

RAW COPY

WORLD TELECOMMUNICATION STANDARDIZATION ASSEMBLY
COM3
HAMMAMET, TUNISIA
26 OCTOBER, 2016

Services Provided By:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-482-9835
www.captionfirst.com

This text is being provided in a rough-draft Format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of, the proceedings.

>> CHAIR: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Please take your seats.

Welcome to the continuation of Committee 3 for our first day's meeting. As I indicated before we broke for lunch, my priority for this afternoon would be to go through several items where I anticipate it may be necessary to charter ad hoc or drafting groups or informal consultation groups to reconcile some issues. I wanted to make sure we get to the point of creating those activities so the priorities would be Resolution 22, subject of gender issues and Resolution 70, we would come back to Resolution 35 time permitting before the coffee break. This afternoon we'll be -- the session of Working Group 3A dealing with starting with Resolution 32. This is our final session for Com 3 this afternoon.

Resolution 22 is the authorization for TSAG to act between about WTSAs. We have a variety of proposals. What I would like to do is make sure that we understand the proposals and understand the charter for a group that we will probably have to create in order to close on this issue. I would like to go through the four proposals in order starting from Arab proposal 43, addendum 20. Can we have a presentation of that proposal

and if we could put that on the screen as it is being presented?
Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair.

First of all, I would like to say that we're happy on behalf of the Arab states Administrations to present addendum 20 to document 43. This is a proposed less illusion to the authorization to act between WTSAs. For TSAG to operate under that period, as we know we all understand how important it is for this issue to be resolved. We have given the Recommendations that differ from those formulated by the telecommunications sector. The Secretariat has studied the list A and studied the Recommendations. It's important for the Secretariat to be able to suggest improvements which would be in the framework of the work of this sector to take into account the improvements needed to assist those efforts and to help the formation of such Recommendations in the work at ITU. This suggestion aims to manage well the Recommendations taking into account the basic text of the Union, in particular Article 15 of the statutes and convention.

On this basis, these Recommendations are proposed in order to achieve this goal within the framework of this proposal which comes from the Arab States Administrations.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

Are there questions of clarification on this proposal?
United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good afternoon, everybody. Thank you, Saudi Arabia, for giving us this contribution.

Just a question for clarification regarding the bottom where it says instructs the director of TSB, it has to propose Recommendations within his limits specified in the Convention for consideration by ITU membership. Is this -- are we suggesting that the director start recommending issues to the Member States?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

I had a similar quarry as well, a recommendation with a capital R means normally a document and I'm presuming that this is not asking the director to do that. If we could have clarification, Saudi Arabia, on the intention?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair.

I would like to say this a proposal for improvement of the Recommendations.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

So the idea would not be recommendations as in -- with a

capital R but proposals of new revisions if I understood your answer.

Let's see, I have another question from the United Kingdom, please.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

Perhaps we could have clarity on exactly what sort of circumstances are envisaged and could I also ask in relation to bracket 2 to -- is it proposed that ITU staff being editors for text for the Recommendations?

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom.

Saudi Arabia, if you can provide a response, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA:

Thank you, Chair.

Given the fact that the text has to come from the Secretariat to have the same foundation for the Recommendations, I believe that the coordination of Recommendations should be undertaken by the Secretariat. This also corresponds with Article 15 of the ITU convention.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Are there further questions or clarification on this document?

United Kingdom, please.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair.

He hasn't -- the Delegate from -- representing the Arab States has not responded to my question. Can you give us examples of when this may be helpful so we can understand what's being proposed? Presumably you're suggesting something isn't working properly now and you wish to improve it.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom.

Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. I also thank the Distinguished Delegate from the United Kingdom for having posed this question and for requesting clarification.

It seems to me, Chair, that we have seen in the past some difficulties, difficulties in nominating editors charged with compiling the text of Recommendations in a stable perennial manner. Given this, we, the Arab States Administrations considered that it would be useful for the members and also good and convenient for these texts to be stable and compliant for a nomination of edits to be conducted in this way to have a log, a registry of all those improvements introduced. These Recommendations are of a different nature to the other Recommendations, Chair, because these Recommendations concern working procedures in the area of standardization and are not

technical texts that are implemented by the members of the ITU.

