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 >> CHAIR: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Let's get started. This is the final session for today of Committee 3.

 So when we had recessed just prior to lunch, we had had an introduction of the proposal from Canada for update of Recommendation A.11. This was a proposal to relax requirement on TSB for providing for sale paper copies of documents that I think today nobody buys because they can download them for free.

 So is there any support for this proposal?

 Okay. I see Japan, the United States. Thank you very much. So do we need -- so we have support for the proposal. It seems rather simple and straightforward. Is there any comment to be made to the proposal? Let's see. Japan, please.

 >> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to say Japan supports the proposal from Canada. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. We have support from the United States and Japan. Is there any discussion or comment to the proposal?

 Okay. I see no one asking for the floor. Any opposition to the proposal? So can we agree to propose an update of A.11, as proposed in Document 58, Addendum 1?

 I see no requests for the floor, so thank you. That's agreed.

 I'd like to move next to document -- we jumped over just before lunch, due to the time. This is a proposal for a modification to A.5, proposal from Russia in Document 55. Can I ask Russia to introduce this for us, please?

 >> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, we have a presentation. Could it be shown on the screen, please?

 In the process of elaborating ITU-T recommendations, wide use was made to documents outside of the organizations. This is from joint participation, discussion, debates, and in particular, development of joint text. All of this is undoubtedly positive and is worthy of further support.

 At the same time, in ITU-T recommendations, wide use is made of references to documents from outside organizations. As a result, recommendations of this type within the ITU-T often end up being essentially a composite of clauses referring to outside texts.

 As an example, on this slide you see part of an approved recommendation, X.1541. This contains and is made up of references to RFC 50.70. And this is actually what most of this recommendation looks like.

 As can be seen from the next slide, RFC 5070 itself contains many references to documents from other organizations, not only IETF. And this leads to the following problems.

 Firstly, complication of recommendation, control of such recommendations. This primarily concerns the multilayer reference system. In fact, in order to grasp of ultimate meaning of an ITU-T recommendation, you have to draw through a series of references and study a host of other documents.

 On the next slide, you can see that the documents to which RFC 57G refers also contain references to documents from various organizations. In the case of X.1541, we are actually talking about hundreds of references. We should also note that if you follow this through the references, in some cases you actually get to documents that are distributed on a for-payment basis. These for-payment documents become an integral part of the not-for-payment ITU-T recommendations.

 The second problem now. This relates to the fact that any change to the reference clauses of an ITU-T recommendation becomes dependent on the decisions of outside organizations, organizations in which ITU members do not have the right to a casting vote.

 In order to remove these problems that I have referred to, the administration of the Russian Federation is proposing an amendment to Recommendation ITU-T A.5, with a view to prohibiting the use of regulatory normative references to the documents of other organizations in ITU-T recommendations containing security. As security is the most sensitive area of responsibility for the administrations of ITU-T participating countries, each recommendation in this area must use the direct text itself with possible references to ITU text in order to avoid any ambiguity of interpretation and also to make it possible to have changes introduced promptly.

 A possible alternative to such an approach would be that of the development of joint text for ITU-T recommendations; that is to say jointly with other standardization organizations when ITU-T is a full and equal co-author of such a text.

 The draft of the revised recommendation ITU A.5 is given in our contribution. We should also note that the proposals from the Russian Federation are submitted by the RCC administrations.

 Thank you, Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Are there any questions for clarification to this proposal?

 And while the speaker suggested this was from the RCC, I, in fact, see it as a contribution submitted on behalf of Russia, so let me ask if there is support to this proposal. Okay. I see support from Armenia and Kyrgyzstan. With that, I will move to discussion, and I will take interventions in the queue as I find them. I have Kyrgyzstan first. Sudan.

 >> SUDAN: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, we have listened to the explanations given by Russia and given by our brothers from Russia, and in the light of that we now understand the grounds for the Russian proposal, and we support it. Thank you.

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

 >> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Listening to the Russian proposal, there are three issues which jump out at us. The first is the issue of flexibility and timeliness. The current approach that's already enshrined in A5 gives the experts in the Study Groups the flexibility that they need in order to access the best possible solutions and the best information, regardless of where it's from and having to re-create it on their own.

 In an area particularly as what ITU-T works on, timely is of the essence. We are already under tremendous pressure to produce timely solutions. And if we were either prevented from having normative references or having to create the text all anew, it would take significantly longer to produce these solutions.

