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>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to this second session of Working Groups 3‑A to Committee 3. It seems there are a few less people than normal. Maybe some people have forgotten we are starting earlier today, which is why I have are given you five extra minutes in which to sit down.

You can find the agenda is Document ADM 15. We will finish the discussion on recommendation A1 which we began the day before yesterday and then move on to resolution one.

We had favorable wind behind us two days ago. We made good progress, and I hope that will be the case again today. I would like to thank you for the cooperative spirit in which we worked two days ago. I think that will be the case again today.

I would like to finish our work today to free up the slot allowed to us. I am sure a number of delegations would appreciate having that free slot so that they can go to other meetings.

So ladies and gentlemen, may I ask for your approval in adoption of the agenda in ADM 15? Thank you very much. Thank you to the technician for displaying what I wanted on the screen.

Let's begin with a short training exercise before we get into our real work. I saw yesterday evening that there is a slight difference between the versions. We have Work Methods in one document, and Working Methods in work document. The English‑speakers say "working methods" is better, and the interpreters will tell us if I am mistaken. But in French I'm not sure what the situation is, so if there is no opposition, I suggest we modify the title of Recommendation A1 to use "Working Methods" from now one, as this seems to be the most frequently used term in English. I don't think this is a substantive change.

I am quite unable to explain why this difference arose. Does anybody oppose this title change for purposes of consistency in our sector?

Thank you very much. It is so decided. Unless I am mistaken, last time we reached a stumbling block with .23310. We held a number of discussions about this. We agreed I would lead some informal consultations with the Representative of China Unicom, among others.

I checked with the TSB about what the usual practice is, and my proposal is as follows. I must apologize because the revised version of our working document was posted on the assembly website, the WTSA website.

You can find it below the agenda in ADM‑15, so you can find the link there. 23310 is the section we're dealing with. Here is my suggestion for an amendment on the basis of my discussions, particularly with China Unicom.

I would like to explain this in. In this sentence in the middle we use the official term "collective letters" which is the term used in the ITU.

I would like to remind you that this term, which can capitalized, refers to official representations of the plenaries of study groups and working parties, translated to the six official languages and circulated to the member states and sector members.

And you can find the section entitled Collective Letters on the website for each study group. These Collective Letters are not sent for reporter meetings because reporter meetings are not study group plenaries or working‑party plenaries.

We are going to a slightly amend the last sentence to the effect that a convening letter will use a TSB‑defined template. So all of these letters will use the same template and will be posted on the website for each study group at least two months prior to each reporter meeting.

And I remind you that reporter meeting is held outside the study group; it is separate and often not held in Geneva, for that matter.

So this template which the TSB will produce, it will include a section stating how the procedure for visa requirements works. So in our report I suggest that we mention we will ask the TSB in each study group web page to ask a section "Convening Letter Meetings" such as all invitations will appear in the same place and the section can be flagged where relevant.

So we will have the main section, and then under that we will have Can screening Letters for the Reporter Meetings which are held outside the general meetings of the study group.

So I hope this explanation was clear. But if you have any questions, please take the floor. If there are no questions, I suggest we proceed as I have suggested by accepting these amendments on the screen, and that we add a sentence to our report saying that these letters will appear in a well‑flagged section on the website.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank those to have assisted me in finding this compromise. I see no requests from the floor.

I think these practical amendments will give us a better understanding of what is going on in the study groups, so we are really improving our ITUT sector procedures with this.

The other item which was still pending relates to Section 325. We held a number of discussions about this, and I suggested that we should add sector members at the end.

That proposal gave us a better understanding of the content or the implication of this RCC proposal we have been dealing with.

And after a number of informal consultations with various different participants, including the ITU legal advisors, I have the following proposal.

We should slightly amend the RCC‑proposed sentence because in the English version it could have fallen fouled by interpretation. Late contributions, if they are deemed to be of major importance by the TSB director, can be accepted and published as study group contributions. In that case, the study groups or those participating in the study group, as a group they can together take the decision to consider the contribution in question or not.

So this is a decision at the level of a study group or working party, because as you know, both those entities can take decisions within the Union.

Are there any requests for clarification, or is anybody opposed to this? I see that the RCC would like to support this. I thank them for their support.

No requests for clarification from the floor, so thank you very much for your support. That is what we will then suggest to Committee 3. I would like to add that this sentence only clarifies what we already do, our current interpretation of the rules for meetings.

