

RAW FILE

WORLD TELECOMMUNICATION STANDARDIZATION ASSEMBLY  
WTSA-16  
COMMITTEE 3  
WORKING METHODS OF ITU-T  
HAMMAMET, TUNISIA  
26 OCTOBER 2016  
11:15 A.M.

Services Provided By:  
Caption First, Inc.  
P.O. Box 3066  
Monument, CO 80132  
1 877 825 5234  
+001 719 481 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.

\*\*\*

>> STEVE TROWBRIDGE: Good morning, everybody. Please take  
your seats.

Good morning, everybody. Welcome to Tunisia and welcome to  
the first session of committee 3 on the working methods of the  
ITU-T. My name is Steve Trowbridge and I'm honored to be able  
to serve for the second time as committee 3 chairman at an  
assembly. I work for Nokia in the United States.

For those of you who haven't been to a session before, you  
will have a controller with your headset which allows you to

choose interpretation in any of the six languages. Channel 0 will give you access to the floor, but I would like to quickly check the various languages. So channel 1 is English.

>> Good morning, chairman.

>> STEVE TROWBRIDGE: Channel 2 is, I believe, French. Merci. Channel 3 is Spanish. Gracias. And channel 4 is Russian. Channel 5, Chinese. And channel 6, Arabic.

So let me introduce several of the individuals who will be assisting us in our work. First of all, let me go through the vice chairmen and ask them to stand up. We don't have room on the podium for everyone who will be taking on tasks, but the vice chairmen, we have many Alexander Grishchenko from the Russian Federation.

Okay. Over here.

We have Ms. Tran Thanh Ha and Mr. Hassan Talib from Morocco. Welcome, everybody.

Let me introduce a couple of other individuals. So some of our work will be taken in advance of committee 3 consideration in two Working Groups. So our Working Group 3A chair is Mr. Achmed Ragi of Egypt. Over here on the right and Working Group 3b is Mr. Bruce Gracie from Canada. So welcome Bruce.

Then we also have a number of people from the TSB who will be assisting us. So Ms. Tatiana Urakova and Jaja Yang, and Martin Oikner and Ana Maria who will be helping in the back with some documentation. There are a few other individuals who will -- from TSB who may assist with of the ad hoc group. I see sitting with the Bulgarian delegation, our director, Mr. Chaesub Lee. So welcome.

So a few comments from myself, by way of introduction. I also happen to serve as chairman of ITU-T study group 15 and Mr. Ragi one of our vice chairmen serves as the vice chairmen of ITU-T Study Group 15. We want to make sure that we have working methods that are clear and efficient to all members. The workload for our committee, we will be considering 65 proposals against 20 existing resolutions, two new resolutions, updates four of the A series recommendations and a request to republic A .7. Just in comparison in Dubai, we had a similar workload, a little bit more. We had 78 proposals against 19 existing recommendations or resolutions. Two new resolutions. We updated six A series recommendations. We had the same amount of time allocated in Dubai, and we were able to complete our work.

So in principle, I think we have sufficient time. Of course the metrics are not a good indicator of time the discussion and the debate could vary. We could work faster than this and we

could allow you to visit the beach or go to COM4 or see some of the scenery of this wonderful country or we could do the opposite. We could work the weekend and spend a lot of time completing the work. And this is not in my hands, ladies and gentlemen. This is in yours. I hope like myself, many of you prefer the former approach. So if we can work to achieve consensus, as efficiently and quickly as possible, we can allow more time for some other things.

A few administrative things. So I -- I did want to remind everybody of general Rule 90. So this is sometimes overlooked. So any proposal to be considered from a member should be supported by at least one other member, before being considered. So when we introduce a proposal from an individual member, we will try to remember to ask if there's any support. So if you have a proposal from only one member, we won't worry about this for regional proposals which we know are supported by multiple members. You may want to make sure you have -- you have lined up somebody else in the room who at least agrees that that proposal should be brought on the table for consideration. So I don't want anyone who went to the trouble of preparing a proposal to come here and find suddenly we don't discuss it because nobody offers support.

In addition, we'll ask, because some of the proposals are noncontroversial, whether there's any opposition, and proposals which have no support, we don't need to spend time to discuss, and proposals without opposition, we don't have to have discussion.

Unless you are happy with the proposal, exactly as it is, you may want to say something at that point, just to ensure that we have the necessary time for discussion.

