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>> CHAIR: Good afternoon, everybody. Welcome back to the final session of meeting 4, Committee 3. We have a number of items of business to conclude before afternoon coffee, as we have already donated our final period of use of this room to the Budget Control Committee. So I would like with your cooperation to get through the rest of the material in front of us.

One small item that I noticed we neglected. I was asked a question of clarification on the text of Resolution 32 which we are not going to touch again but I did notice in there that there was a bullet about waiving charges for some remote participation aspects for participants in developing countries, and I would suggest that we send Resolution 32, which we've already approved and put to the Editorial Committee, I think all the way back in contribution 93, and we send that to the Editorial Committee.

So can I have your agreement to send that? I see no requests for the floor, so that's agreed. With that, I think we have a few items of business, and we'll proceed according to document availability, so we had some comments on the proposal this morning from DT78 from the Drafting Group on the strengthening collaboration Resolution, so we do have available a document 78, R1, if I can ask Mr. Gracie to introduce this for us, please.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Yes, thank you, Chairman. 78, R1, contains the changes that were agreed this morning, with respect to considering C in particular and the addition of text in a new considering D with respect to the various models for collaboration which already exist between ITU and other organisations. The first substantive change is to remove references to the specific A‑series recommendations, A4, A5, A6, A23, and in particular to remove a reference to supplement 3. In its place will be a general reference to the fact that ITU‑T's external cooperation a guided by a selection number of A‑series recommendations and supplements.

So that general reference or generic reference replaces the text that appeared in the original draft Resolution. The second change is a new considering D, which makes reference to the existing collaboration arrangement between ITU and the World Standards Cooperation. Also the arrangements among participating standards organisations that form part of the Global Standards Collaboration, and the collaboration arrangements which are in place with respect to intelligent transportation systems. All of these were cited as important examples of collaboration between ITU and various entities and organisations that was discussed at the Global Standards Symposium.

So substantially, that's the two major changes to the draft new Resolution. Again, the text in invites TSAG is still in square brackets pending the outcome of the discussion on the Strategic Review Committee, which is continuing in Committee 4.

So with that, Chairman, I present document DT78, Rev 1, for your further consideration. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Gracie, for this work that seems to address the points that were raised this the discussion this morning, eliminating the specific reference to a supplement, and adding the additional references that you had noted in your introduction this morning, and as we see, we still have the square bracketed text for invites TSAG for alignment with the results of Committee 4, and that's not something we can resolve here until Committee 4 has concluded its work.

But with that introduction, are there any comments to this proposal?

And seeing no requests for the floor, can I have your agreement that we send this via the Editorial Committee to the Plenary for approval, pending, of course, the Resolution of the square bracketed text when we see the results of COM4 on the Review Committee? I see no requests for the floor so that's agreed. Thank you very much.

So the next item of business for which we have a document is the way forward with Recommendation A.5, and here we have a document DT88 which contains the results of the discussion this morning. And so you'll see in this document in the first place at the front, the proposal of the sentence that I indicated I would add to the report of COM3, so this will be published in the WTSA proceedings. You'll find this in our report in the blue book. The next part of this is the small amendment that we came up with in consultation for Recommendation A.5. And in particular, this applies to clause 2.5, which is the clause that covers the situation where we make a request to another standards body to have the copyright permission to incorporate their text. Now, the existing text of clause 2.5 ends with a sentence that reads, "should the organisation decline to provide such a statement, the incorporation shall not be made."

The proposal from Russia is to replace that final sentence ‑‑ and this is after consultation ‑‑ with a sentence that reads, as you see in document TD88, "should the organisation decline to provide such a statement or fail doing this, the incorporation shall not be made," and then another sentence in this case, the decision to incorporate the reference instead of the text must be made by consensus.

So the existing text assumes that you're done. I think the amendment suggests that a recourse that could be considered by the Study Group if they get a refusal to incorporate the text is that they will fall back to incorporating by reference.

And I think we can rely on our Editorial Committee friends maybe to improve the English a bit. I don't propose we do that here.

One thing I would suggest is that when we do make the decision by consensus to incorporate the text by reference, perhaps we could add, with your permission, at the end of that sentence ‑‑ and I think this is editorial, because the meaning is the same ‑‑ we could add, in brackets, "see clause 2.3," because when we do go back and decide to incorporate by reference, I wouldn't like us to forget that there is a set of qualification criteria that should be considered in the case where we are going to do it by reference.