 The other issue is the issue of if, indeed, this problem is widespread, it is a problem that needs to be looked at and solutions need to be developed across the board such that those solutions would be pertinent to all Study Groups as opposed to just one particular Study Group.

 And lastly, we believe that if, indeed, that this issue has to be addressed, particularly looking at it from the perspective of how different Study Groups are being impacted, the TSAG might be ideally situated and ideally located with the right expertise to be able to address these particular issues.

 So considering those factors, I'd like to state that we have very significant reservations about this proposal and cannot support this proposal.

 Thank you, Sir.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Kyrgyzstan, please.

 >> KYRGYZSTAN: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, we wish to support the position of the Russian Federation with reference to the issue of the use of references to outside organizations in ITU-T recommendations. We are very concerned about the question of security recommendations in particular, and we're concerned about the use of normative references in the text of these recommendations, particularly with reference to outside organizations.

 As a developing country, what we need in recommendations is recommendations that include the full text of standards. That's especially important in the area of security. So in any such text, we should have a detailed account as to how we should guide our behavior in terms of security. That's very important for our countries.

 That being so, we fully support the recommendation from the Russian Federation to amend recommendation ITU-T A.5.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Next I have Armenia.

 >> ARMENIA: Thank you, Chairman. First I would like to say this. This is, indeed, a contribution that is supported by administrations of the RCC. I want to make that point clear.

 The second point I'd like to make is that within the practice of the ITU, documents, particularly recommendations, are, according to condition, documents that should be self-contained. So using recommendations is something you should be able to do directly. There shouldn't be any need to have to go through something else to have lots of other references that you have to go to, references that refer to other references, and so on. You shouldn't have that. They should be self-contained, self-standing.

 Recommendations need to be used. And you don't need to waste a lot of time finding out where you get something within a recommendation and what refers to what. To a certain extent I agree to what has been said by the United States to the effect that this approach does affect virtually all Study Groups. So speaking personally, I would say that I think there's a very interesting idea, and that is to say the idea of working on this firstly for those recommendations that pertain to security.

 And for that reason, this proposal, I think, is a very reasonable one. It is suggesting that we start on this approach with a limited number of recommendations, those that are in a particular series, those that deal with security, and we would use this approach for those recommendations because we know that here we talk a great deal about how we are going to bridge the standardization gap.

 And having all of these references, all of these multiple references simply do not help us in doing that, they do not help us to bridge the standardization gap. And therefore, what we have to do is to recognize the fact that we have a lot of recommendations, a whole plethora of recommendations. They are very voluminous recommendations because each and every recommendation is very detailed, and sometimes you have hundreds, if not thousands, of pages of additional text. And therefore, you have to have a very powerful apparatus to deal with this. You really have to spend a lot of time and effort making your way through all of this and trolling through all of the references that are given.

 And what we have to understand is that we are elaborating recommendations not just for a narrow circle of specialists who might be able to find their way through all this maze of references. We're talking about recommendations that have to be usable, and we have to think about the users who do not always have these super capabilities available to them.

 I know that, of course, technology is now found throughout society, but not everyone has these super capabilities that would be required to get through this kind of reference maze. So I really think we have to think about this recommendation, especially for ITU-T. We have to think about how important it is that our recommendations are understandable, that they are usable, that they are not too complicated, that they don't involve too lengthy a process to understand what is involved.

 And perhaps I'd like to add another slight nuance here. I, myself -- and I'm sorry if anyone takes this as a criticism -- but I, myself, think having uncontrolled references to a whole plethora of recommendations is, in itself, a source or at least a potential source of error, and that is simply not acceptable when you're talking about normative references, when you're talking about recommendations of this type. After all, a recommendation is a very high-level document within the ITU, and it has to be without error. It has to be flawless.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Armenia. China, please.

 >> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, we're glad to appreciate the good question proposed by the Russian Federation. I think that we partially support this proposal.

 In addition, I don't think that this proposal reflects the security issues in nature. Rather, it reflects some problems that we have encountered in making references.

 I think that this issue should be dealt in the Study Groups as we are dealing with the terms and definitions, and I think that we need to give it detailed discussion when we talk about the references to the outside document.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Canada, please.