I hope this response can satisfy the Distinguished Delegate of the United Kingdom and we would be happy to provide any further clarification if necessary.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

One question from myself: According to the Rapporteurs responsible for the text of the Recommendation and an editor, advises -- is described as someone who assists the Rapporteur in the preparation of text, sometimes they do that job very well and the Rapporteur doesn't need to do anything additional but generally those individuals are part of the leadership team and come from the membership and presumably not only the director makes proposals for improving the series of Recommendations but as we know from TSAG the membership also makes proposals. It sounds like this is a proposal that TSB take on the editing staff or a combination of both proposals from the director and proposals from the membership.

Let me ask, if that's a correct understanding? Let me indicate, I don't want to spend too long on one document because I want to introduce them all and talk about the group, where we'll actually charter a group to make the final decisions about the text.

Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair.

As we know, Chair, the function of the editor sometimes does not coincide with the conclusions of the group. This function of an editor when it is executed by the Secretariat does not mean that administrations cannot make proposals. This is not the case at all.

This is not our goal.

We simply want the Secretariat to assist editing and assist administrations in compiling Recommendations from time to time.

The Member States and sector members have the right to offer any other improvement they consider to be constructive and the final decision on recommendations is taken by the Bureau, the Director of the Bureau and Member States and sector members which attend meetings of the TSAG where it will be decided whether such improvements were accepted or not.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

Are there any other questions or can we say that we understand the proposal? Doesn't mean we have taken any decisions so far. Our goal for this part of the session is to make sure we understand all the proposals.

I see no requests for the floor.

I thank Saudi Arabia for the proposal. Next we consider

Proposal 44 Addendum 3 and may I ask as this is being presented if this could be projected on the screen, please.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, this document, 44, addendum 3 is about the proposal with the provision about the modification on Resolution 22. In yesterday's preliminary session we agreed to look at Resolution 82 and -- the review Committee establish it had at the last WTSA, worked quite hard in the past four years and then provided the outcome and report to the WTSA. We believe that such an outcome and review of the structure and the strategy should continue after this WTSA so we propose to modify the Resolution 22 so that TSAG could continue such work.

That is main objectives of the proposal. We propose to add a sentence to this considering and we also would like to propose to add more sentences to the resolve part.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan. Are there questions of clarification on this proposal?

I see no requests for the floor. That proposal was -- United States, please.

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

Just a clarification question on number 6 of the resolves part, last part where it says -- that TSAG monitor standardization related actives and implement structural changes to facilitate structures, continue evolution as well to deal with increased demands for timely, appropriate results to meet -- how is -- what is the proposal? How do they propose to do that?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you for the question.

Mostly what I was thinking about is based on the proposal from TSAG creating a new Rapporteur group on the stands strategy so such examination of the strategic issues of the whole ITU is necessary considering the other standardization and organizations, they all have such a body such as a board to discuss the activity of the organization. In ITU-T, we should continue the discussion especially the Rapporteur group should do that work.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan.

Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair. We also thank the APT for the proposal as presented.

We have a question with respect to the references to the Review Committee. The idea of the contribution as we understand it is that the structure will be reviewed by TSAG and not

REVCOM. It seems it is a superfluous reference. Perhaps that could be some clarifications as to why we are including this reference to the work of RevCom with respect to which we have already adopted a Resolution.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia.

As I was reading the text of item 6 in the resolves of the proposal the first thing that had come to my mind was the study group activity monitoring initiated under RevCom and was proposed as part of the report to move to TSAG. As I reread the sentence, it doesn't quite say that. If that was the intention I think that's something the group, the ad hoc we will create, could clean up if the intention was something else we should have some clarification because the monitoring certainly has been a valuable product of RevCom.

I didn't find anything in the resolves to RevCom but just the considering that they have done that work in the past. I haven't seen the existence of a Review Committee.

Any other additional questions of clarification on this proposal?

Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair.

I can explain my question.

In the considering section we have a section M which refers to the Review Committee or RevCom. As a rule, in the section considering we include those provisions which support the resolves section. I don't see any -- I don't see any resolves aspect which is supported by the inclusion of the text in considering M, specifically the reference to RevCom.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia.

My own understanding of the proposal had been part of the resolves was intended to instruct TSAG to carry out some activities that were initiated under the RevCom. That was at least my understanding of the proposal.

I'll ask Japan if that was their intention.

>> JAPAN: Thank you very much. Thank you for making that question, Russia, thank you, Chairman, for your view.