So it shouldn't simply be a matter that we make the reference on getting the "no" answer. We make the reference after getting the "no" answer and deciding upon the qualification criteria.

So, any comments to that proposal?

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. I would like to point out, having looked at this proposal to correct the text, I would like to state our position, namely, if you look at paragraphs 2 and 3 of Recommendation A.5 they speak of formal implementation. They have formal requirements on the inclusion of references, and we are afraid this will lead to a situation when these requirements are fulfilled, but our purpose, our objective, since we're extremely concerned about references, because in those recommendations where we're talking about risks, risks with information security, with security in ICTs, we're afraid of these risks, and we could be against inclusion of references without a text there where we see risks rather than where the formal requirements of Recommendation A.5 are or are not fulfilled. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I believe this text was the result of consultations with the Russian Delegation, and with the Chairman of Study Group 17, and so the understanding with the agreement of the Chairman of Study Group 17 was that we should not rush to do something overbroad in A.5 now, but should task TSAG with that. So that was the first part of what you find in document DT88. So I'll repeat the sentence, TSAG is invited to consider possible improvements to the mechanisms and the practice of including references to documents of other standards organisations as described in recommendation ITU‑T A.5. So as you've rightly observed, the ‑‑ there is one of the qualification criteria that the document must be available, so part of the criteria that should be evaluated by the membership should be an available document for examination.

So the proposed way forward after consultation was to make this small change in clause 2.5. And I thought this had the agreement of the Russian Head of Delegation and the Chairman of Study Group 17, and furthermore, to charge TSAG to examine other improvements to the mechanism, and further to examine whether there are problems with the application of the mechanism, in particular, reminding Study Groups to apply the evaluation criteria, which seemed not to in all cases not to have been done.

So with that understanding, let me ask if there are any objections to proceeding on this basis for this meeting as the results of the consultation?

Russia, please?

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. I have to ask for a break. I have to consult my Delegation. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We will return to this topic after we see if there are other documents available. Another item we left pending was with respect to Resolution 1.

I believe we reviewed the entire text of that resolution and we were awaiting some words after consultation between the United States and Brazil on the wording of considering C. Can I ask if there's a solution on that issue, United States, please?   
 >> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Mr. Chair, we haven't had an opportunity yet to consult. Is there a possibility we may be able to get back to you as soon as possible?   
 >> Chair: Uh thank you, the difficulty we have here is we've already released our forth period session today to the Budget Control Committee. So we must absolutely complete our work, uh, at the latest by, uh, 3:45. So I, I can certainly take a ten minute break to check these two items. But we do have to come back and conclude. We'll ask for a ten‑minute break. I think there was a drafting session. I see the convener in the room. Perhaps we can have any results of that drafting posted by the time we reconvene in ten minutes time. So precisely at 3:00, please.

[Ten‑minute break].

>> Chair: Good afternoon, everybody. Let's reconvene; we have a few items we need to conclude before 3:45. I ask for your cooperation. So, a number of things. We've clarified with Russia that their concern wasn't with the original proposed text as it’s found in DT88. Their concern was with the proposed additional reference that was just an idea that I thought was helpful. If it's not found to be helpful, I'll withdraw that suggestion. So I'm happy to put forward for your consideration, the text as proposed by Russia.

Secondly, it was suggested that the words, while I read them out this morning, there wasn't any question, but the word possible didn't seem to be strong enough and I would offer as a replacement, TSAG is invited to consider any necessary improvements and mechanisms to the practice including references.

So with your indulgence, I would offer that for your consideration. Russia please?   
 >> Russia: Thank you, Chairman. Firstly, I should like to confirm that we must have misunderstood each other on the text to the modification to Recommendation A.5. As to the instruction to TSAG, we have a text ready, which I will read out if you permit. As complex decision, we instruct TSAG to study the question of making necessary changes to Recommendation A.5, including the proposal contained in the contribution of the Russian Federation to this assembly. So as to unambiguously determine the procedure of interaction with other standard organisations both at the stage of developing recommendations and of correcting their text and this should take full account of the members of ITU to obtain unambiguous text of recommendations and unambiguous procedures to perceive them under the control of ITU members.

