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>> Chair: Good afternoon. Let's resume, continuing with our agenda. We've, we've had some, uh, discussions and we, we, apparently a thought the intervention we didn't hear because of the interpretation problem from Emirates was not quite volunteering to chair the ad hoc group we discussed on Resolution 71 and our vice Chairman Musab Abdullah has volunteered to chair that group after the plenary tomorrow. It'll be in parallel with Resolution 70. I think it's different individuals, so I don't think that's a problem. It saves having to put more activity on the weekends beyond what COM4 is already doing in that regard.

So that concludes the discussion for today, of, uh, Resolution 71. The next agenda topic, uh, is Resolution 74. And here, the only input we have are the TSB editorials and so this is admission of sector members from developing countries in the work of ITU‑T and no proposal other than editorial for updates. So can I have your agreement that, uh, we keep this resolution and send it with the indicated editorial updates, which is document 29, proposal 45 to the editorial committee toward the plenary. Any objection to taking that course of action? I see no requests for the floor, so Resolution 74 is done.

Okay, with that, we had, uh, we had suspended our discussion of Resolution 66, under agenda point 10, due to the lack of a presenter for the Korean proposal. So, now if I can ask Mr. Lee will present the Korean proposal, which is in 59, addendum 3, please.
 >> Korea: Thank you. Modification of the current Resolution 66, using technology functions and results. Briefly, as you can see the table one, technology during the last several years, subject behaviors, specifically to the subject areas. Normally this is not easy to initiate. The technology which generally alleviates the providers various information to us. As you can see the table. Technology reduced the report, one and a half years later, some activity is going on. The focus group was started. Taking into account this, and looking at the current Resolution 66, available on these reports, the TSAG and committee for the seminar. So to be helpful, for the standard development, taking into this impact of the technology report, shown in table one, we propose to modify, of this resolution, a large study group to utilize this technology for the development of standard. So it is also slightly changed, modified this resolution because resolution is started with the creation of technology functions that is already launched of these functions and working well.

So reflecting these things, we propose to modify this Resolution 66 as shown. Thank you very much.
 >> Chair: Thank you, Mr. Lee. Any questions of clarification on this proposal? Central Africa, please?
 >> Central Africa: ‑‑
 >> Chair: China or Japan?
 >> Japan: Japan assumes the proposal. I think it's very clear and we'll act to support the Korean proposal. Thank you.
 >> Chair: Thank you, so, you beat me to asking for support, but thank you Central Africa, please?
 >> China: China also fully supports these relevant modifications because we think the technology change is very fast, so, we think it should be reflected in the TSAG, also it should be reflected in the study groups to be carried out. Thank you.
 >> Chair: Thank you. So, we, we've had, uh, these two proposals, we had one proposal to suppress. There was some opposition to suppressing. One of the reasons given for suppression is that the original resolution asked for creation of a technology watch function and, which had already been done. This, uh, additional, this proposal that we now have puts the function in the current tense and describes an ongoing activity, rather than asking for creation of a new activity.

So, I think, uh, given that we do not have agreement to suppress, would we have agreement that these are the amendments that should be made to the resolution should it be retained? Okay...I see no requests for the floor, so I will, uh, there are, there are some editorials that I think are, are some of which are covered here, but we'll, we'll take as an offline exercise, I think, to combine any missed editorials from the TSB document to apply on, on top of this.

So, can we take that, then, as agreement pending the editorial combination of this and the TSB editorials to submit this as a revision for Resolution 66? Is that agreed? Okay...thank you. It's agreed.

That brings us back in our agenda, we, we had two resolutions that were deferred for discussion, pending availability of the contributors to present the proposals. And so, agenda item 15 is on Resolution 11, collaboration with the Postal Operations Council. So the two substantive proposals, we start with the African Common Proposal, 56 addendum 1, proposal 2. So do we have someone to present this, please? Cote de Ivoire, please?
 >> Cote de Ivoire: Thank you, Chairman. The proposals we have here are mainly editorial. In collaboration with Study Group 2, we've put Study Group 17 instead of Study Group 2. Thank you.
 >> Chair: Thank you. And the other, so this is a regional proposal, the other proposal we have is from Argentina and if we can ask for a presentation of that and that is document 63, addendum 1, Argentina, please?
 >> Argentina: Thank you, Chairman. The proposal from Argentina relates to a modification of Resolution 11 in order to update its drafting to increase and enhance collaboration that exists between the postal operations council of the UPU and the ITU.