I think we can now resume our regular work, working through our agenda and this document. The next section is Section 333 on temporary documents or TDs, and more specifically, the deadlines which supply to certain TDs and their content.

I have a comment to make in this regard. Here "events" is not very clear. We haven't clearly defined it. It is not a term that we frequently use in the sector.

So ladies and gentlemen, I would like to draw your attention to the fact this might be wrongly interpreted. Perhaps RCC could shed light on what they understood this term to mean.

Are these reporter meetings that they are referring to? Are these reports from liaison organizations in other organizations, for instance? Could the RCC help us out?

I see Finland requesting the floor. I'm terribly sorry, Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. We understood it to mean any meeting from which we might receive a document, a deliverable of some kind. I am ready to submit any proposal that would be accepted here to replace the word "event".

We are open and do not want to be too narrow; we are just talking about a meeting of some kind from which we might receive a temporary document.

We were trying to put this as generally as possible, but we are ready to accept any other term or word that would be accepted by the ITUT sector and that would be more understandable to everyone. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you. Yes, that a also how I understood it.

A proposal springs to mind here. Having discussed this with a number of others, I know that we should not be too restrictive here. Perhaps we can say that these are reports on meetings ‑‑ sorry, I am just thinking as I go along.

The question I was asking myself was whether we wanted to add in the fact that we could have a report that is just for information, that that might not require a decision from the Study Group. In that case, there would be no need for a deadline.

Is that what we want to do, or do we want to leave the text as it currently stands? In that case, we could amend to "meetings" and I am not sure whether this is clear enough for everybody.

Does that give us understanding which meetings we are referring to? I see Spain requesting the floor.

>> SPAIN: Thank you very much, Chair. I would like to suggest wording which would leave us with all meetings considered in the previous paragraph. That would be one way out of this problem. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Sorry for the delay. Armenia?

>> ARMENIA: Thank you, Chairman. I apologize for taking some of your time, but I don't think we should be afraid of the word "events". If we think about all proposed conferences, meetings, forums and so on and if you look at the ITU website you see all of this is found under the "events" tab.

So I understand our task and your task is to make everyone's life easier for people to find the information they need on the ITU website. That is what we are trying to do, simplify things.

And if you go on the website, "events" is the word that strikes you. It covers all the meetings and plenary meetings, forums, everything.

So I really don't see why we are afraid of the word "events" in my view, but if you prefer some other word, and I of course support the RCC proposal.

But if you support some other word, I am certainly happy to go along and I agree what was said which the Russian Federation, I don't know why we need to reinvent the wheel because we do have the word "events" which covers all different types of meetings. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you. Is anybody opposed to retaining this word "events"? I see nobody. Thank you.

How about the terms in 333; is there any opposition to that? Seeing none, thank you very much. It is so decided. This is the text which we will put to Committee 3.

And I can delete the second proposal which came from the TSAG correspondents group which I put into reminders of the discussion held in July. Very well.

The final two issues to deal with are as follows. First we have a new annex which was discussed at length in the TSAG. It has been discussed, in fact, for more than a year now.

So there was a request from the TSAG to add this, Document 24, Proposal 7. Is anybody proposed to this? Apparently not, so thank you.

The final proposal is suppression of Appendix 1. It was also proposed by TSAG Document 24 Proposal 8, deletion of this appendix.

As I understand it, this was a direct were pose alto each study group from the TSAG, sent to the reporter just before the meet. They are asked to respect the format proposed by the TSB.

No one appears to be requesting the floor, so thank you.

The last amendment is in Appendix 2, but purely editorial, ITUT before the recommendation "references".

This correction would, in any case, have been applied by the drafting committee on receipt of this proposal. So we have made significant progress.

Does anybody have any comments to make about Recommendation A.1, or do we all agree to submit this now to Committee 3? I can't promise that it will appear on the Committee 3 agenda for the afternoon was the Secretariat has to send this to Geneva for translation, and so forth.

We are not sure if it will appear on this afternoon's agenda. But in any case, it will appear on the session of the next agenda. I see no one requesting the floor. It is so is decided.

The amended text, including the amendments which I made this morning will be commit to Committee 3 for approval. Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. That is great progress.

What remains on our agenda is Resolution 1. We have it on the screen now. Resolution 1. We have a number of contributions on Resolution 1. I will call for them to be briefly introduced.