 >> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Canada believes we should not have a prescriptive way of saying we should not have normative references. Certainly in a spirit of cooperation with other standards bodies, if we ever want to use that stuff, either we can create joint recommendation as suggested by the Russian delegate, and I think that's a preferred way; or secondly, we can reference the document. If we have to develop everything ourselves, it will be really time consuming. And also, as pointed out by the colleague from China, this issue covers more than security, and I think it's premature to just focus on security and besides very difficult to identify which recommendation is security, which one is not.

 Anything in every Study Group has some sort of element of security and instructed by the Counsel to discuss security. It would be very time consuming for each Study Group to decide which one is security and which one is not.

 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

 >> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to point out that the current system provides the flexibility that is needed in those instances where there might be a nest of references. And as pointed out by the Canadian delegate, the need for an overarching, prescriptive approach which can have unintended consequences needs to be examined carefully. This is an issue that could often be best addressed and in this particular case best addressed by those in the Study Group who know what those normative references are and what the alternatives to those references may be.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Russia, please.

 >> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, I'd like to draw attention to one point. For instance, when you have a recommendation, a recommendation that is approved in accordance with the traditional procedure, then it is a recommendation that is approved by administrations.

 When our administration put forward a document that does not include anything apart from references, then if you go through all those references, naturally, there's no translation of that recommendation, and where are you? Well, naturally, the administration says to us, well, look, distinguished colleagues, what have you adopted? What have you accepted here? Because they don't understand what is involved.

 And of course, it would be correct for all recommendations that go through the traditional procedure to include normative references in their entirety because then the administration, in approving that, would see what exactly is being approved.

 Now we understand that you have to start somewhere, so we suggested that, as yet, we restrict ourselves to security alone, but we are willing to expand this to all recommendations approved by administrations by the traditional approval procedure. After all, administrations want this. They need this.

 I don't really understand, what's this question about a restriction on flexibility? We can reach a situation whereby, in fact, we would just end up with numbers and nothing else, and we wouldn't understand what these numbers would be, and then they might be changed. We wouldn't understand what they refer to.

 And as for recommendations that have political or regulatory significance, it's very important for us to understand clearly what exactly it is that we're approving.

 For that reason, to our mind, this is a very important issue. And if we are going to say that resolution on this has to be put off further, then we are actually weakening the position of the ITU and the ITU-T in particular.

 We fully agree with what has just been said by Canada. It would be desirable to work on all of this jointly. We have excellent examples of this within the standardization sector, within the ITU-T, also within the ITU-R, where they have worked jointly with other organizations. However, it's simply the case that a procedure has come into being in recent years which we think is incorrect. An incorrect practice has come into being where we have begun to replace or to substitute text with references, just references, nothing but references, and as has already been said, on the one hand, these are references that it's very difficult to find, to grasp their ultimate significance; and, on the other hand, they may not be correct. And there are examples of that also, times when we've actually found that actually you might have up to 20 incorrect recommendations in some kind of recommendation that then had to be corrected, incorrect references in a recommendation that then had to be corrected at a later stage.

 So I draw your attention to the fact that the ITU-T elaborates recommendations that have to be understandable to all to developing countries, including others, and not just to a small number of experts who know what a particular number refers to.

 So we think that it is essential here and now, at this Assembly, for us to make these changes to Recommendation A5 in order to ensure that we can adopt appropriate measures for the development of such recommendations.

 As for the expansion of this approach to other areas, well, that's something that we can work upon further under the auspices of TSAG, of course, taking into account the views of Study Groups also.

 Thank you, Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Armenia, then I'll inject myself into the queue. Thank you.

 >> ARMENIA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, in principle, the doubts that we had when we discussed these documents have, to a certain extent, been confirmed. We are not against the idea of distributed detailed references and the way in which they are used to all Study Groups. We are not against the idea of rolling this out further. But we understand that's much more complicated than starting in this way. That is to say taking one Study Group to begin with as an example. But of course, we are willing to consider all Study Groups in this way, if necessary.

 I would, however, like to once again underscore this point. ITU documents enjoy a very high reputation, and they are documents that are elaborated for a very broad circle of users. It's particularly important to recognize that these recommendations are not just developed for people who know every cross-reference by heart and who know where everything is and everything is right and whether there are mistakes. They know all this with their eyes shut. It's not for those people.

 And as it is right now, it's simply not admissible. It's not admissible to have ITU documents that just contain references to other documents that contain mistakes. That's simply something that's not admissible.