This will fully reflect our interest and our proposal, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, Russia. The statement was rather long and within that statement, I, I did, uh, hear, hear something that I suspect we would need legal consultation on from the advisor about asking for, that, uh, that ITU should have change control over the text of other organisations. So if I had heard your intervention correctly, I, I think that would be difficult to get agreement to put in the COM3 report. I think we can instruct TSAG to study it and decide what is necessary, but I think it's difficult to be that specific in what action TSAG should take. Because, after all, the results of the study are what exposes what is required to be done. Russia, please?   
 >> Russia: Thank you, Chairman. Let me explain. We're not telling TSAG what, specifically, it has to do and results it should achieve, but just directions in which it should work with Recommendation A.5. In our view, Recommendation A.5 in the form it currently understands has two possible interpretations and this is something which often happens. As a result we have the situation with the problems which we are highlighting in the form in which it currently exists, thank you.   
 >> Chair: Okay, let me take this, then in, uh, two steps. And I, I think we have, in fact, two things to decide and not necessarily to decide as a package. So, the first step would be to take what's in document 88 at the end, the proposed amendment to A.5. And the replacement of the final sentence of clause 2.5. So, any, any comments on that proposal for an amendment of A.5? United States, please?   
 >> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I had sought floor time prior to your proposal but I wanted to note that while we appreciate Russia's efforts to put alternate language, not having had the opportunity to study or to review this language and the significant legal implications, we'd like time to study this language and until then, we will not be in a position to support the Russian proposal, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, any other comments to this proposal? So, I will come back to this later in the agenda. If I could ask that the, uh, that Russia provide, in writing, preferably an e‑mail to, to one of the counselors here, so we can get it displayed on the screen. We won't take that as the immediate next item of business, but in order to decide on a rather lengthy text, I think we're going to need to see it. I'm told that we can proceed without a coffee break and we can run right up until 4:15, but at 4:15, the Budget Control Committee will take over this room. We lose any additional meeting time after that.

So another item of business we were going to return to was the wording of considering C in Resolution 1. Here we had a suggestion of some offline consultations, uh, with Brazil and the United States to try to come up with some mutually acceptable wording and can I, uh, ask for a report on where those consultations stand, please? United States?   
 >> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Following consultation with my Delegation, I'm informed that we did indeed have an offline conversation with Brazil. While we have agreement on one particular part of the subsection in question, we have not been able to reach agreement on the other part. We have agreement on the first part, which, um, strikes Melbourne 1988 within the context of the International Telecommunication Regulations and replaces it with the word enforce. The sentence where we have agreement, or the part of the sentence where we have agreement, which would read that the ITU‑T recommendations resulting from these studies must be in harmony with the International Telecommunications Regulations in force. However, we do not have agreement with regards to the latter part of the sentence. Particularly the words in the preamble and article. So based on that, I believe our position is to bracket the part of the section which we haven't been able to find middle ground on and to send it on to Plenary. Thank you very much.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, United States, I'm trying to get this on the screen here, so we can see exactly what we're discussing. So if you, if you scroll down to considering C, you passed it. Okay. Control room, can we have the projection? Okay, we have this on the screen and so, I, I think that, uh, in force probably doesn't need the, the round brackets, it's simply, regulations enforce, if I understand correctly. And so United States, if you could clarify where the square brackets would begin in this sentence and where they would end.  
 >> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The square brackets would begin just before the phrase "the preamble." And would end after "of those." Sorry, it would end after Article 1.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, United States. As we prefer, if we can avoid it, certainly the preamble and Article 1 are contained in the regulations and so, while I'm not a lawyer, my reading would be that the regulations, the preamble and Article 1 are part of the regulations of the meaning of deleting that phrase, would be, uh, the same. So, one easy solution might be, if we could agree, simply to the deletion of those words. So, let me make one attempt to see if we could agree to the update of Resolution 1 with the deletion of the preamble and Article 1. Okay, we seem to have an interpretation issue. Do we have French interpretation? Okay, so we have it.

So, uh, what, what I'd like to put before you is whether we can resolve this without square brackets by agreeing with the possibility to delete the preamble and Article 1 and simply indicate the objective set down in those regulations. Would there be any opposition to us, agreeing to Resolution 1 with that text? United States?   
 >> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My instructions are to request that this issue be taken up in the Plenary.  
 >> Chair: Okay, so, uh, if, if, if we have to preserve both options of keeping those words or not, uh, we will do that. Of course we prefer to eliminate square brackets where possible, but, uh, could I then ask whether anyone would have any opposition to taking this text with the indicated words, uh, the preamble and Article 1 of in square brackets for the Plenary to take a decision on whether to accept those words or not? We'd send this to the Editorial Committee and they'd prepare the text for the Plenary. Can I have your agreement? Brazil, please?   
 >> Brazil: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If the agreement is to keep the square brackets so we can decide during Plenary, yes, we agree with that, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Okay, thank you very much. So, any opposition to sending the text as you see it with the square brackets, around those words, but the rest of the resolution agreed? I see no requests for the floor, so that's agreed, thank you very much.