As we did last time, I do wish you to be brief in your introductions to underscore changes of substance. Clearly, editorial amendments will be taken later when we go through this point by point.

First is Doc 38 and 9. Who will introduce that? Document 38 Add 9. Brazil?

>> BRAZIL: Thank you very much. This proposal is a fairly long document. I will try to be brief with every change we are proposing. Change No. 1 is editorial modification to the Title Resolution 1.

Change No. 2 will be change in the considering session on considering C. I would say this is also more editorial in nature because it refers to the Preamble in Article 1.

And since we will be revising that in the following weeks and we know the content of the other articles of the ITS, it is appropriate that we describe the mention to preamble in Article 1, and only mention the whole ITS as reference.

The following change is a change in the reference to the resolves of the Resolution 1. It is a change 20 the reference of the considering EMF and also includes considerations G and H.

The following changes are in Section 1, particularly in 1.3 where it talks about the establishment of resolutions in working methods and priority issues.

It has three items and three ways to consider the identification of priority issues. The next change is editorial on Point A of 1.4. The follow change is on Section 3 on Study Group management.

Here we are including the provisions of Resolution 166 from the conference of 2010 on the appointment of Advice Chairmen to study groups and on the regional represent in advisory groups and study groups and all the groups of the sectors.

Section 4 has editorial changes on 4.7. In section 5 on the duties of the director of the TSB, we have an addition, a new 5.3 which says that the director shall suggest editorial dates to WTSA resolutions and provide a recommendation as to whether or not the recommendations are significant enough.

We thank the director for providing this to the WTSA. It forms some editorial changes in Section 5. Section 7 has an amendment that is necessary, due to the suppression of Resolution 17 by Committee 4 on 7.1.11.

Mention to Resolution 17 should be changed to Resolution 44 since 17 was merged to 44. And these are the changes from the inter-American proposal. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you. There is also an RCC contribution. This is RCC 44 add 2. Who will introduce that? I see Finland requesting the floor ‑‑ sorry, Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: This up contribution, chairman and now I will just touch on the proposals relating to deadlines. Actually there are two proposals on deadlines.

We are talking about having the addition in the "considering" section, additional reference to 615. And then in Section 6 we suggest defining when input should be submitted to the Assembly.

Here we would like to make use of the decisions that were taken at Council, and it was decided that at conferences we would recommend that contributions be submitted no later than one month in advance.

However, since we have Resolution 165 and this does directly relate to assemblies, for that reason when we are talking about this, we have 14 calendar days as the deadline, as is reflected in 6.1.

For the rest, 6.2, we propose this be related only to the study groups in TSAG in order to work in accordance with the AC recommendations. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you. Canada, Document 58 add 5.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Canadian contribution supports the definition proposed by RCC on the definition of resolution.

In addition, with provide terms recommendation and questions provided in the draft text in Attachment 1 of the Canadian Contribution. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you. That is a contribution from one member. Do we have anyone seconding that proposal? Usbekistan.

>> UZBEKISTAN: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman we also have a contribution referred to by contribution, add 7 to 44, the RCC document.

And this is the document relating to the definition of text adopted by the sector, the standardization sector. We would like to thank Canada for the additional definition they have proposed.

And we consider that this is a matter of principle. The fact is that looking at all of the documents in the standardization sector, we find that we have no clear definition of resolution and recommendation.

So we don't have definitions of these question terms, question, recommendation and resolution. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: I apologize. I had forgotten about 44 add 7. I think tiredness is getting the better of me as the week goes on!

I do apologize for not having given you the floor earlier, Usbekistan. I understand you now support 54 add 55 from Canada?

>> UZBEKISTAN: Yes, Chairman. Thank you. We are supporting the definition as put forward by the Canadian Delegation; we support Canada. In essence it is very much in line with the RCC contribution.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Uzbekistan. Do you have other comments to make on add 7, or can we take it you have now introduced Add 7 in your previous intervention?

>> UZBEKISTAN: Yes, I think we have introduced it. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you. Are there any questions for clarification on these contributions? We will take questions for clarification, and then we will do as we did on Recommendation A1. In other words, I will go through the document and we will assent to it amendment by amendment.

But right now, are there clarification questions? If there are no questions and no one is asking for the floor, we will get right down to work.

Thank you. For the drafting committee, I noted we had to do some updating and depending on the outcome of the work between 17 and 44 and the work in Committee 4, that is, we have to amend the reference there. This takes into account a comment made by Brazil, in 17 and 44 are merged that will need to be appropriately reflected in our documents.