That is our understanding, to clear -- to make clear the proposal's intention we could move this sentence to considering based on the Review Committee's outcome we made this proposed. I'm happy to discuss with Russia if the ad hoc group is created. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan.

If the proposal is clear to everyone, I currently see no additional requests for the floor, I saw nodding from Russia so I hope that proposal was clear. Let's move to the next one.

The CTEL proposal in 45 addendum 2. If we could have that on the screen as presented, please.

Argentina, please -- I'm sorry. No. I said -- I misspoke. CEPT. Sorry for the confusion. My eyes went to the wrong line. Europe 45, addendum 2, Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Chairman.

Addendum 2 to contribution 45 contains the proposals on transferring the necessary functions exercised to the members of TSAG. We propose the following modifications to Resolution 22. We would add 3 additional items to the resolve part. First, to review on an annual basis the effectiveness and efficiency of all ITU Study Groups and other groups and implement structural changes as appropriate to ensure that the outputs of the groups justify the resources allocated to them.

Second, to monitor the current success of the coordination and collaboration mechanisms with other standards development organizations and consider possible improvements.

Third, to starting 18 months after each WTSA regularly assess the work of the ITU Study Groups and to lead any work item and or question that's not sufficiently progressed.

Finally, it is proposed to instruct the director of TSB to follow the advice of TSAG in order to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the sector and to provide to each TSAG meeting a report of all work under the heading of bridging the standardization gap to ensure that the work is appropriate to ITU-T and complimentary rather than overlapping with or duplicate of the work of the ITU development sector.

That finishes the European proposals to modify Resolution 22.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany.

While people queue up with clarity. I had a couple of questions on my own.

Perhaps just a remark, one, it indicates on an annual basis and I think we reached an agreement in TSAG to meet in cycle with the Study Groups. TSAG should meet at whatever the meeting frequency is and not annually. That was one thing I had noted in reading this.

Another thing I had noted, concerning the proposal of deletion of question texts and to make sure that I understand the proposal correctly.

We have text in Resolution 1 clause 7.4.1.1 that instructs a Study Group to consider deletions of the question that hasn't received any contributions in the two previous meeting cycles.

Is this intending that TSAG rather than the Study Groups would delete study questions within a Study Group by observing their activity and I wanted to make sure I understood that

proposal correctly.

I'll also ask people to request the floor if they have additional questions for clarification.

Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Chairman.

Regarding your second question, I think it's about the assessment of the work of the questions and TSAG should do the assessment and should instruct the Study Group as you mentioned to deal with the questions concerned.

Regarding the first question about the frequency of the reports I think one year would be a good timeframe but the report should be addressed by the next TSAG meeting after one year.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair.

First of all, I would like to thank the Delegate of Germany for having presented this proposal. Chair, I agree with you as regards to your observations, regarding certain addenda in paragraph 1 of the Resolution and also with respect to paragraph 4.2, 4.3 and also 7.1 and 2.1. Do we need to reiterate or repeat in this text all of these references?

My second question, the Bureau, as mentioned in paragraph 1, the question is the opinions formulated by TSAG, are they mandatory? Are they obligatory? In the English text this appears to be the case.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

My personal understanding was that some of these provisions are phrased in a somewhat different way expressing the intention that TSAG continue the valuable activities initiated under RevCom. Finding the right way to express that would be important but obviously we do it one way and not by combining necessarily the text into multiple descriptions of the same thing.

I take your point, so instructs the director to follow the advice is I think something we haven't done so far in the past.

The next request I have for the floor is Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair.

We have approximately the same kind of questions as when we heard you voicing questions, it is about the same thing.

Unfortunately, we didn't receive a response or -- I would like to clarify.

First of all, as regards to the proposed for annual review of the activities by the Study Group we consider the activity or we review the activity of the Study Group, the assembly, every

four years. In our opinion, the formation of a reporting system each year for each Study Group could mean just one or two meetings. We're hoping to get reports on the work of the Study Group over one or two meetings and we believe this would create more chaos than it would order.

We have a four-year term. This is a balanced timeframe for assessment of the work by the Study Group and full review. We don't understand the essence of the proposal. How it would improve life.

Second question: This concerns regular review of work over the period of 18 months and review of the exception of any referral of questions. As you stated, Chair, we have pertinent procedure for the review and looking at issues. Why create an additional parallel procedure? We do not see how this would improve our lives either.

