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>> BRUCE GRACIE: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the final meeting of Working Group 3B.

Unfortunately in the Agenda, the start time appears as 11:15. But this being Friday, we need to finish at noon, 12:00, so the starting time is 10:45.

I am glad to see that some of you are here in any case, I would like to refer to the Document 80M16 with the Agenda. The substantive part will be under Item 3 concerning the proposed modification to Resolution 67.

Ladies and gentlemen, are there any difficulties being experienced with the interpretation channels? They all do appear to be working satisfactory, so moving to Item 2.

 These two documents have been provided by the Budget Control Committee to remind us of the requirements under Article 34 of the convention concerning the financial responsibilities of conferences and assemblies

In particular, the provisions 488 and 489 which stipulate that before adopting proposals or taking decisions with financial implications, the conferences of the Union, which includes a seem bless, shall take a count of all of the Union's budgetary provisions to ensure they will not result in expenses beyond the credits which the Council is empowered to authorize.

Now, this is particularly important, given the fact that Council will be required to review and approve the by biennial budget at the session in June of next year. That was the subject of Document 80.

I also would like to draw your attention to Document No. 81, a note by the Chairman of Committee 2 to the Chairman of committees 3 and 4 and of course the working groups, including this one. This also addresses financial issues.

 The request again to ensure if any decision is taken with financial implications, that we draw the attention of Committee 2 to that issue, and that the budgetary implications be conveyed to the plenary in the report of Committee 2 later in this assembly

So that is the essence of those two documents, although I do not anticipate that there will be any substantial financial implications with regard to the work assigned to us from Committee 3.

So if there are no requests from the floor with respect to Item 2, we will move to Item 3, the review of the output on the ad hoc group on languages.

Essentially there were two tasks assigned to the ad hoc group. One was to review the various proposals put forward, mainly from Europe in a your common proposal, and one from the RCC which contained a number of proposals, including a proposed revision to Resolution 67 which refers to the continuation of the group on vocabulary in ITUT.

Now the output of that group, I refer you to DT 29. This contains the proposed modification of Resolution 67 to reflect the various proposals that were put forward.

Now as you can see from this document, there are substantial revisions. So without further ado, I give the floor to the convener of the ad hoc group from the Russian Federation to provide us with a presentation of Document DT 29.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman.

Our group held two meetings; we met twice. We discussed the issue of the work on the standardization for vocabulary, the committee. We also carefully considered the European proposal and the one from the RCC.

We agreed with the concerns expressed in the European proposal. I kept say there was unanimity on the issue, but there was agreement on attorney points.

We agreed that if we're going to have the study groups that will work in this way, then the work of the Committee itself would be completely pointless. Because if you look at Resolution 67, it clearly stated that the study groups were supposed to do their part of the work, then were supposed to send it to the Committee.

And if this didn't go because the study group had not fulfilled Resolution 67, of course the effectiveness of the standardization committee was not very great, and the Committee itself couldn't just imagine what it was going to do.

It can’t just pluck something out of thin air. It needs to base these things on contributions from the study groups. On the other hand, we did agree that the function itself is important and necessary. It is particularly important for developing countries. It is particularly important for those language groups within which we still have a divide or gap in terms of terminology.

And for that reason it was decided to review Resolution 67. We went through it very carefully. I now submit this document for your consideration.

This document contains modifications in virtually every section. There are things that have been deleted that were previously in the document, because to some extent they are taken into account in other documents.

To some extent the terms of reference have already been established; the committee has already been established. If we're going to continue it, we don't need to go through all that again.

We don't need to again go through the term of reference because it was already agreed upon.

Also in this document we are giving some very specific proposals as to how we should conduct our further activities in terms of the Council, FSAG and Bureau director.

I won't go through this in great detail, introducing each and every one of the sections. If we go through it point by point, when necessary I can give clarification.