Many of the issues we will discuss directly in committee 3, and then create, if we need to, additional ad hocs or drafting groups or informal consultation groups. Some of the issues are allocated to our Working Groups. So Working Group 3A has the traditional scope of the key working methods documentation. So this will include resolution 1, resolution 32, and Recommendation A .1. Working Group 3B has a little bit different scope than we had in Dubai and this is for efficiency. So in Dubai, you may recall Working Group 3B looked after some language issues. In this session, we have allocated two Working Group 3B, seven resolutions on collaboration and coordination and hopefully we can take those efficiently in a Working Group.

With that, let me move to approval of the agenda. So we have two documents that we have prepared. One is a general agenda,

which you will find in temporary document 11. And this provides a -- an overview of all the documents we plan to consider. And so please advise me if you find anything missing here. As you will see on the first page, the timing indicated here is provisional. So we have taken a -- in some sense, it's a guess, as to how long the discussion will require, in another sense, it's an allocation. So if we aren't able to reach a conclusion within the time allocated, perhaps that's a good clue to us that we need to create an ad hoc group or a drafting group or an informal consultation group.

The same is indicated on our -- our agenda for the first session, and this you will find in document ADM5. So any questions or comments on the overall agenda or the first day's agenda that we prepared in these documents?

(Off microphone comment).

>> STEVE TROWBRIDGE: Okay. Thank you. So it was an oversight on my part, since Mr. Lee is sitting with the Bulgarian delegation instead of with us on the podium, but let me ask if you would like the opportunity for a few opening remarks.

Bulgaria, please.

>> CHAESUB LEE: Yes, this should be good exercise how we can use this microphone when you ask -- took the floor. But except for this, just go ahead. Thank you very much.

>> STEVE TROWBRIDGE: Okay. Everybody remember this, it doesn't happen very often that Mr. Lee doesn't have anything to say. Thank you for your presence in our committee.

So we will take the agenda as approved and we will then proceed according to ADM5 and move on with our work.

So the first item of business is resolution 33 and we have one CITELE proposal on resolution 33 to consider, and it's a proposal for suppression. So CITELE -- okay. Canada, please to present this for us. Thank you.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. And good morning, everyone. Indeed, this is a CITELE contribution that calls for the suppression of resolution 33. I want to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the resolve resolution of 33, from Member States and sector members to contribute the priorities of ITU-T to the TSAG strategic process. TSAG is to monitor the work in the given studying period in light of the planning part.

Mr. Chairman, having said this, we recognize that, first, in establishing the TSAG Rapporteur group on the strategic and operational planning which is responsible for the review of the operation on plans for ITU-T, which is normally submitted annually for approval by the ITU council, as well as the input

into the strategic plan for ITU-T to be considered by the approval, TSAG has fulfilled its responsibilities under the terms of this resolution by providing an opportunity for the membership to contribute to the operation and the strategic planning process.

Second, Mr. Chairman, the establishment of the new Rapporteur group under TSAG on the strategic organizational function to review on the landscape and make recommendations to the TSAG on the impact of such exchanges on sector priorities, as well as overall work program, all aspects identified in resolution 33 have been addressed.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the Member States of the Americas proposed to support resolution 33, because its objectives have been accomplished.

Thank you, very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada, and as I promised on the way we would proceed, according to general Rule 90, we know there's support because it's a regional proposal. Is there any opposition to this proposal?

Okay. I see no requests from the floor. So this request for suppression passes. I hope we can proceed with many more items on our agenda that efficiently.

And I think I understand we have the ability to project these documents as they are being presented. So we didn't do that for the first one, but let's try to do that as we move forward. So the next proposal we have is also one proposal against resolution 66, also for suppression. This proposal is from the United States. So can I ask for an introduction of this proposal, please? United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, colleagues. This proposal to suppress resolution 66 was motivated from a review in taking up the invitation of the director to review existing resolutions and I believe that the TSB resources can be used more directly for support of the standardization activities identified and progressed by the membership. It is their role to identify how new technologies can be included within the ITU-T work program, since it is the membership that has the responsibility and authority to devote resources appropriate to their needs to advance the studies incorporated within the work program.

There are many ways in which new work can be initiated within the ITU-T as past discussion on working methods within TSAG have indicated.