 So I would, therefore, call upon all interested parties to think about this. I would really urge people to think about how we can try to make changes where necessary in order to improve the situation.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Armenia. And just to inject myself in the queue in the scope of having been the correspondence leader for working methods in TSAG over the last four years and having some familiarity with this document, I would call participants' attention to the fact that A.5, if it is applied as written, doesn't allow for references to be made lightly. There is quite a qualification process to decide to make a normative reference to an outside document.

 And in particular, I would call your attention to Clause 2.2 in A.5, which gives ten criteria that are to be satisfied before making a reference to -- a normative reference to an outside document. And some of the concerns that have been addressed are discussed, for example, in 2.2.8, where it is indicated that when a document is to be referenced, that all explicit references within the reference document should also be listed. Also, I call your attention to 2.2.10, which indicates that a full copy of the existing document for reference is to be made available and should be available via the Web at no cost so that the Study Group or Working Party may proceed with its evaluation.

 Once those ten criteria are evaluated, then Clause 2.3 gives the Study Group making the decision a choice. So it indicates for normative references only, the Study Group or Working Party evaluates the above information and comes to its conclusion based on the usual consensus process. The decision of the Study Group or Working Party shall be documented, given a format shown in appendix, and that requirement must be completed by the time the recommendation is decided under TAP or consented under AAP.

 So some of the problem I've heard described sounds like perhaps a willy-nilly or carols application of the process which hasn't followed A.5. So I would like to remind participants that there are these provisions and no need to accept a reference to a document that's not fully understood, and the reasons for the reference fully documented under Clause 2.2, subclauses -- well, 2.2.1 through 2.2.10. So that's intended to prevent exactly the same kind -- the kind of problem that is being discussed.

 So next in the queue I have Canada.

 >> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Canada fully supports your statement, Mr. Chairman. I think perhaps the example was just shown by Russia may be an extreme example, it shows a really bad example how one shouldn't use the list of references without any context, without any discussion, just a list of references.

 And I will draw your attention that in ITU-T, in our recommendation, we do internally reference other recommendations, which perhaps put in the right context is no problem. Same thing we can do the same way for the external references, and besides, if you want to pare everything out and input into an ITU recommendation, there is bound to be some errors and some wrong interpretation.

 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Russia, please.

 >> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, it has quite rightly been noted that recommendation A.5 is one that governs a number of issues relating to the inclusion of references in ITU-T recommendations. Our experience of discussing Recommendation X.1541 in particular has shown that A.5 is implemented just in terms of one point, and that's the point relating to normative and nonnormative references.

 We have seen that there has been absolutely no justification which is supposed to be required in accordance with A.5. The only justification was that this was an IETF document and, as such, was quite a good quality document.

 We don't deny, we are not arguing that IETF is a very high-level organization, a leading one in many respects, but that was it. That was all we did in terms of applying A.5 in accordance with that particular recommendation, 1541. And certainly, our experts, our specialists, find that there were a very large number of mistakes. And we did not object to the adoption of that just because of the fact that these were, indeed, errors or mistakes that could be deleted or removed.

 Now, we'd also like to point out that we got in touch of the office of 1541, and we got into an argument of text. They said the way they had it was more flexible, better written, and so on.

 Thank you, Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia.

 Of course, the point you mentioned, the qualification of the referenced organization is one of ten points that are supposed to be considered, and in fact, 2.2.9 is exactly that point. So satisfying one of ten points doesn't satisfy A.5. If one follows procedure in terms of a given reference. I know some Study Groups are pickier about making sure all the points are followed than others.

 Next I have Armenia.

 >> ARMENIA: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, thank you very much for giving me the floor again, and I'd like to say that I fully agree with what you have just said about the fact that there are certain requirements here. I've also noted that reference has been made to the fact that perhaps some of the examples we have given and are being considered are bad examples.

 But the fact is that clearly we have to look at those examples that we're not happy with in order to improve things so that in the future we won't have any such examples. If we're just going to have good examples, we know they are out there, then we are going to not get anywhere. We have no doubt that there are good examples, but we have to look at and recognize the fact that there has been a bad example.

 It might just be something that happened once by chance, but again, we have to make sure it doesn't happen again. We have to look at this as you can say an exception, but it still has to be something that we should not allow to happen again.