Thank you, I understand we're waiting for a posting of the results of the continuation of the Drafting Group on Resolution B1. That'd be a DT83R1. Remaining in documentation that we have is back to the topic of, uh, A.5. So there are two parts to the problem and perhaps we can take them independently.

So, one is the issue about what text we would include in our report for inviting TSAG to take some action and there, we are waiting to see the Russian proposal and have it ready to put on the screen because it's a rather long statement.

The other part of it would be whether we'd have agreement to the change that has been proposed for A.5, which would be a replacement of the final sentence of clause 2.5. So...

Okay, thank you, I was looking for us to have this text on the screen, so the proposal for Recommendation A.5 would be to replace the final sentence of clause 2.5 as you see on the screen and can also find in DT88. Can I have any comment to that proposal? Okay, a little more readable now. Any comment to the proposal to make this modification to A.5? I see no requests for the floor, so can I have your agreement to, uh, to forward this to the editorial, via the Editorial Committee to the Plenary for approval? United States?   
 >> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In the second revised statement, should the organisation decline to provide such statement or fail doing this, the incorporation shall not be made. You may want to consider the word, the incorporation may not be made as there might be other extenuating circumstances which might require further deliberation or discussion. Or perhaps change along the lines of this incorporation shall not be made at that time, because in case something changes, we will want the flexibility to be able to go back.  
 >> Chair: Would Russia have any objection to the addition of the words in the first sentence "at that time?" Is that okay for Russia? Russia, please?   
 >> Russia: Thank you, Chairman, it seems to us that the sentence is already flexible enough in, on the basis of consensus, it corresponds to the spirit of the ITU and I think that we should stay with this wording, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, and of course, as always, any recommendation is subject to revision and if one issue or one revision of a recommendation should contain a reference, and a subsequent revision, we're able to incorporate the text because permission had been obtained in the meantime, that could be, that kind of change could be made in the text of the recommendation. And so, ITU, of course, has control over its own texts. So, it seems like the, the meaning is essentially the same. The point trying to be addressed is what will the Study Group do if the other organisation declines to allow copying of the text?

And, um, the, my understanding of the document would be you would have to back up to clause 2.3, but the request is to add something here indicating that you need to reach consensus to use a reference, rather than incorporating the text. So this is the proposal. Anymore comment to that proposal before I ask if the, if we can have agreement?

Okay, I see no requests for the floor, could I have your agreement that we send this text forward for a revision of A.5? I'm seeing no requests for the floor, so that's agreed, we'll send it via the Editorial Committee to the Plenary, thank you.

Thank you, let me ask Russia to confirm whether you've sent your proposed text for the report to TSB so we can get it projected on the screen. Let me ask you to do that while we're looking for the next document, which will be the, the further work by the Drafting Group on, on the proposed new resolution for Brazil. We're looking for a DT83R1 and as soon as my sync tool finishes here, I'll see if that's available.

Thank you for your patience, ladies and gentlemen. Just to tell you what we're doing, we're waiting for, and trying to get availability of two more things for our consideration. One is some proposed text from Russia for the report about how we might instruct TSAG and we'd like to display that on the screen for your consideration.

The other thing we're looking for is the result of the drafting that happened at 1:30 today. That will be an 83R1 which we hope will be posted momentarily, when we can consider that for approval. And once we can consider those two items, Committee 3 will be complete and we do intend, because we will lose the room, to finish that before 4:15. But I hope you'll indulge us a few moments of silence while we wait for those two pieces of text. Thank you.

Okay, thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Sorry for the delay. We had, earlier, introduced from Russia, a, another suggestion for what text we might include in our report as an alternative to what I initially suggested in DT88 and/or the amendment I had verbally, so, I had seen a request for the floor from Russia. Do you still need the floor or should we examine this text? Okay, no request for the floor. So I will give everybody a minute to read what is on the screen. I will slowly read the words and then, we'll ask if there's any comment to the proposal to include this kind of text in the COM3 report.

The words are considering that Recommendation A.5 in its current state doesn't provide strict regulation procedures for the use of references, full stop, in order to solve this issue, we propose to instruct TSAG to provide necessary modifications to Recommendation A.5 noting the contribution of Russia Federation C55. Modifications should be aimed at achieving strong rules with collaboration for other organisations at different stages of processing. The ITU recommendations including their development improvement and modification.