It's also noted that the Secretary General has been indicating a desire to create an ITU-wide journal that presents

diverse topics of interest in language that is accessible to non-specialists, to improve the visibility of the ITU. Such a publication could serve the need for general audiences of ICT topics. And it is noted that there has not been technology watch report published since 2014, before the last Plenipotentiary meeting. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. And as this is a -- a contribution from an individual member, let me first ask if there's support for this proposal. I see Canada supports.

Thank you. And is there any opposition to this proposal?

Okay. I see from Russia. Okay. With that, I will move then to questions of clarification on the proposal.

So I see first Russia and then China.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair. And we are also grateful to the United States for presenting this document. We heard in one of the arguments that from 2014, no reports were published under this resolution. And so I would like to clarify how frequently should reports be published under this resolution, given the fact that quite naturally we have a rapidly developing technology before us. But this development is not so fast as to have something to report every day.

So it seems to us that such an argument that we don't have a report that was produced over the past two years, this argument is simply not completely clear to us. At the end of the day, this resolution makes it possible to publish reports, reports that are very important and very interesting, particularly for developing countries.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. China, please.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Chair. China would like clarifications on two points. First of all, regarding the suppression of the resolution, what would be the rule are deployed under this practice? When the works that need to be continued or sustained, is it even convenient to suppress the resolution governing that work?

Secondly, at ITU-T, there's a very special kind of status given that there is a very high speed of technological development. We need to support monitoring notably given the scope and other areas of work. We need to strengthen support of this work.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China. At the moment, I see no more requests for the floor. Unfortunately, Dr. Lee has left us. So I can't ask him a question directly. Just as Chairman, I would

make a couple of observations myself, as far as this, at least as far as I understand the proposal, there are many individuals in many roles who understand and notice the progress of technology and certainly our members are actively engaged in the industry and aware of technological developments and at least in most of our areas, our members are not shy about bringing us proposals for new work, where new technology emerges.

I think the idea of this resolution had been that there may be topics that our members don't notice for one reason or another, that should be brought to our attention and we would see a report about some new emerging technology area that should cause us to think whether we wanted to initiate any new work. And I think the observation of the United States is that that certainly, once every two years, technology evolves much faster than that, would indicate that perhaps we are getting sufficient proposals for new work from the members, and don't need additional input from TSB. So that would be my understanding of at least the original intent of this resolution and then the reality of its implementation. So I think there was a view when it was created that we might receive additional useful input that we weren't getting from the members about new work, and, in fact, I think the observation of the United States was that that doesn't seem to have materialized in a meaningful way. In fact, most of proposals we do get are from the membership for new work, if I understood the proposal correctly.

I see a request for the floor from Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Other chairman of review committee, I would like to mention on this aspect, I'm sure you remember my presentation made yesterday, one of the key proposals includes reviewing the activity on CTO meeting and those of technology watch report. And in the regular committee discussion include TSAG, we agreed to establish a new Rapporteur group on the standard strategy to implement those standard strategy function in the part of the TSAG.

So suppression of this resolution, I thought, already suggests future investigation and it has already been implemented as part of standard strategy studies. So -- but if you mean that a suppression of this resolution will try to ask TSB to stop this kind of activity, if the US propose in that way, I would like to ask you to consider the more good alignment to the result made by TSAG and review committee discussion.

So what do you mean the suppression of this resolution?

And through the reviewing in our review committee, technology watch provide a go initiation -- good source for the initiation on focus group and create a new work item.

Now we are discussing about the 5G, but tactile Internet is analyzed in the future watch and it gives us a good target to implement in the next generation networks. So this kind of strategic work, more future oriented study work should be a part of the standard strategy study in ITU-T.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Mieta. Just to clarify my understanding, I fully agree that the -- the responsibility of TSAG for strategy is very important. In fact, that's called out in Article 14A of the convention. And as is the strategic standardization function and that function receives input from a variety of sources. It receives input from member proposals. It does receive, as you noted input from the CTO group. I think one of the places it might have received input from could have been these technology watch reports, but the observation of the US is that it doesn't -- or it doesn't seem to have proven to be either a voluminous or valuable source of input to that process. The process, of course, is very, very important. We need to establish the appropriate work for the seconder through that kind of analysis and that work, no doubt, will continue with a variety of inputs. So my view would be that the decision about suppression of this resolution is simply a matter of deciding whether we want to still have a request that the TSB try to provide that particular funnel those kind of inputs.