 And let me say I am not saying in this proposal and we are not saying in this proposal that all of this should affect all recommendations across the board. We are suggesting that we start this work in this area. Let's see how it goes. If, in fact, we see that there are absolutely no problems, then perhaps we don't have to rule it out any further, but let's start with this. After all, the first example we had, the first study we had, showed that there were more than 20 mistakes. And if you have an average administration with limited resources, they can't go through all of this, and they can't find all of the mistakes.

 So distinguished delegates and experts from some countries have very powerful research institutions. They have the possibility of going through all of this and finding out exactly what is involved and to what extent normative standards apply in a particular document and so on and what the normative references are. They can follow them all up. But not everyone has that capability.

 So I really do think we have to think about this, and we have to recognize that there are certain criteria, as you have said, Chairman, but sad to say not all of these criteria are being complied with. And that's why this proposal is being put forward. We are thinking about what we can do to resolve this situation.

 We think that we have to take some preventive steps at this level to prevent bad examples occurring again. We think that's very reasonable, and we think that's what we should now do.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. So simply to respond, I think it's important to answer the question, whether we end up with a bad example, if you will, like this because there is something wrong with the process or because the process we have wasn't followed. I believe we have safeguards in the process that should prevent reference to documents that don't meet the criteria.

 So I am sensing most of the RCC countries support this. I am sensing other non-RCC countries do not. So I am not seeing an overall consensus. I am trying to think of a way forward here. It seems like we should find some way to communicate to the Study Groups and remind them of the criteria for A.5 references and encourage them to follow that process and perhaps find a way also to invite TSAG to examine whether there is a way to improve the situation going forward.

 So I will consult, I think, with my Vice Chairman, see if we can come up with some appropriate words. I don't know whether we can do it simply by something in our report or if there's some other mechanism we can have. But I think it would seem important to remind Study Groups who aren't fully following the process that that there is a criteria that needs to be satisfied before making a normative reference.

 So I see Russia asking for the floor.

 >> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, we put forward a very specific proposal for amendment to A.5. We were supported not only by the RCC but also by Sudan. The U.S. and Canada spoke against, countries that do have great capability and capacity that are involved in the IETF. I would like once again to underscore the point that this is very important for developing countries. It's important for us to see the text of normative researches for recommendations that are of great significance in accordance with the TAP. And that reference to security.

 We're not against references. We are willing to accept references. But we're asking for these references to be shown in the text of the recommendation, normative references that is. We're not against references, but we're against the idea of just having references. We want to see in the text of the recommendation the normative references. We're not asking for any more than that. We are asking, in this case, just to add that. I don't really understand what the contradiction is here.

 Could you explain to us, please, what's the problem, what is it that people don't understand?

 Further, recommendations going through TAP have to be translated. Now, naturally nobody is going to translate these references, but normative references we have to be able to see. We have to be able to see them. Our administration considers in accordance with all of the provisions of the ITU that that is something that has to be implemented. We have to see what the ITU is proposing. And for that reason, normative references has to be given in full. We are not asking for any more than that, and we don't see how in any way that's going to detract from flexibility.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia.

 I'd like to call your attention, before I move on in the queue, to point 2.2.10, that a full copy of the existing document must be available in order to evaluate it for a normative reference. And it indicates in A.5, the objective is to have referenced documents available via the Web at no cost so that the Study Group or Working Party may proceed with its evaluation.

 The issue with copying the text is one of copyright, so copyright must be obtained before one could actually reproduce the text in the recommendation. But the text must be available to everyone at the Study Group in order to proceed with the evaluation that A.5 calls for in order to include it in a recommendation.

 So actually, in line in the text, has an issue with copyright, but the document must be available, and if the document is not available, according to A.5, you wouldn't meet the qualifications and shouldn't make a normative reference to a document that everyone doesn't have access to.

 So I certainly would invite anybody in any of the Study Groups to refuse to allow a reference to a document that is not made available to the Study Group or Working Party making the evaluation.

 Next in the queue I have the United States.

 >> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 -- to ensure the bad examples that are referenced here do not take place. I believe you have also pointed out a reasonable well-balanced path going forward, to look at where it has gone wrong and the reasons for that prior to moving precipitously on any action that could have significant adverse effects on how experts in ITU-T can develop standards in a timely manner.

 Thank you very much.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. China, please.

 >> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 The Chinese delegation supports the Russian Federation; however, we think that this view should not be only limited to security aspects.