In conclusion, section that instructs the Bureau Director, the text which was submitted is not completely clear to us. Instructs the Director to follow the instructions of TSAG is not clear what actually is meant. We would like to receive answers to these specific questions if possible.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Let me remind participants that I was hoping to make sure that we all understood these proposals and not conduct at this stage debates of substance and the merits of the proposals. If we could try to confine ourselves to making sure we understand things.

I think as far as the proposal for the review, what was there, it is lower than the TSAG, you can find under the of meetings of RevCom, the information, for each Study Group we have on a meeting by meeting basis an analysis of the number of attendees and their geographical distribution and the number of contributions received, the number of texts consented, agreed, the contributions by question, it provides useful insight as far as identifying areas which are perhaps questions not receiving sufficient contributions. Not meaning you get rid of the question but you have motivation to look, providing an analysis of the liaison statements send and received to and from which other groups are.

I think many people in managing the work of the Study Groups found that as a valuable tool to understand the activity level of the various Study Grouping. My understanding, and if it isn't clear in the proposal, we need to clarify in the output that the intention was that that sort of monitoring that had begun under RevCom will continue under TSAG because that was something that people found very valuable from the RevCom activity. I'll allow Germany to correct me if I misunderstood the essence of that proposal.

Are there other questions of clarification on this proposal?

I see no additional requests for the floor. We have one more proposal to present and understand, IEP46 addendum 31 and at this point I think I'll recognize Argentina.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair.

We present this AIP which presents to the changes to Resolution 22. The first change is in addition in the resolves part to structure and establish -- for the Study Group, baring in minds the needs of developing countries and also the actual geographic distribution among the regions for ITU and the second change we would like to propose in the resolve part in item 2 saying that TSAG examine implementation of the actions and achievement of the goals appearing the Bureau's action plan for the purpose of identifying possible difficulties and recommending solutions to regarding these changes.

This is the changes we would like to bring forward for this Resolution.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Argentina.

Questions of clarification on this proposal?

Sorry for the delay here.

There's a proposal in this document which is in proposed new resolves 2, that TSAG examine the implementation of the actions and achievement of the goals appearing in the Bureau's action plan and then for the purpose of.

I wasn't quite clear on what action plan is being referred to in this clause.

Can I have some clarification on that, please?

I would have given Argentina a chance to respond first but I see a request from the floor from Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman.

Thank you Argentina to present this document. We just seek clarification on the resolve 1C. There is additional sentence proposed text about assigned Chairman and Vice-Chairman and about the principle of geographic distribution for the positions and I'm afraid that criteria of Chairman, Vice-Chairman, it is defined in Resolution 35. That could be a duplication. I would like to seek clarification on this point.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan.

I would tend to agree there that it is better to reference Resolution 35 than try to repeat the criteria of Resolution 35.

On those two previous points which action plan was being referred to and if that's a correct understanding that the intention of the text in resolves 1 was really to create the same sort of criteria as we have spelled out in Resolution 35 and if the reference to Resolution 35 would suffice to make sure

that those criteria are taken on board and assigning Chairman, Vice-Chairmen in the group created by TSAG.

Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair.

The idea for the first modification was to strengthen the concept and principle within Resolution 35 and makes reference to the modification here. The action plan which was referred to in the second modification is it the action plan of the study Groups within ITU-T.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I see a look of puzzle. On the face of the TSAG Chairman, but perhaps we can discuss offline before the group has the meeting session that everyone understands what's being proposed here.

I see no requests for the floor. I hope the proposals are clear. That doesn't mean that we have agreed what to do. As I said, I think this would be easier to work in a smaller group, an ad hoc group to attempt to take the agreed elements of the four proposals and incorporate them in a single text to consider by adoption by Com 3.

Considering the topics, activities of TSAG, I would suggest that our Working Group 3B Chair who knows a lot about TSAG takes responsibility for that. The provisional time we indicated we would try to take that up would be tomorrow just at the end of the lunch break. 13:30 is the time we would look for that.

If I could have a show of hands how many would intend to participate in that group we can try to allocate a room of appropriate size. Provisionally the room will be Jasmin but check the monitors just in case that changes. We're not the only Committee creating ad hocs. I'm glad to see not everyone in the room put their hand up, it is somewhat easier to work through this in a small group.

This is showing up for ITU for the floor.

>> ITU: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I ask the group to bear in mind the document that was presented yesterday which I presented yesterday, number 27, on the implementation of the various actions associated with Resolution 22.