So I see a request for the floor from Russia and the United States.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair.

First of all, we would like, once again, to underscore that we do not fully understand the arguments which are listed to supposedly persuade us that we need to suppress this resolution. We are not persuaded. It is noted, first of all, that the reports compiled under this resolution are recognized by everyone to be significant and of great interest to be highly influential. It was also noted that this concerns the tactile Internet technologies which were described in the 2014 in one of the reports.

And so the question of whether this is a significant source or not, or how significant it is, is a source of new technologies. We have all seen that it's an important and interesting source of information which we certainly should not lose. That's our first point.

Second, there was another argument that starting in 2014,



there have been no reports. Perhaps we should ascertain why it is that there were no such reports. Perhaps we could receive some comments from the bureau on that issue, but in any case, we do not expect such reports to appear every day. They develop -- they appear as technologies develop.

That being the case, if a report appears in 2015, '16, or '17, it's all good. This resolution is not in anyone's way. It's not a hindrance. It doesn't do anything other than provide us with another possible source of new technologies, and we do not understand why we would deprive ourselves of such an additional source of new technologies. And so we support the preservation of this resolution.

In the future, we will take a look into how reports are compiled and how they appear. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Just a quick observation on the apparent intent of resolution 66 for myself. If you look, it resolves two to instruction the telecommunication Director General to provide them to the relevant Study Groups and TSAG for their consideration for an action in accordance with their mandates.

So I think it's clear that the intention of this resolution was as a -- a method to initiate new work rather than -- and what I have heard in some of the interventions -- informing the membership of new technology.

So I think many of you may be aware of this new initiative on an ITU-wide basis of preparing an ITU journal, which, in fact, will provide a lot of interesting technology information which may or may not have anything to do with the future work of the sector, but I think there are other avenues for publication of information about technology that may not result in proposals from the membership for new work in the sector.

So I have a long list for the floor. My screen seems to be sorted out alphabetically rather than in order of interventions. I know the United States has asked for the floor, and we'll try to sort out who is next among the five requests for the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I'm interested in trying to respond to several of the questions that have been raised about the contribution for clarification. So first I would like to thank all of those who have commented and spent the time and energy to review this proposal.

With respect to the significance of not having a report since 2014, it's significant because we have not stopped introducing new topics for study. The ITU-T has successfully introduced new work items, new study areas, new Study Groups

without having had another technology watch published. It does not hurt to lose that publication in terms of the carrying the work forward. And so in a related question, from China, about what happens with other work items that have been approved, we fully support and see as the essence of the driving force within the ITU-T the proposals set forth by the membership and the collaborative activities to advance the studies on topics of common interest within the Study Groups.

And so that should continue without any impact based on whether or not this resolution exists or does not exist.

And with respect to the comments from the Chair review committee, yes, we do fully support the idea that the strategic planning function within TSAG continue and look for appropriate areas for work, but that's based upon membership activities and interests, not a Secretariat driven direction of what our appropriate new technologies for investigation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you to the United States, and I think we have proven that the chairs of this group are not good at estimating the time that will be required for a topic, because we are already at double the amount of time that we put down for this. I have four current requests for the floor from China, United States, Saudi Arabia and Germany.

I will -- I intend to close the list. If anyone else would like to speak, please press your button and get on the list. Okay. I see Switzerland. One more chance. Anybody else? Canada, Russia -- Russia, no? Yes. Okay. So we will close the list with China, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, Germany, and China.

So China, please.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. First of all, we agree with the -- the comments made by the speakers and the importance of the technical watch report. We think that TSB -- this technical work function will help us with -- it will help the reporter group to get appropriate resources and it will help us to execute the standardization work.

TSAG and the Study Group does not have any right for budget and financial resources and if TSB can give clear mandates to the technical watch and carry out the technical watch activities and report is only a form of their -- of -- we also have CFO meetings and the cloud scope. These activities are very good ways for us to discuss future technologies and they are also very significant event. I think this resolution is still very important. We need to enhance this resolution and we need to get various sorts of input.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Please.

>>> Thank you, Chairman. We agree with the previous speakers with regards to the importance of this resolution, especially with regard to looking into new technologies and enriching the knowledge of members with regard to these technologies.