 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. I think seeing no more speakers in the queue, what I would like to do is to allow some time for consultations among the parties to see if we can come to a better understanding, and so I would like to put this point on the agenda for tomorrow. So I certainly would -- I'm not going to convene a formal drafting activity. I think more one-on-one kind of discussions are what is required here. And then we'll resume this discussion as part of our business tomorrow morning.

 So if that's okay with everybody, that would let us then move to a few other items of business where we do have documentation available.

 And so in particular, the first one of those is to move back to Resolution 11. And here there has been some offline consultation and identification of a possible way forward. We do have a document that I have put in under my name, DT73. So if we could go to that document and see, I think all the interested parties have been consulted, and I think we have, hopefully, a way forward here on Resolution 11. So if we could have that on the screen, please.

 So as we remember, we had a variety of proposals. We had come to the conclusion in our discussion that perhaps it was too simple to simply put responsibility for 2 over to 17 simply because of one area of overlap.

 There are a number of edits here in the document that came from some of the source documents. I think really what's important is if we get down to the resolves section of the document, which here we've, I think, reached agreement among some of the proponents that, given a relatively small degree of interaction, we may not need an overall point of contact. We do have in Resolves 1 that the relative Study Groups should continue to collaborate, and we have identified some of the possible areas of collaboration that were listed in the -- by the discussion that we had earlier on this quality of service, electronic services, security of mobile payment. And so that's an exemplary list, so it's preceded by "such as," and that would go into Resolves 1, and then what had been in original Resolves 3 was something that, in fact, was not a resolves but was an instructs or should have been an instructs, and so this is instructs the Director of the Telecommunications Standardization Bureau to encourage and assist this collaboration between the two.

 So that's the essence of it. The document has been posted, so DT73 has the text. I think all parties who were involved in the discussion seem content with what's been selected for the early material, and it's been kept short enough and crisp enough, I think, to be in scale for the degree of interaction. So we do have something that's under two pages, but I think captures the essential points.

 So can I ask if there's any comment to this proposal as a way forward for revising Resolution 11?

 Okay. I see no requests for the floor, so can I ask your agreement that we accept this text and forward it via the Editorial Committee to the Plenary for approval?

 Okay. I'm seeing only nodding heads and no requests for the floor, so that's agreed. Thank you.

 So next we have to consider is the results of the drafting activity on Resolution 55. Here we have a document, 56, to consider.

 So I believe Argentina led this drafting activity, so if you could take us through the proposed update in DT56.

 >> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, indeed, for this Resolution 55, there were two proposals for updating, one from Argentina and one from Japan.

 We worked jointly in order to be able to come back with a joint text, which we now put before the meeting. Basically, the text and the considerings is updating all the regulation that is have taken place in the area of gender perspective since 2008 up until now, including resolutions not only of the ITU, but of the United Nations and ECOSOC. I don't know if you want to cover it point by point or if we can move through.

 >> CHAIR: We can move through until I start seeing requests from the floor to stop us. Thank you.

 >> ARGENTINA: Then under recognizing, there is also emphasis put on matters relating to the essentials of standardization in terms of development and globalization of ICT, equal participation of women and men in this area.

 And finally, under resolved, where we have -- this is perhaps where we have the most significant changes, and it is that the ITU should continue to encourage the inclusion of gender perspective in all its work, as well as the use of gender-neutral language in ITU-T activities and groups and within TSAG and Study Groups. And also that gender perspectives should be included in order to ensure the effective implementation of all the outcomes and results of this assembly and that high priority be given to training and hiring and operations within the ITU of gender issues, both within TSAG and the Advisory Group on Development and that there is interest shown in matters relating to this matter. And we also ask the Director of the Bureau to include gender matters in all work of the TSB where -- which is currently applied to ITU's work in this area.

 And that special training be given to TSB staff on gender matters and that Member States and Sector Members are encouraged to contribute to the goals of gender activities and participation by women and men in standardization work, and that there is encouragement in the participation of women in leadership positions. It also instructs that there should be encouragement for the participation of women in all ITU-T activities and that women working in the areas of standardization should be identified in order to create a women in standardization group.

 And that annual reviews be carried out on the progress of this issue and that results be shared with TSAG and at the next assembly.