So we have added, under considering, the importance that there is both of the ITU and of the Universal Postal Union, specialized organisations for communication unions which have been collaborating in identifying synergies with a view to achieving the objectives of the summit on the World Organisation Society. The corporation that exists between the two organisations and with the development of postal services and telecommunications over recent years, there has been further development of the coordination between the two organisations and there is a need for further work together.

So we have modified the resolve so that the ITU‑T study groups that are relevant to this should continue to collaborate with the Postal Operations Council and its committees as necessary on a reciprocal basis and with a minimum of formality. So we also instructed the Director of Telecommunications Standardization Bureau to assist the corporation between the two organs and examine the interest within the related work programmes and establish a contact point for their follow‑up and also to inform the council of the progress made and results achieved in this regard. Thank you, Chairman.
 >> Chair: Thank you, Argentina. As this is a proposal from an individual member, can I ask if there's support? Okay, I don't see an indication of support here for the Argentinean proposal, um and so, let's look back to the other proposal and so, so there we find, uh, if we can go back to the Africa proposal. Oh, uh, intervention from Cuba, please? While we bring that up on the screen.
 >> Cuba: Thank you, Chairman. It's just to propose Argentina's proposal. Support it.
 >> Chair: Okay, thank you. Um...so...with, uh, with some support, then, let me ask if there are some questions of clarification on either of these documents? Okay...I see no requests for the floor, so, points of discussion for how we should proceed? Okay, I see no requests for the floor here, either, um...so...just from my own, uh, observations, I, uh, I, I see that, um, in, in the Argentinean proposal, there is a proposal, simply to drop resolves to rather than to replace Study Group 2 with Study Group 17. My understanding from the limited discussions I've had regarding this resolution is that there is actually very little activity of overlap and interest between these organisations at present. There was a Study Group 17, uh, activity and identity management that was relevant and it was felt by, by some that that was covered by resolves one, that the relevant ITU‑T study groups should collaborate with operations postal committees as necessary on a reciprocal basis. Since that seemed to be the only point of overlap, there, uh, didn't seem to be necessity to, to have a main point of contact to coordinate as if there were several areas of overlapping interest. And, so, I, I observe in the Argentinean proposal that they have simply proposed to drop resolves two that Study Group 2 would be the main point of contact.

So, could we agree, that rather than replacing Study Group 2 with Study Group 17, perhaps we could drop resolves two, and agree that is covered under the language of resolves one. Any objection to that as a way forward? So I think we have consensus that we drop resolves two.

Another observation just from the Chairman, while I appreciate the work that has been done in the Argentinean proposal, it seems like quite a bit of text for, for something related to a relationship where we have only small points of overlap at, at present. And so, I would invite some discussion. I don't think anything that is proposed here is wrong, but for, for something with, with sort of an isolated area of intersection of work, I'm, uh, I'm wondering if we can have some discussion of the, the necessity for adding some of this extra material.