Mr. Chairman, when we talk about the volume of reports that should be published, as a result of this resolution, we think the procedures taken by the TSAG, in order to standardize the ICTs and especially with regard to the standardization function, we think that this will indeed contribute to give us an enriched list that could be covered by such technology watch reports.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we support the idea of preserving this proposal, this resolution as the previous speakers have said. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. According to our observation in the Study Groups, we say that if there's a new technology coming up, ITU-T is capable of taking it on. For example, the Internet of Things Study Group was created and we see that as a good example and also on the 5G issues.

But my issue is more a question. Having heard that there has not been any reports since 2014, I would like to have an indication from the TSB? What is planned? What is expected? Is this one for the next year? What are they working on? And the other issue, what is the financial implication if we keep it? What is actually behind? Because we think we should be most efficient as possible and we have to say is it really -- is the benefits of a large study justify the costs?

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany.

Switzerland.

>> SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair. We have listened attentively to each of the arguments of all the parties. It seems to us that we need more time to think before finally deciding to suppress this resolution.

The previous speakers mentioned that the reports that were published were of extremely high quality. Reports of such quality are expensive. They are not easy to reproduce and this prospecting activity is something which very few administrations can afford. So such a technology watch-type activity is of value. So it seems to us that this begets the same question as stated by the Distinguished Delegate of Germany. I would ask why there weren't reports in the past year, perhaps we could find out why. And before that, I would

say before suppressing it, we believe more information and more time to think are required. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Switzerland. Next I have Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. I'm a little puzzled. On one hand, I hear members, recognizing the importance of having new information, but it seems to me that we come to ITU-T, it is the role of the membership to identify how new technologies can be included within the ITU-T work program. It's up to the members.

Now, we would like to have or it appears we would like to have TSB to help us identifying technologies, but it begs the question, how much will that cost? I hear the members have resources and the TSB have resources. And the point of view is that the resources come from the members. I don't believe that TSB will have enough resources to produce expensive reports, the reports I have seen are very nice, very complete but probably very expensive. I don't know if TSB is here to indicate the cost of the expenditures or positions of reports. So I associate with the comments expressed by Germany that we need more information about expenditures.

And also I need clarification. The resolution requests more information. That's what the members require. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, and finally, Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. At the outset, I would like to draw your attention to the financial aspect. We understand that this is not a new resolution. It has existed in the past. And the financial resources were allocated to it in the past, and we did not hear any problems. I mean, any financial complications or hindrances to implementing the resolution. We understand that all of our financial resources required to implement this resolution were allocated and fully ascertained and determined and so we see no complications or difficulties here.

Our second point is that we considered that this resolution opens up an additional channel. New technologies which would later subsequently be considered by the Study Groups.

We really do not understand why you would shut down a source of information, which was created in the past and has worked successfully in the past. The administrations sector members, academia and so forth, are other sources, but we need all of these sources by which Study Groups receive information about new technologies, but we consider that this particular additional channel, and source of information is very important and it facilitates the work of the Study Groups.

One final report, the reports compiled under this resolution, help resolve the tasks before developing countries analyzing those new technologies as they appear, and so we believe this third aspect is very important. This is an important resolution, which allows us to render assistance to developing countries. And therefore we support all of those who considered that this resolution should be preserved.

Moreover, if there is any way to improve or ameliorate activity under this resolution, we support that.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. So let me summarize where I think we are. So I heard support for the suppression from at least the USA, Canada, Germany. Opposition to suppression from Russia, Saudi Arabia and China. And some in either of those groups have aligned with Switzerland in feeling like we need more information. So Tatiana has taken note of a number of the questions that have emerged. It's fully correct that the financial implication of resolution 66 should have been evaluated by Com2 in Johannesburg. So maybe there are not the resources to produce the reports that were requested by this resolution.

So we will try to get that kind of information from TSB and get some of those answers. So I suggest we put this issue aside for now and come back to this in the future session when we can provide the additional explanation from TSB, and perhaps that will provide us more clarity with how to move forward on this issue.

Thank you. I'm informed that the deputy director has arrived in the room. I don't know if it's unfair to ask for answers to some of these questions on the spot or if we should allow time to -- to construct more coherent information about the implementation of this resolution and the frequency of reports and the financial implications of the implementation of resolution 66.

So just a question to the deputy director, if you would rather take that now or have time to prepare some information for us later.

So deputy director, please.