However at this stage, I am ready to submit the document as it is for your consideration. And in conclusion I would like to extend a warm thanks to all those who per its painted in the group and to our Secretary, Drug. It was an enormous amount of work with which we had a lot of assistance.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you very much. I also extend my appreciation to the group for the extensive work undertaken with respect to the modification of this resolution.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to open the floor for any general comments. I do intend to go through the document section by section to determine if there are any comments.

There are any general comments before beginning the examination of the get tailed review and revision of this resolution? Are there any general comments?

If not, ladies and gentlemen, I again refer you to Document DT 29. The first substantive change, of course, is to the title itself. It is now referring to the use in ITUT of the languages of the Union on an equal footing.

Any comments, ladies and gentlemen, on the title? As Dr. Minkin has already explained, the old title of the creation of the standardization committee vocabulary is now redundant, given the fact the SCV has already been created. Seeing no requests, I assume the title is satisfactory.

Any comments with respect to recognizing "A" and B? The only update is editorial in "A" so I assume there are no comments. In the Considering, there are a number of amendments, of course beginning with the deletion of the old Considering A and B and C and D as well.

The first reference is to Resolution 154 which was revised by the Guadalajara Potentiary Conference with respect to the Council working group on languages.

Any comments? There is also a new Considering B, just referring to the importance of providing information in all of the official languages. The rest of the text is deleted. Are there any comments any of the deletions and the new considerings?

I see no one requesting the floor, so I assume this is satisfactory, so that is approved.

The next section concerns notings. There are amendments. The first noting refers to ‑‑ perhaps Dr. Minkin can help me here. Has the noting been retained?

Because of all the deleted text, it is difficult to read. I believe there is now just one noting. Is this correct?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. There is just one noting stating that in fact the Committee was established in accordance with Resolution 67 of the last assembly. That is all that remains from the whole noting section, just one noting.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: That clarifies things. Ladies and gentlemen, any comments on this noting? It is simply stating a fact, so that is approved.

Now coming to the substantive part of the resolution, Res 1 into the ITUT study groups within terms of reference shall continue their work on technical and operational terms and their definitions in English only.

Any comments on this particular sentence? No comments, so that is approved. Resolve 2, clearly stated that standardization on vocabulary work shall be based on proposals made bit study group in the English language with consideration and adoption of the translation into the five other official language as opposed by General Secretariat.

This shall be ensured by the standardization committee for vocabulary. Comments on Resolves 2? No comments, so that is approved.

Now the next series of resolves are deleted, former resolves 2 and 3 and 4. There is now a new Resolve 3 which states that when proposing terms and definitions, the ITUT study groups shall use the guidelines given in the Annex B to the author's guide for drafting ITUT recommendations.

In was a matter that was highlighted in our discussion at our previous meeting, and certainly reflects the current situation. Any comments, ladies and gentlemen on this particular new revised Resolves 3? I see no one asking for the floor, so that is approved.

Now the former Resolves 6 and 7 and 8 have been deleted. There is now a now Resolves 4 which in effect is the old Resolves 9. Any comments? It is only a numbering change so, that is approved.

Now in terms of the next modification which is now the new Resolves 5, it indicates that when selecting terms and preparing definitions, the ITUT study group shall take into account the established use of term and existing definitions in ITU, in particular those appearing in the online ITU terms and definitions database.

Again, ladies and gentlemen, we discussed this at our previous meeting. I think there is now a more clear understanding of the nature of this database and its function.

Are there any comments on this new Resolves 5? No comments, so it is approved. New Resolves 6 is a modification to the old Resolves 11, which indicates that the TSB should collect all new terms and definitions proposed by the ITUT study group, and enter them into the ITU terms and definitions database.

Yes, Dr. Minkin?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Chairman, I apologize. It is a bit awkward for the Chairman to be adding to a decision already taken.

Here we perhaps should add "in consultation with the TSB" so that it is clear what we are talking about here.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Yes, thank you. If I understand correctly, it would be for the new Resolve 6, that, comma, in communication with the TSB, comma, should collect all new terms, et cetera.