So would anyone care to comment on the pros or cons of that? Cote de Ivoire, please?
 >> Cote de Ivoire: Thank you, Chairman. I'm wondering whether, or rather, how the collaboration will take place. I think we really do need a lead study group to work together with the POC of the UPU. If we just say relevant study groups should continue to collaborate as necessary, well, what is the mechanism which will designate the group which will be working together with the POC? Thank you.
 >> Chair: Thank you. As, uh, just speaking from my own experience within the work of the study groups, normally study groups will undertake to communicate with other organisations as necessary in the course of their work. And, there is nothing to prevent any study group from liaising with any appropriate organisation for any topic within their mandate. So...that type of communication where needed happens as part of the normal work flow. It doesn't happen because people in the study group spend time reading the resolutions and realize they should communicate. They communicate if they've got an area of overlapping interest. So...I think the mechanisms are there and available for use as necessary. And my understanding from what I've been told is that, that as, um, as technology has moved on in the direction it has, the area of overlap is quite minimal at this stage. If that should change, obviously, the relevant study groups would initiate communication as necessary. But that's, uh, this is not really an issue I'm personally very close to, but that's what I've been informed by a few people who are involved. Are we aware, can anybody cite other examples of work between ITU study groups other than the identity management work of Study Group 17? That's personally the only thing I'm aware of. Mr. Dubuisson?
 >> MR. OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Chairman, I share your views, first, as a participant in Study Group 17. I don't think that Study Group 17 is the most appropriate to be the lead study group if we keep in resolves two. And I would like to inform the assembly that there's a Memorandum of Understanding between ISO, IEC, ITU, and UNECE. And here, I represent the standardization sector with the agreement of the Director of TSB. UPU has a seat in the coordination group of that Memorandum of Understanding and for some months or years, even, hasn't been sending representatives. Which seems to confirm there aren't many subjects in common between the UPU and those other organisations. In conclusion, I'd like to say that at the end, instructs the director, I don't know whether the information should be sent up to council, I'm afraid the Director might have nothing to report to council if we decide to keep this part at the end. I think it's enough to transmit the information to the TSAG. Thank you.
 >> Chair: Thank you. Other views? Okay, certainly just as an editorial matter, to move, to encourage and assist this collaboration between the two organs, move that from a resolves to instructs, seems perfectly fine to move resolves to, but I think that, uh, I'm sensing more of uncertainty as to the need for instructs two and three, as has been pointed out by Mr. Dubuisson.

So, if that's satisfactory for everyone to, uh, to simply end, end with instructs one, to the Director of the TSB, dropping, uh, original resolves two and having converted, uh, resolves three to instructs the Director of the TSB, the next question is how much it's necessary or advisable to amend the front matter of the resolution, given the minimal degree of overlap. Any opinion on amending that aspect of this resolution? Thank you, Argentina, please?
 >> Argentina: Thank you, Chairman. I'm grateful for the efforts made to try and improve our proposal. And with regard to the subject of common interest, such as participant, as a participant myself of the UPU meetings as well, I understand there are plenty of subjects of common interest. And, this form of collaboration over the last few years hasn't worked as well as we would have wished and I don't know if we have managed to fully identify or they're not well‑enough known, the subjects in question, but the UPU has been able to advance its work and been able to take into account process of ICT. The products relate a great deal to the services offered by the ITU. So we see that there are many synergies, just to give one example, that is the transfer of visas by mobile telephone, which is something we're looking at under the draft resolution and that's without taking into account all the matters relating to logistics in postal services, which are related to all the internet transactions that take place. And we think that there are certainly areas of common interest and this is something, while we're trying to update and face up to the realities of the ICTs nowadays, thank you.
 >> Chair: Thank you. Let me ask if there are no more requests for the floor, if we can have just a few examples to give us an idea of other study groups who have, have some level of collaboration with, with the Universal Postal Union. Are we, I'm, uh, I'm a little stuck here, because, uh, I'm not, not personally aware of anything other than the Study Group 17 example. Do we have other cases with other study groups that we know of? Is that...normally we expect our groups to initiate communications as appropriate. We, uh, we, in COM4 we assign work to them and if they need to communicate in the course of that work, they undertake it, we don't normally tell them, uh, someone to communicate in, in the absence of, uh, of clearly identified purpose of that communication.

Okay, I think I'm inclined, perhaps to, uh, to suggest that a number of individuals tried to discuss with each other and consult offline about the need for this or to identify the specific areas of work. So...we do have quite a few sessions scheduled for next week and I'll, while we will spend some of that session time reviewing the work of the various drafting groups that comes back into us and the work of, uh, 3A and 3B, I think we will have some time to, to revisit this issue which I think is, uh, a smaller one, and I think at present, this would appear, at least to what I've been informed as an area of minimal overlap. And, uh, I think if we can find a suitable way forward that, uh, doesn't overburden us with something that's out of scale with the, uh, the scope of the relationship, then hopefully we can find a good way forward with this. I'd like to put off the final conclusion of this until a future session.