I think it would be useful to bear in mind the report from RevCom which I believe is document 43 which could serve as a reference for the discussion that will take place tomorrow.

I think those documents would be of help in the conduct of our discussions.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Everyone planning to participate tomorrow has a reading assignment for tonight to make sure we all understand these documents.

Russia.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair.

We fully agree with your decision. We would also like to clarify nevertheless.

If this ad hoc group has a Chair in the form of -- of Working Group 3B they won't be able to work in parallel, so it would be more logical to simply allow Working Group 3B to work on this and take a Resolution at their own meeting. This would avoid creating additional superfluous groups that would generate additional complications for the administrations who are modest in size and unable to be present then they could discuss this at 3B.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia, for the suggestion.

I think there are two reasons why that's not practical. One, 3B has its own allocated meeting time. I think it's going to be a challenge to get through I think 7 resolutions in the 1.25 hours allocated to them at present.

The other thing, in order to make progress it is generally more convenient to work in a somewhat smaller group rather than in plenary with interpretation of six languages where drafting can be carried out on the screen. I think the method of working for an ad hoc group is different than the method of working of a formal Working Group or Committee. I think for those two reasons I prefer to proceed as I have suggested. We consider this as an ad hoc and carry it out in a smaller room, in a single language and draft the text as everyone can see it on the screen in order to meet the agreed portions of the four proposals bearing in mind as Mr. Gracey has pointed out, the report from TSAG on the implementation and the suggestions from RevCom. If that's okay, I would like to proceed in that manner.

The next issue I wanted to take up is the issue of gender. We have two Agenda points, 7 and 8, related to gender. They're not independent. There are two proposals with respect to Resolution 55, one is for a modification, the other is for suppression, but not to be confused the idea that's coupled with the proposal in proposed new Resolution AIP2 so it wasn't that the idea that we wouldn't have a gender Recommendation or Resolution, it was that we would replace it with a different one so the suppression was coupled with adding a new one.

I think there's little doubt from the proposals that we have that we'll conclude this WTSA with a single Resolution on gender issues whether it is a modification of 55 or a new Resolution is for discussion and still to be determined. I think there will not be any difficulty getting agreement on the content because I don't think there's any disagreement on the principles we're trying to achieve here.

With that, I wanted to get an introduction of the three proposals to make sure we understand this. What we'll have to decide is whether this turns into an informal consultation group and whether the originators of the three proposals will get together on their own and come up with a common text or if we need to make it more formal we can decide that as a result of the discussion. I want to introduce, understand the three proposals.

The first, APT44 addendum 6. Could I have an introduction of that please.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair.

Good afternoon, everyone.

I'm pleased to introduce this proposal for consideration on behalf of the Asia-Pacific Tele community. Gender equality and mainstreaming is an issue of importance, pair mount importance to for the ITU and the United Nations system as a whole. We consider it necessary to update Resolution 55 to reflect developments in progress that's occurred in this space since WTSA12 and we also consider that the discussion around this Resolution to be very timely given the recently established ITU-T woman in standardization Expert Group will be holding their first meeting here in conjunction with WTSA.

The proposed Amendments have been provided in the interest of streamlining the document and taking into account the TSAG principles for preparing resolutions and opinions and updating references to concluded and new activities and initiatives designed to progress work towards promoting the goal of gender issues were equality and mainstreaming.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia.

Questions of clarification on this proposal?

I see no request for the floor. The proposal is clear for everyone. That's good.

The next two I think are linked even though they're shown under different Agenda points.

The two CTEL proposals, 46 addendum 4 and 46 addendum 5. If I could and for introduction of those two.

United States, please. It.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair.

Good afternoon, colleagues.

I will be presenting 2 addendums 4 and 5 together, in particular in AIP4CTEL proposed a suppression of Resolution 55, mainstreaming a gender perspective in the ITU-T activities. We make this proposal alongside our proposal of a new Resolution as drafted in AIP5 entitled promoting gender equality in the ITU-T activities. We all know the benefits of ensuring women have access to telecommunications and ICTs, stronger economies,