Is that correct, Dr. Minkin?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Here it says the standardization group or TSB should collect all new terms and definitions proposed by the ITUT study groups and put them into the ITU terms and definitions database.

And I suggest that we add "in console with the SCV"; in other words, we should say if she wish to make comments, they should make these comments in consultation with the SCV.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you. That clarifies things. It now reads, just to repeat, that the telecommunications standardization burrow should collect all new terms and definitions proposed by the ITUT study groups and an "s" should be added to groups, so that it is awed study groups and not just one.

And enter them into the ITU terms and database in consultation with the SCV. Mr. Rada?

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I apologize to the group for being a bit late. This is one of the reasons on, does not make the Ed Com secretary the Secretariat of other work.

On this point, is the implication of this modification that before the database is revised, based on the approved recommendations of individual study groups, TSB is to consult with SCV? That is the way I read the words.

Is that the intention? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes, that is one of the functions of the SCV. They are supposed to look at new term and they are supposed to consider how they relate to other terms, how they fit in with other terms as proposed by other study groups, and if there are comments, they are supposed to make a recommendation.

That is not the function of the TSB. The TSB is supposed to collect and distribute, and the consultative or advisory aspect it supposed to be taken on board by the SCV. Mr. Rada?

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, our practice has been to include in the database those definitions as approved by the collected membership in ITUT recommendations.

If it is asserted that SCV is the deciding body on those definitions, with your continued intervention what I am now understanding is that we you should not consider the recommendations approved until after the SCV looks at those terms too because they are defined within the normative text of ITUT recommendations. Thank you.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. That is the whole point, that in this instance we are going to have a situation where you are going to have different study groups, and they approve the same terms and definitions, and direct definitions.

Sometimes one study group does not know what the other study group is doing. We have examples of where that happened. The point is the SCV does not take decisions; it can give advice, recommendations.

But they can say look there is a term here and a term there, and logically you should have this decided upon before the recommendation is finally approved and everything is set in stone.

We have to have all these matters settled at this stage. In mechanical terms, if you are going to get a term and send it to the database, if you do is automatically you end up with a database where you choose a term and you find five different definitions for it.

And that is exactly what we're trying to avoid. That is our precise problem and what we think the SCV should be doing.

The same thing happens in the radio sectors. We get terminology from the study groups. We look at them, and I don't see a problem with this. I think the function of the SCV, itself it is not a decision‑making body without a right to make decisions. But it can compare and look at things because it is kind of an inter‑group body, so to speak.

It has an overview, it sees all the terminology which I think is its job. Thank you.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Any other comments, ladies and gentlemen? If not, we can consider the new Resolve 6 as amended ‑‑ sorry, China?

>> CHINA: Thank you. In the new Paragraph 5 and 6, there are ITU term and definition database; however, in Paragraph 5 we can read online database.

But in Paragraph 6, there is no "online" is it an editorial mistake, or is this a substantial difference? Thank you.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you, China. We can add condition online" to the paragraph under Resolve 6; it was an omission. Spain?

>> SPAIN: Thank you. I would like to make a comment on the previous statements which have been made. We need to be very cautious when we are defining the role of the SCV, the standardization committee for vocabulary in terms of practical procedures, what activities they undertake.

Because we might find ourselves in a situation in which that committee acts as a filter or delays decisions where the adoption of terms is concerned.

In fact we want to improve current procedures, streamline them. This committee should supervise the acceptance of terms that is acceptable but are not entirely convinced that that supervisory role should precede the inclusion of the terms in the database which might imply a delay to the availability of the terms in the database.

So I think we should carefully think about the best way to proceed, what that might be.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: I will give the in floor to Mr. Rada after first a question from the United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: I too was late, my agenda said 11:50, I don't know what went wrong. Committee 4 went long, so I missed the early debate as well as the previous meeting in Working Group 3B because of other commitments because last night I was able to attend the ad hoc group.