So, we can move to another item from yesterday where we didn't have the contributors present, so, uh, agenda point 16 is Resolution 22. Here we had two substantive proposals. We had the African proposal 56 addendum 1 followed by the Arab Group proposal 62. Can I ask someone to present 56 addendum 1, please? Cote de Ivoire, please?
 >> Cote de Ivoire: Thank you, Chairman. I think the document from the African countries is basically about editorial‑type modifications. We have to take into account the conclusions of the GSS, the Global Standards Symposium, because this has just happened and we have to include it in this document, thank you.
 >> Chair: Thank you, Cote de Ivoire. If I could have some clarification, uh, Resolution 22 in, as it was updated in Johannesburg, has, uh, the item considering F. Which says that the global standards symposium was held in conjunction with this assembly to consider bridging the standardization gap and examining global ICT standards challenges. I think that, uh, considering F, would remain true, if we reaffirm this resolution, uh, although it talks about it different GSS.

So are you proposing anything other than retaining considering F? Is there a more specific proposal, please?
 >> Cote de Ivoire: Personally, I didn't participate in the GSS, but the contribution was made in the event that other very important subjects were addressed during that GSS, which should be included and considering F, thank you.
 >> Chair: Thank you. I know that one could certainly look at the programme and the report of GSS and agree that that, uh, GSS did considering bridging the standardization gap and examining global ICT standards challenges. So it'd seem to me that that statement remains true. So...I was simply looking to see if, if there was any, anything specific to propose adding beyond that. Certainly the report is available, someone could read considering F and go, it's publically available in the website and look at that report. And this, perhaps, is enough to point them to that.

So, I think, rather than belaboring that, perhaps we go the next proposal. So, uh...this one is, I'm lost in my agenda, sorry. Arab states, 64, addendum 2. If I could have a presentation to that. Uh...is that, uh, Emirates, please?
 >> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, very much, Mr. Chair. With regard to the proposal by the Arab Group and it is with regard to Resolution number 22, the changes are mainly editorial ones. With the exception of paragraph resolves F, no...I apologize, the speaker E, with regard to the, uh, to, to create new groups including focus groups as well as appoint Chairman and Vice Chairmen in coordination with 191A and B of the coordination in order to enhance and improve effectiveness of ITU‑T's work as well as promoting flexibility and responding to high priority issues. Such groups shall not adopt questions or recommendation. And here we have an addition. Nor have supervisory functions on study groups, but work on a specific mandate. We have another change in F, uh, made by coordination groups and other groups and implant those that are agreed in consultation with the relevant study groups.

After having consulted with the Arab Group, we would like to retain E, E, with regard to focus groups. So we'd like to revert to the original text in E focus groups and add the expression nor have supervisory functions on study groups. This is the Arab proposal. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 >> Chair: Thank you. Are there questions of clarification on this proposal? Okay, I see no requests for the floor, any points of discussion? Okay, I have no requests from the floor here either, I, uh, just a thought from, uh, my perspective, the, uh, the phrasing and I think I understand what is intended by the phrase "nor have supervisory functions on study groups," but it doesn't seem to me, like usual language. And I, I wonder if, uh, I think some of the more typical phrasing is that it shall be subordinate to the activities of study groups. So, I think, we're not creating any group above a study group. Any group we, uh, we, uh, create would be below a study group.

The other thing that occurs to me is that, um, uh, the, uh, in contrasting some of these other groups, I wonder if we need to explicitly call out TSAG in the set of primary groups. So...while recognizing the primacy of study groups and TSAG, uh, then we, uh, we, more or less say these other groups are below all of that in state your and ability to produce any kind of normative output. That's where we get into not adopting questions or recommendations. I wonder if there's a way to capture the sent meant in a little more customary language if that would be satisfactory. If, if we need to do that in offline drafting, we certainly can do that. If the proposal is clear enough, maybe we can take a decision, uh, directly.