So, is there any, uh, any comment to that suggestion? Canada, please?   
 >> Canada: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Canada suggests to delete the world regulation before procedures, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, any objection to removing that word? Okay, for Russia? Russia, please?   
 >> Russia: Thank you, Chairman. We agree.  
 >> Chair: Okay, further comment to this text? United States?   
 >> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. A couple of observations. One is the issue of whether this is a case of their not being adequate procedures for how references are made or whether this is a case of procedures existing but not being followed adequately. From that perspective, the issue also is what can be done to strengthen the existing procedures and put in elements where those procedures are not adequate. And in that light, we would like to propose that in the first sentence about considering that Recommendation A.5 in its current state doesn't provide strict procedures. You may want to reconsider that, considering that existing recommendations in A.5, for the use of references may not be strictly followed. And in order to strengthen the observation of procedures, we propose to instruct TSAG to provide necessary modifications to Recommendation A.5, noting the contribution of the Russian Federation. And the second, we'd like to suggest, modifications should be aimed at strengthening the rules, strengthening collaboration, or strengthening the rules for collaboration with other organisations, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. Let's get the first part of the proposed edit from the United States, then I'll turn to Russia. So, United States, if you could repeat your earlier suggestion, uh....  
 >> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: It's okay, Mr. Chair. That's provided me a few additional minutes to refine my language. Considering that in some instances, existing provisions of Recommendation A.5 for the use of references may not have been followed ‑‑ I'm sorry, for the use of references ‑‑ we propose to instruct the TSAG. It's basically deleting everything from thereon until we propose to instruct.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, so let me turn the floor, then, to the Russian Federation.  
 >> Russia: Thank you, Chairman. We'd like to clarify, because what the United States proposed to us seems that the recommendation is not being complied with, but it's not a question of the recommendation and making changes to it, our position is that the recommendation is such that it makes it possible to do this. It doesn't give an unambiguous set of rules for using references. And that is what we have to stress. Not whether somebody complies with the recommendation or not, but that the recommendation doesn't give unambiguous rules.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, Vice Chairman of COM3?   
 >> Thank you, Distinguished Chairman. In terms of terminology, it seems the expression proposed by the American colleagues, instead of achieving strong rules, we're using the words strengthening the rules. Well, here, some uncertainty is being injected because it's one thing to achieve strong rules, we are saying that the rules have to be strong for everyone and they have to be observed and I very much like the sentence from our colleagues, but on the other hand, if we talk about strengthening, we can strengthen these rules, but at the same time, they are of indeterminate strength. Thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, Russian Federation?   
 >> Russia: Thank you, Chairman, we propose, nevertheless to revert to the text we proposed earlier. Perhaps to make it more clear and easy to understand for all participants, we could add the words about not making, something that doesn't make the interpretation of the recommendation ambiguous.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, I'm going to inject myself here, obviously I think I've, uh, opened what we would call in English "a can of worms" by wordsmithing of text before it appears in a report. I think I have a sense of what participants would like to see and I would like to, I think, claim the pen, again, as Chairman and offer that COM3 should have something in the report, along the lines of COM3 instructs TSAG to investigate, identified problems with referencing to, uh, to develop any necessary strengthening of the rules of recommendation, ITU‑T A.5 or improvements required in its application.

So COM3, I'll say it in dictation speed, instructs...this would be my proposal, we don't prejudge, we know there are problems, but we don't prejudge how many of those problems result from unclarity of the rules or how much, uh, results from people being unaware of the rules or not following them. As with many of our procedures, I think we, uh, we write something down and we rely on delegates, we rely on TSB, we rely on people to carry those rules out. So the, uh, the problems that we have are not always the fact that the rules are unclear.

Sometimes people didn't bother to read the rules and don't bother to follow them. We need to make sure the rules are followed and we need to find out if we need to improve the rules, but we'll do that through a process of asking TSAG to investigate the problems and to, uh, to have two avenues for addressing those. One avenue being to strengthen the rules with anything necessary and another avenue being to, uh, have improvements in application of the rules. That'd be my proposal as Chairman for, uh, how to move forward here. Russian Federation, please?   
 >> Russia: Thank you, Chairman. On the whole, we support your proposal, but, we have two corrections. After develop, the, instead of any, develop the necessary strengthening of the rules. The necessary. That's the first amendment we'd like to make.