I must say I have concerns about the role of the SCV based on the experience of the last four years. It was started with good intentions, and I'm not sure the outputs have justified the role envisioned for it.

The resolution now talks about the use in ITUT of the languages of the Union on an equal footing which I have no problems with, but I'm not sure whether a decision has yet been taken about whether this resolution actually meets that particular need because it is talking about term and definitions, not about the extent to which the five or six official languages are actually taken into account.

So I know where we are, but I must say I do have big reservations which are reinforced by the fact that we're not actually overwhelmed by Advice Chairmen for the SCV itself. That suggests there is not strong support for it from elsewhere. Thank you. Chair to thank you ‑‑

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you. Bulgaria?

>> BULGARIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sorry for being late. I have asked what was the experience in the past? I have found that in the past four years, this body was actually not operational, forgive me if I am wrong.

If we have the good intention to ensure that the terminology used is aligned with all six languages in a Harmonized manner, but if this committee on the vocabulary would for some reason not meet because of nonattendance of the meeting of its members, that means that the whole publication of the resolutions and recommendations and any output of the study groups which is to be treated in the six languages of the Union would be delayed.

I would like to make it very clear here that if in body SCV would be very operational, then it might be helpful. But if its operation will jeopardize the whole base and tempo of activities of the sector, I would like to see measures to ensure that either this committee is operational and doing its work, or if not operational and doing its work, it ceases to be in force and that we proceed along with the practices of the past.

Perhaps something along those lines should be enshrined into the text. Sorry, this is my idea, forgive me if it is a bit ridiculous. Thank you.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: I would like to give the floor to Mr. Rada.

>> Thank you. In light of the several interventions that point to the heart of the utility of the SCV, I would like to come back to the one specific point on Item 6, the modification that Mr. Minkin attempted to introduce.

I believe that this particular interspersion of SCV between the approval of the terms and the entry into the database interferes with the core function of that data base.

I have no problem of the theory that there ideally should be one definition for each term, and it would be wonderful to have such decisions made before recommendations are approved.

But the database records history, the decisions made by the membership. If they chose in their wisdom to have one term mean different things in different recommendations, we still feel the obligation to report that.

That is all that is in that database. If somehow the SCV is going to attempt, with very good intentions to modify and define particular definitions as being "deaf the definition" we lose the act to report the facts as to what is in different recommendations.

And I am at a lose how to functionally proceed with that database as it was designed in service to the membership if we insert the SCV between the action of approval of the recommendation and entering the term in the database. Thank you.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you. Sudan?

>> SUDAN: Thank you, Chairman. I was present when Resolution 67 was produced and a good number of member states were there. Sudan was representing the Arab States.

 We approved this wording. China was there too, for that matter. So we can't really say that this wasn't approved by the members in their entirety.

There were reservations and the Chairman of the group said if there were reservations, they needed to be aired on that occasion. At the end of the meeting it was said that the conclusions of the group would be passed onto the committee. Thank you.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you very much. Russian Federation?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Once again, I would like to draw your attention to the very name of this body. It is supposed to be there, it is a consultation committee that does not have decision minute making power, without the ability to introduce or change terms.

But it is supposed to be an advisory group to look at the situation and draw the attention of study groups to particular issues. The work that goes on in the study groups.

Of course I have mainly worked in the radio secretary or, but in the standardization committee I have also been involved in the work and I know what recommendations are and how they are prepared.

You go through a study group, I know how it works.

And sadly, practice has shown that unfortunately ‑‑ and I really mean this very unfortunately the overwhelming majority of term are not included, not properly considered in the database, a great pity, which is why we are doing this.

Yes, we have a database, but sadly what is in it? We are supposed to have an advisory, consultation committee which is the whole point of the committee, advisory in nature. We know this works in other sectors and we want to do better.