So, any comment on, on the, two ideas, uh, in considering this from, from the chairmen. What would be to add in E, recognizing the primacy of study groups and TSAG and my suggestion as more customary language, rather than normal have supervisory, and I think the intent, if I'm understanding ‑‑ if I'm reading it correctly, would be that we're not going to create many groups above a study group or that can, we can create things below or with lower stature than study groups. I think we'd normally say subordinate for that. Let me ask the Emirates in particular and Arab Group in general if that is what these words were trying to say.
 >> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Mr. Chair, with regard to E, we'd like to retain the text, uh, nor have supervisory functions on study groups. I repeat, we'd like to retain this text. Now with regard to F, we agree with you, so, we can delete the proposal, uh, by the Arab Group, however, I repeat with regard to E, we'd rather retain the text unless there are objections by the participating parties. So hopefully we'll be able to retain this text and approve it, thank you.
 >> Chair: Okay, thank you, I actually hadn't commented on F, so I, uh, my two questions were whether, when it made sense at the beginning of E to call out the study groups in TSAG and whether there was a better phrasing. Now I won't insist on, uh, certainly my wording, but I see Mr. Gracie asking for the floor.
 >> Mr. BRUCE Gracie: Thank you, Chairman. If you allow me to speak as Chairman of TSAG, when I read, um, convention article 14A, concerning the role of TSAG. The phraseology, with respect to that role, vis-à-vis the study groups indicates in 197E that, uh, TSAG shall provide guidelines for the work of study groups, so that is enshrined in the convention. So...it would seem to me that, um, if we want to add anything to Resolution 22 it should be in complete conformity with article 14A. I'd be happy to work with the Arab Group with respect to, um, the specific text they wish to convey, but believe it'd be absolutely necessary to reflect the same type of terminology that exists within the convention. Thank you.
 >> Chair: Thank you, Mr. Gracie. I think that would be, uh, would be good to, uh, to come up with, with some words that are, are consistent and match what's in the convention. Let me test, if I may, the, whether there is willingness to agree with the spirit of the words that are here and we can, uh, look for some offline consultation and revisiting in a future session to give us the exact words to best capture that in a way that is consistent with the convention. So, are people generally okay with the sentiment of the addition proposed in E, recalling they are suggesting retaining the original text on focus groups. So ignore the strike out, that particular strike out in their proposal, so is, is the general idea okay? And if so, we'll ask for some consultation before a future session to come up with the, the words that best reflect that idea. Emirates, please?
 >> United Arab Emirates: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I support the proposal by Mr. Gracie. The head of TSAG, we will conduct consultations with regard to this text and will revert to you in the coming meeting. We will propose a new text or add new text for both E and F. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
 >> Chair: Okay, thank you. I think that gives us a way forward. So a lot of the other material, as you've mentioned is editorial. So, I think in terms of coming back with a final proposal, we, uh, have remaining, whether we would accept that the considering item, which reads that the Global Standards Symposium was held in conjunction with this assembly to bridge the standardization gap and examining global ICT standards challenges is a sentence that we can retain as it is and it is still true, while it refers to a different GSS, uh, it refers to this one from, from Dubai rather than the one held in Johannesburg. Can we accept that text to describe considering for this resolution? Cote de Ivoire, please?
 >> Cote de Ivoire: Thank you, Chairman. I agree with your proposal, thank you.
 >> Chair: Thank you, thank you for your cooperation. I think that gives us a way forward to come to a future session of committee three, then, with text that I think will be easily able to agree. Thank you, general, for your cooperation in this.

So, uh, returning to the agenda, we have two proposals for new resolutions, the first one is propose new Resolution B1. This is from Brazil. The document is 57A11. Brazil, please?
 >> Brazil: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's my pleasure to present document 57, A11. There are several resolutions dealing with academia participation, Resolution 71 and Resolution 169, Guadalajara. All trying to enhance the participation of academic institutions, but in fact there, are few of them among us. This is so for many reasons. One of them, at least, Brazil would wish to treat in this proposal resolution. Participation of academia on activities of ITU's Telecommunication Standardization sector. Has shown to be effective, advantages for both sides. ITU‑T can count on motivated professors and students that are avid to further develop area research and work and academia. Has the opportunity to exchange experiences with worldwide aspects and keep itself updated with latest technology trends and communications.

The Brazilian Administration believes the academia environment is a conversive space for development in ITU‑T and seizing participation and opportunities to leverage the development of telecommunication and Information Technology sector.

Moreover, academic research on telecommunications should always take into consideration the standards and regulations already established by ITU‑T, since it should be harmonized with technology development around the world. Besides being responsible to market needs.

However, academic participation, ITU‑T is frequently hampered due to the production requirements imposed by R&D funded agencies. They usually demand research time and productivity items that don't value contributions to mechanization bodies. This contribution promotes mechanisms to increase visibility of significant contribution to the development of standards which could make standards development count towards the production objectives, required of academia.