greater flexibility for alternative work arrangements, access to virtual health and educational services and so much more. In our AIP we proposed new Resolution is based directly on the text of Resolution 55 but substantially updates existing references removing those which are out of date and cites new actions, decisions and events which are relevant to gender equality and gender balance. It further provides specific steps to promote greater participation of women in the work of the ITU-T. The ITU has made great progress on gender equality. Since the first woman was at the negotiating table in 1932 we have the gem awards, international girls and IC, it day and equals which is the new ITU initiative to bridge the gender digital divide. Even looking around this room we can see women leaders existing and emerging, but if we want to be truly inclusive we must do more. It is time to update the wording on this topic and as we see in this new Resolution this is the best way to accomplish that. The text in AIP5 proposes that the ITU-T continue its efforts to ensure that all of the ITU-T's policies, work programs, information dissemination activities, publications, Study Groups, seminars, courses and conferences reflect our commitment to gender equality and that priority is given to gender balance in the selection of Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Rapporteurs. The text further urges members and sector members to include qualified women on Delegations whenever possible. Gender equality is not only about having girls and women use technology, it means women leadership in telecommunications and ICT fields. As Chairs and heads of Delegation, as CEOs, ministers, as professional staff and elected officials. As indicated by the intra-American support on these ideas we believe that they represent a promising way forward regarding gender issues and the ITU-T.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Is there any questions on clarifications of this proposal?

Both proposals are clear. I think my sense is that there is a great deal of harm nip in the two proposals. I think there shouldn't be any obstacle to drafting a single text that reflects in one document the set of updates. We have been given some guidance from the TSB that it is preferable to keep the same Resolution number, although we're free to update the title and I think the title is certainly a matter of importance in the CTEL proposals. I think that's something we can take a final decision on when we would see the text.

I'm interested in whom would be interested in taking part in a had drafting book. If mainly the proponents I think we can call it an informal consultation group and leave it to the proponents of these originators of the proposals bringing us a

text. If there are others interested in participating we can -- I don't think we need to call it an ad hoc group but a drafting group with the intention of producing a single text which takes on board the largely agreed elements of the two three proposals as we look at it.

How many individuals would be interested in taking part in that kind of drafting activity?

Looks like we have about five who are interested. It is -- five or six. I think we'll then make it a formal drafting group rather than an informal consultation group in order to produce this common text.

I would like to assign this to one of my Vice-Chairmen if I could ask you to Chair this drafting group? Is that okay? I'm seeing -- okay. That's okay?

It looks like we could accommodate either tomorrow evening at 17:30 or do Friday end of lunchtime, 13: 30 as you prefer. Any strong preference for one of those times?

How many would prefer to do this tomorrow evening at 17:30? Nobody.

How many would prefer to do it Friday at 13: 30?

That seems to be the preference. We'll tentatively look for the same room, Jasmin, if that changes, that will be on the screen.

We have one other mandatory item of business I was looking for, to get through to create a similar kind of a group, that's with respect to Resolution 70. If I could start with a short introduction of the three proposals which I think are similar to the last item, not really in conflict but are complimentary proposals. The first is from the Arab States, 43, addendum 7. If we could show that proposal as it is presented. Thank you.

We have someone from the Arab States to present 43, addendum 7?

Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair good afternoon, everyone.

I'm happy on behalf of the Arab States to present document 43, addendum 7 regarding the accessibility of ICT for Persons with Disabilities.

This modification goes together with Resolution of 2014 from the plenipotentiary as well as other ITU activities during last year supporting the activities of People with Disabilities, including boosting accessibility to ICT and training and education technologies and articulated with public policies in the area as the world assembly on accessibility of ICT for Persons with Disabilities.

Chair, ladies and gentlemen, given the importance of this Resolution and the importance of expanding accessibility to ICT for Persons with Disabilities the Arab Group reiterates the

importance of preserving this Resolution. We could say that the modifications presented in the Arab document editorial Amendments which echo changes that have taken place since the last assembly was held in Dubai in 2014.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Are there questions of clarification on this proposal?

I see no request for the floor. The proposal is clear.

The next is from APT, 44 addendum 7. If I could have a presentation of that.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair.

I'm pleased to introduce document 44, addendum 7 on telecommunication information and communication technology accessibility for Persons with Disabilities on behalf of the APT.

Promoting accessibility for Persons with Disabilities is a fundamentally important issue for the ITU and the broader international community. Since WTSA12 the ITU made progress toward improving telecommunication and ICT accessibility for Persons with Disabilities through the operations of the union, partners and related activities. We consider it necessary to update Resolution 70 accordingly and our proposed Amendments have been provided in the interest of streamlining the documents, again taking into account the TSAG principles for preparing resolutions and opinions and updating references to concluded and new activities and initiatives or designs with the intent to progress work toward the goal of promoting telecommunications and ICT accessibility for Persons with Disabilities.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Is there questions of clarification on this proposal? I see no requests for the floor.