And that will be reflected in the documents sent to the drafting or editorial committee. So we start with the usual updating of place and time. I don't think there is any problem with that.

However, looking at consideration C and the deletion of the reference to Melbourne, the preamble and Article 1 of the ITRs, any objection to that? Thank you.

Now in considering F, here we have a reference to Resolution 165 from the conference. I don't think there should be any problem with that. As we did previously, you may see some slight editorial changes reflected on the screen.

These are slight changes that I myself have made. However, if you have a problem with any of these changes, don't hesitate to take the floor and let me know.

And of course, we also have the editorial committee that will be looking at this, as you know. Once we have approved this document and once it has been translated, I myself will go through the French version and check it.

As you know, that is the authentic version. So I will check it, as well as checking that there is no problem of alignment between the texts before being sent to the editorial committee. Brazil, please.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you. Regarding this consideration of F in Resolution 165, in our point of view, this amendment should be reviewed because as we all know, Resolution 165 created a lot of problems due to having not very good timelines for contributions. We had a lot of problems with the deadlines set by this resolution, with documents coming very late to the world conference on radio communications.

We also discussed this a lot during this year's council session, and we actually approved the decision that urged member states to respect a different deadline for WCIT this year.

We consider adding the resolution, because 2 will either be amended during the next conference, or it will be suppressed. Thank you. Germany?

>> GERMANY: Maybe I am also a bit tired. I would like to go back to C, where it deleted Melbourne in 1988. Can I have some reason for why we did that? Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Brazil, and then I will answer your question.

>> BRAZIL: The reason is that whatever international communications, whenever or wherever they were amended, the important thing is to follow the current, valid text.

So there is no need to mention the place and time of the last world conference on international telecommunications that amended the text. Whatever text was amended is the valid text.

If we take the place and time reference, it will avoid necessity for future changes in this same consideration of C. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: I see Finland asking, so I take it is Russia or the RCC again?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes, we are neighbors here; no problem. With reference to Resolution 165, a comment. We may not like Resolution 165, but that is not the point; it is a decision taken by the supreme body of our Union, the ITU.

For that reason or reference, the resolution directly concerns what is appropriate and indeed has to be included. The content of the resolution may change at some later stage, but that will be a decision for other people to take.

We have no right ourselves to change it. We may share some of the concerns expressed by colleagues, but only a plenary conference has a right to amend or change this resolution, which is a resolution having a direct impact on the matter we are dealing with.

We might call for something different to be done, but we are obliged to put into practice a decision taken by a plenary conference. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Brazil is asking for the floor, but before I give you the floor, I am going to go back to Considering C. Germany raised a point about this.

Germany, could we actually delete what is deleted on the screen? Would you agree to that deletion? Or do you want us to put this in brackets at this stage? There is of course another option.

After all, there will be some editorial or drafting work done on these resolutions after the WTSA, as I understand it. You know, there will be the publication of the acts and it all takes a while with months going by before we have the absolute‑definitive printed, translated version of all these documents.

So we could put a note in our report, and we could ask for this to be updated in accordance with decisions taken at WCIT. Germany.

>> GERMANY: I have problems with this kind of making reference to something that is in the future. I probably could live with it, but I would also prefer to have somewhere in between so that we don't lose this point. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Brazil, can you tell us first of all whether at this stage we could keep a reference to Melbourne 1988 in brackets and delete the preamble in Article 1? After that I will again give you the floor to talk about Resolution 165.

>> BRAZIL: Of course we can keep Melbourne in brackets but I honestly don't see the need to keep the reference since we only have one valid ITR at a time.

Can I comment on Resolution 165? Okay. I thank Russia for making the clarification on the need for Resolution 165.

We of course agree that we have to follow whatever the plenary potentiary conference decides, but we do have the option of mentioning Resolution 165 here or not. That is the point that I was trying to make. In addition to that, we do agree with the proposal from RCA to 6.1 which defines a deadline that is better than 165.

So we have the option of not mentioning 165, but we aren't pushing to remove it. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you. The legal advisor, please?

>> LEGAL ADVISOR: That means it a Seat 614. Thank you, Chair map. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

Going back to considering C briefly, just to make things easier for you, might it not be prudent instead of saying Mel born 1988 to make a reference to the international telecommunication regulations in force? If we said that, we wouldn't be tying ourselves to one particular set of regulations in time, but we would be making it clear that we were talking about the ITRs in force, no matter where or when; it would be the ITRs at the particular moment we are dealing with that are in force which would apply.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you. Armenia, are you on Considering C? Go ahead.