 And then finally, the Secretary-General is invited to collaborate in these matters with the United Nations' organizations and that staff of the ITU are also encouraged to collaborate with the guides on gender-neutral language style in order to avoid any undue use of gender-related language.

 And Sector Members are also invited to encourage the promotion of candidates from women for presidencies, chairmanships, vice chairmanships, and that there is participation of women in all areas of work and that women are nominated for working in Standardization sector of ITU-T. And there is also promotion of ICT for women and girls so that they may be involved in careers related to the standardization sector.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Argentina, for taking on this drafting activity.

 So we have in front of us a proposed revision to Resolution 55. Any comments or questions to this proposal?

 Okay. I see no requests for the floor, so can we agree to propose an update of Resolution 55 through the Editorial Committee to the Plenary? Can we agree to this text?

 I see no requests for the floor, so that's agreed. Thank you very much.

 So here -- and I notice I forgot to do it on one of our previous decisions -- I notice that there is some possible budgetary implications, so I see, for example, the need to train TSB staff, and so I would ask your agreement also that we can send this as something that COM 2 should be considered for possible budgetary implications. So can I have your agreement to that?

 Okay. We will send this to COM 2.

 The other one I forgot to ask that same question was the update of Recommendation A.11. Here we may have a budgetary implication of saving money because we have some paper documents we don't need to produce. So I would suggest we also send our update of A.11 to the Budget Control Committee. Can I have your agreement to that?

 Okay. That's agreed.

 Moving to our next item of business, Resolution 68 was our next drafting group. We have a document in DT72.

 Okay. So I believe Musab. Thank you. So I believe Sudan chaired this drafting group, so if you could introduce this for us, it's DT72, if we could have that on the screen. Thank you.

 >> SUDAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The editorial group met at 8:30 this morning to discuss Resolution 68. First of all, I would like to thank all those who participated in this meeting, the representative of the USA as well as the representative of the Arab group, representatives of Japan, and also a representative of Italy, and I would like also to thank Mr. Bigi.

 This is the revised copy that resulted from our meeting, and we submitted to you for your approval. If you need me to read it paragraph by paragraph, I could do that. However, to save time, I could leave it for you to take a decision regarding its approval.

 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you.

 If we could just scroll through it slowly, I think the document has been posted, so we have got a number of mostly editorial changes A, B, C at the top. When we get to the resolves, we've merged in a change from TSAG for the CTO meetings, so if we can -- so it looks like the number of changes is actually a bit smaller than I might have expected with some of the inputs. But I think that we do have a consensus, as I understand, of the drafting group to propose this forward.

 So any questions or comments to the text as you find it in DT72?

 I see no requests for the floor, so can I have your agreement to the text in DT72 as an update of Resolution 68 to forward via the Editorial Committee to the Plenary for approval?

 I see no requests for the floor, so that's agreed. Thank you very much.

 So thank you all. Looking at where we are, we have some more work that is yet to be completed, but we do not have the document availability to proceed. So let me inform you what we have ahead of us for tomorrow morning. So I believe we meet after morning coffee, if I'm not mistaken.

 So we will have to hear the completion of the work in Working Group 3A, where a document has been provided to us for an update of Resolution 1, but not yet posted or translated, so the document is complete but not yet available.

 We have -- we expect an update of the Brazilian proposal for indicating contributors and editors or recognizing those for the support of academic participation. That drafting group will be held at 17:30 today, so in about 15 minutes' time, so we expect to have that document available for us in the morning.

 The document for the proposed new resolution from Canada, which is the TSAG responsibilities for strengthening collaboration, that work has been completed. A document has been submitted to us, but as before, not yet available.

 We will also have available to examine tomorrow will be the report of Working Group 3A, our own report of this session, and that will complete -- then we will need to come back after consultations and decide on a way forward concerning the Russian proposal for update of recommendation A.5.

 So three resolutions and A.5 as the substantive work that is ahead of us for Committee 3. So I am cautiously optimistic that perhaps we can finish that work by lunch and release some of the extra periods, but of course, it depends on -- on the discussions that you have offline and whether we can quickly reach consensus.

 So I appreciate your hard work so far. We've made it through most of our work in this Committee, and I thank you for your cooperation to get us to this point. And so I certainly invite you to discuss offline the remaining issues, and we will have the remaining documents in the morning for your consideration.

 So if there are no other business for today, I'll adjourn today's session and look forward to seeing you after morning coffee tomorrow. Thank you.
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