>> DEPUTY DIRECTOR: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think I know what the questions are. I may not have caught all of them. So with respect to the tech watch reports, we changed the format in 2015 and 2016, before before half the reports were written or cowritten by staff from TSB. If it was cowritten, it was written with experts, the other half of the reports were written by experts from companies, and the level of the report

was -- or the audience of the report was the intelligent and nonexpert. So it was more on the level of say, scientific American or the economist. And we changed that and in 2015 and '16, we don't have TSB staff write these reports anymore, but experts and the reports are for technical. It would be if study Groups are interested, they could take this document and progress it further within their Study Groups or focus groups.

We did not market these reports as tech reports but we called them technical reports. If you look in the document of the TSB director, his report on activities of the ITU-T, over the last four years, you see a section dedicated to tech watch reports and it lists the number of -- or at least the tech reports that have been issued over the last four years, you will also see the ones that were labeled technical reports and they have been submitted to the Study Groups or they are going to be submitted to a respective Study Group for further study. So maybe that is a quick response and if you would like to have more details, we can prepare something in more depth.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Let me ask if there are any questions for the director on the information just provided, and I would ask you to confine your remarks to that because we closed the list of speakers on the issue itself. Any request for the floor or was the information clear?

So the other questions I would ask is if the information provided by TSB has changed anyone's views on whether resolution 66 should be suppressed.

Okay. I also see no requests for the floor. So the views remain unchanged.

So what I would conclude then, is that we have not achieved consensus. To suppress resolution 66, but given the discussion, I would suggest we enter something into our summary report, requesting that the TSB provide more information on an ongoing basis, perhaps through TSAG on the implementation of resolution 166 or resolution 66 so that we are clear what has perhaps with this resolution. It seems that some of the reports generated have been published under other names and have not been visible as far as implementation of this resolution.

So can we agree with that as a way forward. Canada, please?

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman and my apologies. Is with regards to the statements expressed by the deputy director, he has indicated that reports are produced by TSB. My question is that the TSB require -- I mean, that the TSB use the resolution 66 to produce reports because I have even other reports that it has. They don't need resolution 66 to produce reports and so

the question, do you need resolution 66 to produce a report?

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the question, Reinhard, can you answer to that specific question?

>> Thank you very much, Stephen, Mr. Chairman. There a a line in resolution 66, which offers a vehicle that those reports produced under the label tech watch can be fed to the Study Groups for them to examine and then take it on or leave it as they see. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So I think that's perhaps clear that without resolution 66TSB could publish something but wouldn't have the license to submit it as an input to a Study Group or as to TSAG. And so with that clarity, can we have agreement on my proposed way forward so we don't agree to suppress this at this meeting but we will request in the report for TSAG to give us reports through TSAG on an ongoing basis of the implementation of resolution 66. So we don't have any difficulty finding what has been done with respect to this resolution.

I'm seeing several heads nodding. So we will conclude in that way.

So the next topic on our agenda, and hopefully we can finish this before lunch is resolution 31. So I have two proposals with respect to resolution 31. So the first is from the African region, 42A5 revision 1. So who will present this for us, please?

Zimbabwe, please.

>> ZIMBABWE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning. With regards to resolution 31, we are saying we -- although we view it as fairly simple resolution, we have identified the need to -- to -- to include a close which considered the waving of contributions from nonprofit making organizations in developing countries in the true spirit of inclusivity and bridging this standardization gap.

So we have added a close, which seeks to waive contributions from nonprofit making organizations from developing countries, Mr. Chairman, I submit.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Zimbabwe as this is a regional proposal, we don't need to ask if there is support. Let me ask if there's opposition to this proposal.

And I see no requests for the floor. I have a few comments. Let's see, Russia and then the United States.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. And thank you very much to Zimbabwe for having introduced this contribution. I do have a question. This proposal, does it pertain only to the standardation sector, the T sector, or could we address this issue on a broader basis, pertaining to all the sectors

since it does have financial consequences, it might be a better idea to address it at -- at the council.

We don't have any objection to this proposal but we wonder why it's being proposed here, rather than on a more general level. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia, and before I move down the list, I will interject with some information from some consultation we had concerning this, at least with some analysis. This does seem to be an item that's covered by Plenipotentiary item 187, which asks for particularly that action by the council and there is existing activity under the council Working Group on financial and human resources, which are currently studying this issue.

The other information we have been provided is that the membership rates is something beyond that of WTSA where it's certainly in the remit of council, and the Plenipotentiary conference.