As we all know, productivity of academic research is constantly evaluated for many purposes. Which include assessment of, of undergraduate and graduate programmes of the institutions. The approval of project proposals by funding agencies and progression. This production evaluation, which usually takes the form of scoring items that include books, papers and patents published, courses taught, thesis advisory roles and research projects accomplished, usually doesn't take into consideration the authorships of contributions to ITU‑T, nor to authorship of study group deliverables and technical papers.

To write and present contributions to ITU‑T doesn't count towards grants and Korea progression for academia members. Which may be obliged to prioritize all the activities in order to meet the requirements imposed for evolution on their careers.

Further incentive mechanisms are therefore necessary to make key standardization process, such as contribution and authorship to more academic members. ITU should act closely to its member states and respective agencies that formulate public policies in the areas of education, science and technology and industry in commerce, for instance.

Moreover, the Brazilian administration suggests that ITU‑T modify the publication procedures for its standardization documents, including recommendations by acknowledging somewhere in each document, detailed information about its authorship and main competitors so the identification is kept for productivity analysis.

I should also like to remind that many other standards organisations eliminate competitors in their final outputs. In this respect, in order to demonstrate how does this, how does, how this is in effect, I'd ask the secretariat to show on the screen some examples of recommendations in which we can see the names of the main contributors to the recommendations.

In the ITPOE, we can see a comprehensive list of all the people involved in the working group. Highlighted persons that made contributions to the recommendation. In our view, ITU can follow this step or find a new way in which authorship can be easily shown. In essence, the Brazilian Administration recommends this new resolution, which I wish to reiterate is very important for the academics. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 >> Chair: Thank you, Brazil. Can I ask if there is any support for this proposal? Okay, support from China. And Iran. And so, let me invite any questions of clarification and discussion on this proposal. And any opposition to the proposal? Okay, I see no requests for the floor. So, uh...the question I would ask or a question I'd ask here is that the academic category of participation is something that we have, uh, as a trial until the next Plenipotentiary Conference. And at that level of status, I wonder if, if it makes sense to have more than one resolution on the subject. And I would ask for opinions that if we were to accept this kind of proposal, whether we should have a separate resolution or whether, in fact, it should be merged in some way into Resolution 71 for which we've already created a drafting group. Are there opinions about the merit of trying to come up with a consolidated resolution in that subject area? Or whether this is a distinct proposal that should remain separate? Any opinions? Brazil, please?
 >> Brazil: Thank you, chair. Regarding your suggestion, I think that contributions are very important for the sector and I think that merging them would be kind of unpractical and we'd have two length resolution dealing with very different subjects. Although they're dealing with academics, but the objectives are quite different. So I'd prefer to keep them apart. Thank you.
 >> Chair: Okay, thank you, Olivier. Mr. Dubuisson, please? Perhaps China first?
 >> China: We support the Brazilian proposal to keep it separate. Because of the following points. Firstly, such a proposal, if it's adopted, it will involve ITU‑T, and approval processes for these publications. I hope it's better for the proposal to exist as a separate one.
 >> Chair: Okay, now Mr. Dubuisson?
 >> Mr. OLIVIER Dubuisson: Thank you, Chairman. I share the comments that you made on the fact that we are in a trial period for the, uh, participation by academia and we're not necessarily in favoring the proliferation of resolutions, but in particular, wanted to mention, sides too, concerns me a great deal, on the number of recommendations given that has not yet been done and we'd only do it for universities which creates a difference between the membership and it seems to me that could also pose a problem in terms of intellectual property. Because, when we're working in ITU, we're working on contributing to common work, which contributes to a recommendation and doesn't mention the individuals within the recommendation, thank you.
 >> Chair: Thank you. Mister, uh ‑‑ speaking as Bahrain?
 >> Speaking as head of drafting group for 71, I'd like to bring up the potential concern, we don't know the final form and shape of Resolution 71. As such, um, things might fall between the two resolutions, because one is talking about admission and the other is talking about participation and may make certain assumptions on the terms of admission. This is taking into account, the fact ‑‑ based on the new proposals, 71 is being expanded to include certain aspects of encouraging participation. Just bring this up as a point to consider.
 >> Chair: Thank you, I think that is, uh, it's sensible to wait until we know what shape the, the Resolution 71 might take and then one idea that was occurring to me, if you'd be willing to take it on board, perhaps where we might assign this proposed new resolution, also to the same drafting group, who may still bring us back two texts, if that makes sense, but if the shape of 71 would dictate otherwise, perhaps the drafting group could agree. So if you'd agree, perhaps we could proceed in that way and then, uh, participants with additional concerns could have a chance to work through that process and, and bring us back something to look at, at the conclusion of that drafting activity.