<< ARMENIA: Thank you, Chairman. In principle, the Legal Advisor has taken the words out of my mouth. In the practice of the ITU, if we have a reference to a document, then it is understood we are talking about the latest version of that document.

I have every respect for our Legal Advisor. So adding the two words "in force" as he suggested, should not create any difficulty. But whether or not or not they are in, with or without them the reference is clear.

And having Melbourne 1988 here, I think with just mislead the reader. Of course it is having understood that you are talking about the latest version of whatever document you are talking about. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you. Germany, and Brazil as a representative of CTEL, could we do that? Brazil is saying yes. Germany?

>> GERMANY: It is okay, but what was just said, we are referring that the ITRs that are in force right now. An right now the ITRs in force are the ones in Melbourne. When we are doing something now at the WTSA we can only refer to the ITRs Melbourne 1988; that is a fact. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Armenia, please.

>> ARMENIA: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, that is how we're reading it today, but we are preparing a document here that will be used for the next four years.

Of course we understand that what you are saying is correct today; there is no other set of regulations in force. But in a month there will be different regulations and we will still be talking about this for four years.

And while we do that, we will be talking about the version in force at the time we're talking about it. So I see no logical difficulty here because we must not forget that we are preparing a document not just for ourselves, but for readers who are out there who will be referring to this document for at least four years.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, as I understand it, there is no consensus on this text. I suggest we say "in force" instead of" Melbourne 1988" deleting reference to Article 1, all in Consideration C. We won't have time to finish this today, so we will come back to Resolution 1 at a later discussion. So let's leave C for now and go back to considering F.

Here there was some discussion on Resolution 165. I see the United States asking for the floor. I do hope you are F.

>> UNITED STATES: No, I was trying to go to C. I actually agree with the colleague from Germany. I really need to think about this. Can we please put it in square brackets? We don't have consensus. Thanks.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: I don't have square brackets on my keyboard. Okay. Now to Considering F where I have put brackets, can I now remove the brackets around F? Brazil, would you like more discussion with the RCC offline about this between now and the next meeting? I can remove the square brackets, Brazil? If I understand the gestures Brazil is making, yes, I can delete the brackets.

Russian Federation, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: If I understand we are retaining the text, then I will withdraw. If we are not retaining the next, I do have another comment.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: As I understand it, I understand we have what is on the screen now; in other words, we are maintaining the text. There was the proposed addition of H. I don't think there is any particular problem with that. In fact, I wonder if that wasn't an oversight in a previous version.

So we're now at 1.1. I actually think there is a mistake in the CTEL proposal here where it talks about work program being deleted here. I don't quite understand why. After all, the WTSA is responsible for this. We even have a Committee 4 that is dealing with it.

So Brazil, can we ignore this amendment? Was it an error? Yes. Thank you. Next we have a CTEL proposal which is to insert a new .2 on the work of the Assembly relating to the resolutions.

Before I open the floor, I would like to say that personally, I am not very fond of the term "recycle" and I have checked what the translators had put in the French version.

There they have used the French meaning of "convert" which would be the direct translation, the literal translation of that in English. Would it not be better in English to mutt "convert"? However I will leave the English native speakers for their opinion on that.

Are there any comments? Is anybody opposed to inserting 1.2 BIS or replacing "recycle" with the word "convert"? No one is requesting the floor, so thank you.

CTEL was asking to have "vert" deleted in a number of instances. I cannot see a drawback, but I do have comments.

I think the drafting committee will put them back in when they are checking the text. Furthermore, the WTSA document‑management system means that a TSB assistant has to look at all the documents for Resolution 102.

Last time I had to spend two hours with the assistant to ensure all the amendments were copied correctly. If CTEL doesn't mind, I think we will leave these editorial issues aside because I think, in any case, they will be put back in by the editorial or drafting committee. Thank you, CTEL for your help in that regard.

We now move to 1.9.4. This is on an RCC proposal from Canada to add a series of definitions for question, recommendation and resolution.

For recommendation, my proposal would be to use Canada's definition. I say that because if we refer to the rule for writing definitions with the standardization committee for vocabulary or SCV has produced in an annex to the recommendation guide to the ITUT, those rules say that the definitions used should be as sort as possible.

