comes after J, so it is a -- while it's in the edited copy listed as L, I think that's incorrect. It's K on the screen.

 >> ANDREA SAKS: Yes, okay, perhaps you are right. But can we just -- can you move up to the correct text just so we can solve that next problem?

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. I think that's the text I'm seeing so I am seeing the activity of the Internet Governance Forum in the edits you were speaking of is L and it's K on the screen. That's what is currently displayed.

 >> ANDREA SAKS: Okay. What is after the dynamic coalition on accessibility and disability is DICAD, the acronym. That was added. Are we looking at not the document with the edits now instead of the ones that we just looked at a second ago which had the other edits? You're looking at the one that came out of the ad hoc group and not the one that the TSB? Wouldn't it be easier --

 >> CHAIR: Yes.

 >> ANDREA SAKS: Wouldn't it be easier to look at the one sent originally, sent last night?

 >> CHAIR: We're getting that onto the computer for projection.

 >> ANDREA SAKS: That way you won't have to type everything.

 >> CHAIR: That will save us.

 >> ANDREA SAKS: I think it will.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you.

 >> ANDREA SAKS: That way we've done the work for you.

 Do you want to go back to B and C so people can see that properly? Yeah. On recognizing. Yeah. Okay. That's the one I first mentioned as you can see there is the 10 and the second resolution from Hyderabad from the WTDC which was added and then the words "After activities as well as all specialized United Nations Agencies" and the omission of the word "and" which the original author of the contribution has agreed to. Is that okay with everybody? Okay. Then we go back down to -- we add DICAD on L or J, whichever the numbers turn out to be. And okay because the rest is what we did. Okay. Thank you.

 Then considering, again, we should put the United Nations Convention and there is a space between the UNCRPD even in the correction. It's usually there is no space between the letters. But that was the other correction which is the acronym that was added. We just want to eliminate that hyphen.

 >> CHAIR: Yes. Thank you, Ms. Saks. If we could pick up the substance, I think things that are editorial --

 >> ANDREA SAKS: It is just an editorial. Whenever we refer to "the convention" we should refer to its correct name. And the acronym was left out which is what we've been putting behind because from the document we use acronyms; therefore, it is defined.

 >> CHAIR: Very good. Let's move through the rest of this, picking up the substance really of what came from the drafting group and any significant changes since then.

 >> ANDREA SAKS: Okay. The drafting group agreed to put this particular Item in this section. We moved it. So it's fine. It was altered rather than having so many of the different organisations mentioned. It was -- the wording was altered to read as such. And it was moved from another location and those are the specific references in Article 9, again, originally in the original document, were moved in the second document that came to this particular conference and then were changed to another location because it was made much more sense to do it that way. Basically, okay. And again we put this back in. Wait a minute. Where are we? There we go. Thank you.

 Just trying to see where we are. What section is this? I am using -- doing the naughty thing as a dyslexic using paper. Can I go back up to where -- I'm getting lost! Where are you?

 >> CHAIR: Yes, I think maybe we can sort of trust on a lot of the front matter that some attention has been paid to this in the drafting groups. Maybe if we could go to the substance of the resolves and indicate what we're going to ask people to agree to shortly. So people -- if people can understand the substance of what we're agreeing to, it's mainly the resolves, thank you.

 >> ANDREA SAKS: If you can go back down a bit and not use that blue highlight because then I can't see it over the green.

 Okay. Basically we change the order and added, moved one of the -- one of the sections together. We also added in the special -- the correct titles for the references for the accessibility checklist that also has been corrected to take out 2006 and we are taking out the word all the way through, "elderly" and it's basically "older person" and "persons with disabilities" because the problem is older -- disabilities that affect you when you get older start as young as your mid-40s and you are not elderly at mid-40 so it applies to a wider group of people. And I don't know anybody in the world who likes to be called elderly even if they are.

 So that's what the United Nations has adopted and what we have adopted in the ITU. It's more politically correct. Older persons first and they often don't recognize that they are a person with a disability. You will find that to be the case. There are many hidden disabilities, like lots of people who can't hear don't even know they can't hear.

 So anyway, the number 2 if we can go down, I'll take this whole section. Down a bit, please. This is encouraging the ITU Study Groups to draft proposals that will include accessibility features and non-discriminatory standards and regulations to include persons with disabilities and older persons which I'm happy to say they are doing and continuing to do and that has emphasizing the use of the accessibility checklist so this will be done in the future.

 And that we want to also in number 3 have an ITU workshop before the next WTSA which we won't have any trouble in doing because we like doing accessibility workshops and our Director is very supportive of this activity.

 Okay. Then down to we're trying to get people to be aware that affordability is a big problem with accessibility, assistive devices, and this is a very important part of making ICTs and also the telephone system accessible for persons with disabilities, i.e., in keyboards and in hand-held devices and other things. So it's important to encourage people to do and to include that in their design.

 That takes care of five. Now, one of the things we changed in five was to include the major accessibility problems which are mainly visual, auditory, verbal and other physical and mental disabilities because a lot of times people don't think of all of them; they think of the one they know. We listed them all that we could do that would just about cover everybody because it's either all or none. We could not list every single one but those are the main categories.

 Thank you for that correction. Originally we had a huge list of all regional telecommunications organisations throughout the world and though we'd love to do that, again, we decided in this case to do just a general so we're moving on to nine.

 This, again, is in agreement with the Director who has been extremely supportive of accessibility work and funding and this just gives him a little bit of an ability to use ITU resources even though our budget is small, to encourage participation of persons with disabilities in the standardization process. Often when we can, we actually help with fellowships for persons with disabilities to actually come and contribute with their expertise and also to include languages that they use, like sign language, Braille, alternate formats for print, and especially the captioning that you all are enjoying now.

 Okay. I realize I'm just getting a signal that I'm taking too much time. I'll go through it a little more quickly.

 To facilitate the implementation of software. Industry, please, take the accessibility features that the ITU so carefully designs in its recommendations and put them in because universal design is extremely important and without your help, it does not happen. So this is a message to them.

 Next one.

 Is that it? Are we done? Wow! Well, okay. Does anyone have any questions with any of the changes that were made in the drafting group and the subsequent editorial changes that were made by our accessibility Secretariat back in Geneva that cleaned up our mistakes and omissions?

 >> CHAIR: Okay, thank you, Ms. Saks, for that introduction.

 We have the updated text in DT57 with, I think about six mostly editorial repairs to that and so I would like to ask if there are any comments to the substance of this or any suggestions for change to this output.

 Okay. I see no requests for the floor so can I ask your agreement that we I think after a little bit of editorial cleanup we send this to the editorial Committee to the Plenary for approval.

 I see no request so that's agreed. Thank you very much.

 One other thing here that I would like to take. I was reminded that this in fact is something that with budgetary implications and I think that the whole idea is asking us to spend money on this and so with your agreement also I would like to inform the Chairman of Committee 2 of this resolution so they can take that into account in their work.

 Any issue with that? We will also call this to the attention of Committee 2, thank you.

 I think we are only about two minutes away from the appointed time for coffee break so I think rather than get into another subject I will recess for the coffee break at this point.

 So I will see you all back here; I think we are scheduled in the second period as well. So 11:15 start time, please. Thank you.

(Coffee break taken)

(Session concluded)
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