I agree the earlier we work on definitions, the better, in my view, before you have a document set in stone. It is at an early stage where you have to send your terms to the advisory committee. It won't change the substance or the essence; it request give advice and no more.

I am saying in consultation with. We aren't talking about decisions, just about consultation. And then the advisory group issuing recommendations. That is all. Thank you.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you very much. Any further requests from the floor, ladies and gentlemen? We have a number of comments with respect to the wording in No. 6 and the intent of the additional words "in consultation with the SCV" and what that implies vis‑a‑vis the database.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is some ambiguity in the way it is expressed, perhaps some consultation can be undertaken so that it is very clear to the Assembly exactly what the pros implies and the various aspects associated with the SCV work, ie the work of the study groups and the work of the bureau.

So perhaps we can leave this paragraph in abeyance for the moment to see if we can clarify the text so that there are no remaining ambiguities and doubts?

So if I can continue rather than delay the consideration of the remainder of the document, then we can come back to the document to see if we can clarify the text. Is that agreeable?

First, a request from Kuwait.

>> KUWAIT: Thank you, Chairman. I first thank Professor Minkin and his colleagues for this significant line of work on Paragraph 6, what Professor Minkin said was completely correct.

And in our experience in the study groups, when a term is used and entered into the database, this is very useful. It is very important that this should happen.

If for instance the SCV can only provide guidance, there may always be discrepancies between the terms used in the six official languages before the terms are put into the database.

I completely agree with Professor Minkin from that point of view. In terms of your summary, Chairman, we need to this point into account. We need to take it seriously and follow up on it. And of course, must not waste time.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you very much. Ladies and gentlemen, we will return to this paragraph after the completion of the consideration of the rest of the resolution to see if we can add some clarification so that it is crystal clear to everyone what the intent of this paragraph is.

Perhaps those who have an interest in this particular paragraph may want to provide some advice to Professor Minkin so that we can make some progress at the end of the meeting.

Ladies and gentlemen, if we can continue, we have suppressed the old Resolves 12 and 13 and 14. Will; these are no longer relevant. We added a new Resolve 7 indicating that the SCV should work closely in collaboration with the SCV of ITR. Any comments on this additional paragraph, ladies and gentlemen?

If there are no comments, that is approved. Now we have the Instructs, the director of the telecommunications standardization bureau.

Substantively, the changes are as follows. This is a bit difficult to read, given so much deleted text here. In fact, I don't see any text with respect to the Instructs.

Mr. Rada is giving me this ‑‑ perhaps the text can be displayed? It does not appear in DT 29. While we are waiting, I give the floor to the Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. In Russian it is clear. I am using the Russian text which is very clear, but in truth, the English text is not very clear so that I can see why you have problems.

I have been looking at the document in one language and it is absolutely crystal clear to me. But I am afraid in the other versions, it is not, so I do understand you. I did it best in my own language.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you, Dr. Minkin. So I do believe that the English text now appears in the Instructs part. So as you can see, the Instructs 1 is to continue to translate all recommendations under the traditional approval process procedure in all of the languages of the Union; that is No. 1.

Secondly, to translate all TSAG reports in all of the language of the Union. And No. 3, to include in the circular that announces the approval of a recommendation, an indication of whether it will be translated.

So those are the three items under the Instructs from the director of the telecommunications standardization Bureau.

We did discuss this at our first meeting, and I do think it is very straightforward. I will give the opportunity for any comment. I see no requests for the floor, so I consider that approved.

Ladies and gentlemen, for the rest of the text, the Annex 1, obviously the term of reference for SCV are no longer relevant; therefore, they are deleted.

But Mr. Rada has pointed out to me that there is another part missing in DT 29. That is an invitation to the Council. So there is an Invites to the Council that appears presumably in Russian, but not in English.

So as you can see, Council is invited to take appropriate measures to ensure that information on the ITU websites is made available in all official languages of the Union on equal footing within budgetary limits.