So hopefully we can agree to proceed on that basis. Brazil, please?
 >> Brazil: Chair, just to clarify the position, so we will discuss both resolutions as a single matter, but we can bring it back again, uh, if we decide we would have two separate resolutions.
 >> Chair: Yes, that was the intent. So I think all those interested in the, in the matters related to academia can participate in the same drafting group and then, at the, at the discretion and the conclusions of the discussion, based on the shape that the resolution or resolutions take, the drafting group might bring back one or two texts. So yes, the freedom would be assigned to the drafting group to bring back that proposal to COM3.

So, I'd like to move, uh, then, from, do we ‑‑ four minutes? Uh...okay, bearing in mind the time and we're only a few minutes from running out of interpretation, we can select one more agenda item and what I would propose, since I think there may be a little more discussion on the other proposed new resolution from Canada, is that we take one that I hope is easy, and that is that we have, uh, one, two, three, four, five recommendations in the A series that have no proposal for update, specifically A.8, A.12, A.13, A.23 and A.31 and then we have two supplements in the A series. Supplement two and supplement three. I'd note that supplement three was just updated at the last TSAG meeting. So that's a fresh text.

So since there are no proposals for update of those, uh, let me, if I can ask your agreement to close out these items and send them as they are to the Editorial Committee. Can I have your agreement for those texts where there's no proposal for update? So it's, agenda item 19, A.8, A.12, A.13, A.23, A.31 and the two supplements, two and three, to the A series. Can I have your agreement? We forward those as they are. Okay, thank you, that's agreed.

So, with that, I'd like to close the session, well, uh, one more thing, we have one, uh, drafting group, where we haven't selected a time, uh, for, uh, Resolution 68, so, uh, we have the volunteer Mustafa al‑Madhi from Sudan who will convene that. We need to select a time. I heard that the weekend is a problem, so that would leave, uh, uh, the two choices of running in parallel with the other two on Friday, after the close of the plenary. It may be, uh, a distinct set of participants. The other possibilities would be, uh, early Monday morning? Is that okay? So...can I ask your preference, uh from those two choices for a time? And then we'll try to locate it, uh, a room, can you indicate which one and we'll tell participants the time and they'll look on the screens for a room. Would you prefer Friday after the plenary? Can I ask you, uh, which of the two times we can schedule? The Friday after the plenary or, yes, please?
 >> We prefer 2:00 p.m. or after 2:00 p.m. That is for the meeting on Resolution 68.
 >> Chair: Thank you. And let me ask the interpreters indulgence here, certainly five minutes or less, is that okay?
 >> Yes, that's okay.
 >> Chair: Okay, thank you, it seems like, while I don't think there's anything of controversy, there are quite a few bits of text that need to be combined. We are imagining, we need to schedule at least an hour, uh, and the difficulty with 2:00 p.m., we have sessions beginning at 2:30. So we could, uh, do 1:00 p.m. or we could do morning or evening before or after. So, 1:30? 1:30? Would that work? Could we do 1:30? We have one hour before the beginning of the afternoon session? It seems like there's enough work to do. Would that be satisfactory? Sudan, please?
 >> Sudan: Thank you, Chairman. I apologize, please forgive me, I meant to say Monday, we would prefer the second option Monday morning.
 >> Chair: Okay, so Monday before the opening. 8:30 a.m. on Monday? Okay, perfect. Uh...I think that should be easy enough to find a room. So those who are involved in Resolution 68, the drafting group will be Monday morning at 8:30 and the room to be displayed on the screen. Okay, thank you very much. I think we can recess for today.

[Meeting concluded at 17:33 local time].
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