The final proposal in this group is CTEL46 addendum 14. If I could have a presentation of that, please.

United states, please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: On behalf of CTEL I would present the same document updated, Resolution 70, there has to be some updating, this was updated in 2012 only and it needs modernizing to some degree. There are other aspects that have been added to bring in some of the changes occurring in the ITU-T and some other aspects that will give greater capacity for Persons with Disabilities to participate and the terminology that has to be updated, which is extremely important.

In line with everyone else, I think if I can say something, all -- I have read all of them. They pretty much say the same thing. They just need to have the text aligned I think. I'm --

having said that, rather than going to great detail it would be better to have a situation when everything is aligned to go into detail at that time.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

Questions on clarification on this proposal?

I see no requests for the floor. All three proposals are clear.

This is very good.

As for the last remark from the United States, there is a lot of consistency in these. I think we would certainly refer to an activity to put these together into a single text as being a drafting group rather than an ad hoc. It doesn't really need to decide anything other than what words are necessary to convey the largely agreed intended meeting that everyone has in mind.

It didn't show up on my screen. I understand we had a request from the back of the room from Uruguay.

>> URUGUAY: Mr. Chair, thank you for giving me the floor. I would like to talk about accessibility. I represent Côte d'Ivoire. I wanted to speak about the proposal from the APT, the proposed suppressing the organization of a certain event mentioned in the Resolution 70 from 2012. I wanted to know why the suppression was in that contribution of those events. .

It would be the standardization Bureau that would organize these events. I wanted to know why can a suppression was proposed.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

APT, if we could have a clarification on that point so we don't have any confusion in the drafting group. Australia, please.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair.

Thank you, Côte d'Ivoire, for the additional question.

Could I please just clarify my understanding.

Which particular event or section of the APT proposal is your Query relating to?

>> CÔTE D'IVOIRE: Thank you.

I was talking about 4 which was from the 2012 Resolution 70 which was suppressed and now the director of the TCB is charged with the responsibility of organizing a workshop but in Resolution 70 it was the states doing this.

Why was this change proposed and why replacing states with the director of standardization.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Australia please.

>> AUSTRALIA: Our intention in relocating the text was I

think simply with the intent of assigning that activity specifically to the most appropriate area of the ITU-T however in our view the most important issue is the worthwhile activity be carried out and maintained. If there is a view from the floor that that activity would be better placed under the resolve section we would be amenable to that.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I see heads nodding. Hopefully that's clear.

I guess given our time, we have one minute left. Can I ask the interpreters -- I'll ask, but we probably won't use more than 3, 4, is it okay if we take a few extra minutes?

>> Chair, that's fine.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

Any final questions on clarifications of any of these? I think we understand it is a matter of deciding where an item goes, which I think is still under the terms of drafting. What I would like to do is create a drafting group from discussion with a few individuals and maybe this won't meet the pleasure of everybody, the preferred time seems to be on Saturday at 10:00 a.m. and I think also Jasmin would be likely the room although that will be clarified on the screen. I would like to ask since we have the honor of the presence of a person who will put on a slightly different hat, not the CTEL spokesperson but the Chairman of the JCA on accessibility and human factors, if I could ask you if you would be willing to Chair this group and -- Ms Sachs and I trust she would be an ideal candidate for carrying out that work.

That would be on Saturday at 10:00 a.m.

United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chairman.

I would be happy to Chair that since I am one of the original authors of the original Resolution and also was involved in the updating of 2012. I would be happy to help with that particular question that was posed earlier.

I would be very happy to do the Chairing and the helping of getting one document put together.

Thank you for asking me.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I'm optimistic that on had these three items that the able Chairman we appointed will be able to had bring back a text that we can agree with the minimum of additional discussion needed and I think they all know better than to try to bring me anything with square brackets in it. I don't envision we will need that in at least two of the three of these.

That completes our time for today.

I believe Working Group 3A will be meeting -- is it in this room? That's after coffee.

So someone else will be in front of the room for you for the remainder of the day and Com 3 will meet again for several sessions tomorrow.

It looks like we start tomorrow.

Thank you, we're recessed for today.