And in fact, those rules were initially proposed to the TSAG by Canada. So overall, the definition of the term "recommendation" is the same; the only difference is that some of the text is being put in a note so, that the definition of "recommendation" is fairly short.

Another amendment I would like to put forward is that we replace "instructions" with "provisions" which will mean we can cover everything appearing in a resolution. It is a broader term.

Finally before I open the floor, we must keep in mind that if we decide to include these definitions in Resolution 1, the definitions will only apply to the standardization sector ITUT.

If other sectors define these terms, their definitions may differ from ours. The definitions may not be aligned with one another. Finally we need to bear in mind these terms are used in the constitution and the very much, and this definition we are positing here cannot have any implications for the fundamental text of the Union, the basic text.

Finally I would like to specify that where the convention and the Constitutionally-concerned definitions appear in Annex A to the constitution of the convention.

So from a legal point of view, I don't think there is any disadvantage with our introducing these definitions here; there can be no retroactive effect on the constitution and the convention.

Are there any comments or remarks? Seeing none, I assume that my explanation was clear. Thank you. Therefore we will add in these three definitions. I remind I Recommendation 1.1 we made a reference to the definition of the term "question" as defined in Resolution 1 on the screen. Canada?

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Sorry to take your time to go back to 1.2 Item B. On your suggestion to change the word "recycle" to "convert" I think the meaning seems to be to reuse or to repeat this resolution, rather than convert. We're not converting something.

That is my understanding of the meaning of the term "recycle" here. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you. Do we have a representative of the United Kingdom in the room? No. They are the repository of the English language at the ITU, if I am not mistaken. I see no problem with leaving in "recycle" I simply wanted to say that for the time being, the French translation mentions "converting" rather than "recycling"

But the translators in Geneva did what they did. For the time being we will leave "recycle" and we will see what the drafting committee does when they get the text. Canada?

>> CANADA: Thank you. How about "reuse" for an alternative term? As "recycle" may create a problem in translation? Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you.

>> RUSSIA: As you know, Chairman, our authentic, key language is French. Whatever you agree with is fine, and it will be translated into the other languages. It is the French that counts.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Russia. That is the very reason for which I checked the French version because "recycle" in French was not too attractive as a term, but anyway. There is also "reuse" which I will discuss that with the drafting committee to see what they think of all this.

Any further comments on this section, the definitions? Let's try to move forward with the last five minutes we have left. Next we move to the CTEL proposal to add in 3.7 and 3.8.

Unless I have overlooked something, I think that some of the terms or principles used in these two paragraphs have already appeared in 3.5 and 3.6 just above the new ones.

For instance, the broader par test paying of various different members as Chairman and so on of the so the same terms already seem to appear.

The other slight problem I identified was that Resolution 35 is going to be amended in the WTSA so there may be a discrepancy there. Here I wanted to suggest adding at the beginning of 3.5 a reference to Resolution 35.

Instead of adding in 3.7 and 3.8 as proposed, because we may find ourselves in a situation where the content of 3.7 and 3.8 may be at odds with that is going to be decided, if indeed it is decided by the ad hoc group dealing with Resolution 35. Brazil?

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The suggestion is a good one but Resolution 1 is more perennial, less subject to change than the other resolutions. It is a more constant resolution. It may never be suppressed, and Resolution 35 may be suppressed.

We have to make sure Resolution 35 is not suppressed and that it includes whatever Resolution 165 has decided, but we agree with your proposal. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you. At the beginning I thought you were not going to support it, but thank you. Germany?

>> GERMANY: I think it is an excellent proposal. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Germany. I will make the necessary changes after the meeting. I am being told it is now time to finish, but I have a French clock which is slightly different from the Swiss clocks.

So I will just finish one thing, 4.7. Same thing here. I suggest that we do not suppress this. It is a CTEL proposal, I think it is an editorial issue and that the drafting committee will just put it back in. So I suggest we do not undo what will be done again later.

Very well. We will have to use the third slot allotted to us, but we have made quite a lot of progress. I thank you again. I think we have an excellent working spirit here and that the fruits of our labor is very clear.

My advisor is telling me the next session will take place Monday afternoon. So let us meet again at that time. We will also have the report of these two sessions to present for any potential corrections. Thank you very much, and all the best for the rest of the day. This session stands adjourned.

(Session concluded at 10:15)
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