This issue was also discussed at our first meeting of this working group. There is also an cans instructs TSAG missing in the English text where the TSAG to instructed to consider the best mechanism for deciding which AAP approved recommendation shall be translated, in light of the relevant Council decisions.

So that would complete the substantive part of the modified resolution. I should simply indicate all of the annexes have been deleted because they are no longer relevant.

I will first give the floor to Bulgaria.

>> BULGARIA: Thank you very much. On paper version, in green I have instructs director of the telecommunication bureau 1, and then 2, and then I go straight to remaining text which stipulates approved in all languages of the Union.

There is a missing part here. What is on the screen is not that I see on the paper, so it should be aligned. This is what I'm signaling to you. Thank you. Chair to indeed the paper copy is missing.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Indeed, the paper copy is missing the instruction to TSAG and to the standardization bureau and to TSAG and the invitation to counsel, so all that text is missing on the paper copy. In any case we apologize for that, but I do believe it does appear on the electronic version. Yes, it is in the electronic version.

So there is another example of why we should work electronically, I suppose. Unfortunately I was using a paper copy too, and I missed all of that text. I have just been taught a lesson; I will from now on work electronically!

In any case, ladies and gentlemen, for these additional paragraphs appearing to the electronic version, are there any comments? First the Instructs the Director of the TSB, if there are they comments we will consider it approved.

The Invitation to Counsel, any comments? We will consider it a prophet. Finally the Instruction to TSAG, any comments, ladies and gentlemen? If not, we will consider this approved as well.

So if we can now return to Resolve 6, I would invite the meeting to offer any comments with respect to clarification of the text based on the interventions made with respect to, in particular, the interface of the SCV vis‑a‑vis the study groups and the database itself. Are there any particular comments which may help clarify the text and remove any remaining doubts expressed during the course of this discussion?

I see Mr. Rada is offering to provide us with a possibility of text which may help clarify matters. If you will allow me to pause for a moment to allow him to complete his work.

I can perhaps give the floor to Mr. Rada to offer a slight revision to the new Resolve 6.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the intention was to suggest that the consultation of SCV was with respect to the study groups as they are defining the terms.

So modifying the exact proposal in English to move that phrase of the consultation to be associated with the study groups who are making the proposals, this then becomes a simple matter of mechanics for the TSB to enter the material into the database at a later stage. Thank you.it is a challenge to make it visible for you to see. The end result would be for Item 6 that the telecommunication standardization bureau or TSB would collect all new terms an definitions proposed by the ITUT study groups in consultation with SCV, and enter them in the online ITU terms and definitions database. Thank you.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you, Mr. Rada. Any comments, ladies and gentlemen? Spain is requesting the floor.

>> SPAIN: Thank you very much, chairman. I have no major objection to the proposal from the Secretariat. I assume the Secretariat's experience will be enough to convince us that is a practical solution.

However, I'm not sure if I am coming up against another document problem because neither in the electronic version I am looking at nor the evening line or Spanish paper versions can I see a role being given to the SCV in Paragraph 6.

So what is going on with this role? I feel a bit confused. If the role handed down to the SCV is one of consultation, a consultative body for the study groups, and the Secretariat is telling us that is a practical way forward, I have no objection.

But I am quite surprised because in the text I am looking at, the electronic and paper versions, I see no reference to such a role for the SCV. Thank you.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you very much. Perhaps I can ask Dr. Minkin, since he seemed to have agreed or be agreeing with the text that has been offered by Mr. Rada, if I can ask him to comment on the intervention from Spain.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. I actually have to apologize because ‑‑ well, as you know English is not my native language.

And reading this, it never occurred to me that people would read it differently from the way I understood it. I made it in my own language, and I really do apologize to the others for introducing it in this way regarding the fact there was some conclusion.

I submitted it, and this proposal was put forward here. I apologize to those in the group surprised by it. But thank you very much to our Secretariat who found a right place to put this text in this formulation.