Second, we would, after all, like our contribution to this assembly to be mentioned, to draw attention of TSAG to the problem we have raised here. Thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you, what I can suggest here is identified problems with referencing and I say, for example, this contribution, people may bring other problems to our attention, but you've brought some to our attention in this contribution. I'm happy to insert that reference. So, uh, with that, are we close to being able to conclude on this? Reminding we have just under 20 minutes left and one more document to look at. Russia, please?   
 >> Russia: Thank you, Chairman. I think that this is the last amendment. I hope so. Instead of "for example", could you please put "noting." Thank you.  
 >> Chair: Fine for me. So...okay, I'm not going to treat that as an approval, because this is, after all, report text, and the report itself, in whole, is approved, but I think that has helped us to develop text and will save us a little bit of time in describing this discussion.

So we will accept that and you'll see this text in our report. So, we have one more item of business, and let me simply look to see if the document is available. It is? So the document is DT83R1. Could I ask Emirates who chaired the Drafting Group to cover this.  
 >> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Chairman, we met midday to discuss proposals submitted by Brazil. In light of discussions in Committee 3, this...this should cover everything, academia, the, uh, Telecommunication Standardization Organisations and we asked the group to study the mechanisms so that we could take this on board and take account all the participants in the Study Groups. We took note on all the comments and thank you for giving us the ten‑minute break as to be able to introduce amendments and corrections to the document. DT83, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. We have in front of us, DT83, it does take on board an amendment to the title, not unlike the one described, uh, by France Telecom orange this morning and other amendments to the text. Can I have your comments to this proposal? Spain, please?   
 >> Spain: Thank you, Chairman. I'm still reading this proposal. It seems that in considering B, there's some text missing. The sentence finishes halfway through, thank you.  
 >> Chair: Thank you. I agree, we need to, uh ‑‑ yes, we could solve this one of two ways. We could either replace the rest of the sentence or delete the words that Mr. Jones has highlighted if we don't have some replacement text. Suggestion from the convener of the Drafting Group on this point? Emirates, please?   
 >> United Arab Emirates: Thank you. On considering B, we discussed this during our ten‑minute break. Perhaps we could stop after the word evaluated.  
 >> Chair: Yes, thank you, that seems to solve the problem and make the sentence read correctly. So, any other comments to this proposal? Just, uh, maybe scroll down to the resolve so people have a chance to, okay, do we have resolves in here? Okay, so we have a very simple resolves that this is important to acknowledge the contributions and then the instructs are the substance for the director and for TSAG to investigate the mechanism and inviting member states.

So, any additional comment to this proposal? Then can I have your agreement with the amendment indicated to this text for sending via the Editorial Committee to the Plenary for approval as a new resolution?

I see no requests for the floor, that's agreed. Thank you very much. And, with that, uh, Committee 3 has completed our work. And I'm delighted that we have been able to do that before the end of our allocated time. I would like to thank all of the delegates, all of the contributors, Distinguished Guests, I'd like to thank all of my Vice Chairmen and the Chairmen of the two working groups we had before us.

I want to put special emphasis in thanking my Vice Chairmen that all of them have volunteered to do work, including the leading of Drafting Groups. I think that's a tribute to the, uh, administrations that have nominated them for the Vice Chair position, to have selected individuals who are willing to come do the work to help us complete our tasks. That makes a great deal of difference in being able to get through things.

I'd also like to thank the TSB staff who has helped us, our counselors, uh, Tatiana and Greg who are sitting to my right and left. Also we've had assistance from Sara Scott in the background, posting documents, assistance from Greg Ratta with Working Group 3B. We've had a lot of help to arrive at this point and I do want to thank everybody for their work.

And of course, we couldn't do this at all, uh, without the interpreters who have, uh, lived through our, our, sometimes fumbling path through the material. But, uh, thank you for your help in allowing us to communicate and, uh, allowing several of the important issues to be, to be settled among us.

So, thank you all, I will see you in, in the Plenary and we will finalize this work that we've moved so far along. I see a request for the floor from The Emirates, please?   
 >> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Chairman. If I may, I'd like to take the floor one final time in this group. I, myself, would like to thank you, Chairman, for your wisdom in guiding work in this group and I'd also like to thank your Vice Chairs who have been instrumental in securing these fortunate outcomes of this work. I'd also like to thank the interpreters. Thank you to everyone and thank you, personally, to you, Chairman.

[applause]  
 >> Chair: Thank you very much. We're adjourned.

[Meeting concluded at 16:06 local time].
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