If everyone agrees we support the proposal just made in light of all clarifications and explanations given. I can give more clarification if required. Thank you.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you very much.

For those who wish to intervene, I would ask if they would simply push the button on their microphone, please? Then I can give them the floor. It will show up in green, and then when I give you the floor, the microphone will appear.

I first have a request from Ghana.

>> GHANA: I think so far we have steadily progressed, and I want to make an intervention on the role of SCV. I think we have suppressed a lot of provisions because of the noting section that SCV has been created.

 Perhaps we need to strength then the noting section to give a bit of function or responsibility to the SCV as established. The English version just states that nothing in accordance of Resolution 67, Johannesburg 2008, the committee for vocabulary or SCV was established

I think if we strengthen this aspect of the noting, adding a brief function here, it will answer the discussions that we are now having with regard to the other portion.

This is where I would like to make an intervention, and perhaps we need to look at the editorial in the English version of the noting section. Thank you very much.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you very much. Bulgaria?

>> BULGARIA: Thank you. First we thank Mr. Rada for this very practical proposal that we believe deserves to be fully supported, as well as the proposal of Ghana. Really some work needs to be done to improve the noting section, and we believe it will help the quality of the document and clarify the responsibility of the committee. Thank you.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Ukraine?

>> UKRAINE: Thank you. It seems to us that the proposal from Mr. Minkin which was put forward after the text had been decided upon is indeed a proposal that is well‑founded. We need that in order to understand the way in which we are moving forward toward consistency of terminology here.

Also we agree with the proposal put forward by our Secretariat, recognizing the fact we need to recognize the SCV status an there is a legitimate basis for the way it is worded and should now work. Thank you.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Did I see the United States requesting the floor? It actually shows up as Sweden.

>> This is not the United States, speaking, this is an English reader. And the text that Mr. Rada proposed, it is not clear whether that modifies the word "collection" or "proposal" and I don't think the TSB needs to consult with the committee in the collection process, although that may be what was intended. I think we can leave it up to Mr. Rada to clarify that, but in English it is not clear. Thank you.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Ladies and gentlemen, the way I would like to proceed, we of course have no provision for another meeting of Working Group 3‑B. We are if he end of the first week of the Assembly and I do need to of course report to the full committee.

It seems to me, ladies and gentlemen, there are no substantive issues remaining, as far as this resolution is concerned. We have made modifications Resolve 6.

We have noted ‑‑ perhaps I shouldn't use "noted" but we have taken into account the views expressed by Ghana, supported by Bulgaria that perhaps an additional noting would be required to place the work of the SCV in its proper context.

So I believe that could be undertaken editorially, rather than substantively. So I think it is just a matter of finding the right words to insert into perhaps a new noting ‑‑ or the only noting. So I do not believe that requires a great deal of work.

Then as we just heard with regard to perhaps a further clarification with respect to the use of the English language with respect to Resolve 6, there may be some editorial adjustment required. But as far as the substance of the resolution, there appears to be agreement so that I can submit this proposed, modified Resolution 67 to Committee 3 for approval, if you agree.

If you will allow us some editorial license to accommodate the proposal from Ghana and the comment just made by an English‑speaker. If that is acceptable to all, I will proceed in that manner.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. The draft resolution is approved pending send editorial modifications. We can then proceed with Item 4 on the agenda.

Any other business? I see no one requesting the floor. I think it is time to close the work of Working Group 3‑B. I would like to express my particular appreciation to Mr. Rada as Secretary of this working group, and to colleagues who participated in the drafting exercise for the fairly substantive changes to Resolution 67.

And as I have mentioned, this draft resolution will now be conveyed to Committee 3 for its approval. With that, ladies and gentlemen, I thank you very much for your participation. We look forward to future discussion at the level of Committee 3. Thank you.

 (Session concluded at 11:49)
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