So these were some observations we had behind the scenes and we can get some clarification on that because I think we have both -- both the chairman of that particular council Working Group and the legal advisor in the room if we need clarity on that.

Any other comments or requests for the floor?

So yes, Mr. Gracie, please.

>> CANADA: Yes, thank you, I'm speaking as former chairman on financial and human resources but, indeed the issues associated with resolution 187 on the review of current methodologies for the participation of sector members associated and academia in the work of the union has been addressed in the council Working Group and by council itself. And I tend to agree with Dr. Mincken that if any change in the fee structure relating to associates from developing countries were to be implemented, it would need to be done on an ITU-T wide basis and therefore it would need to be addressed by the council.

I do believe that such matters are not sector specific, and should be addressed on an ITU-wide basis.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Dr. Gracie. So I think considering that information, let me ask a question to the proposer, to Africa, whether it would be -- since this seems to be from the analysis beyond the remit of WTSA if we could address this by simply in the summary report inviting the council to consider the importance of this matter. I think that's happening anyway. We can certainly add our own emphasis to that.



Would that -- would that be satisfactory as a way forward on this issue for Africa? Zimbabwe, please.

>> ZIMBABWE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, are we saying then that the additional clause that we are proposing is not necessary in this resolution?

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I think what we are saying is it -- first of all, is it necessary because of the activity in the council Working Group then taken on with respect to resolution 187, but also not within our remit because it's not up to the T sector to set membership fees. That's I don't know our authority. We have the authority to set the conditions of participation but not the membership fees. That's a matter for council.

So I think those two together would mean that we certainly urge the council to continue their work but can't put something prescriptive on membership fees in a T sector resolution, because that's above us. Zimbabwe, please.

>> ZIMBABWE: Mr. Chairman, once again, I think our modification is taking note of the role played by council in TSAG in terming the waiving of these contributions. If you read the modification in the resolution.

Can I read it?

>> CHAIR: I think we have read it, and we understand it. But it's not for TSAG to set membership fees, it's up to council, and this is fully, fully a council matter. We invite council to consider the urgency of this matter and we can do that in our summary report which has the same force as a resolution, but I think we can't put language in a T sector resolution which -- which prescribes membership fees. This is a -- an ITU-wide matter which is considered by the council in Plenipotentiary rather than a sector specific issue. So we don't choose our own fees.

Let's see, Mr. Gracie, you have some more clarification for us?

>> Yes, thank you, Chairman. Perhaps we could invite Zimbabwe or any other member of the ATU to submit a contribution to the council Working Group. Mr. Bah has indicated that the meeting will take place at the end of January, the beginning of February. I think this would be an appropriate place for the contribution so that the matter could be considered further. So given the fact that the council Working Groups deal with matters that are not specific to any one sector, like the T sector, the decisions such as this would need to be recommendations from the council Working Group to the council, would take up this matter and make a decision,

rather than trying to amend resolution 31. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Dr. Gracie. Is that an acceptable way forward. We can invite the council to -- or remind the council of the urgency of the issue. I think that's as far as we can go in our remit, if that's acceptable for Africa.

The group that can do something about the membership fees will consider it if there's a contribution. And I think is considering it even absent that contribution, because that's an existing item under resolution 187.

Is that an acceptable way forward?

Okay. I see no requests for that, the floor so we'll proceed in that way. We will invite the council to consider the urgency of the issue in our report. We will not put the proposed amendment in the resolution itself, since it's beyond your remit.

We move to one more proposal we have against resolution 31 then this is from the United States 48 addendum 6. United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chairman. The United States proposes to revise resolution 31 to remove request two. The US proposes to remove the TSAG to monitor on an ongoing basis, the conditions and the financial impact of conditions of associates. I present this for your consideration. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Is there support for the proposal?

I see Canada and Russia support the proposal. Do either of you need the floor? Nobody needs the floor?

Is there any opposition to the proposal?

Russia supports an opposing. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Clearly given the speed of interpretation, I responded after your intervention. Unfortunately, I would like to object to this proposal when you open the floor for that, or can I do that now?

Thank you. Well, we believe that -- thank you. We believe that this paragraph should be kept in, and the previous contribution from Africa showed us that these issues are not a problem and monitoring the participation of our members in the sectors are very important issue the advisory group can determine the conditions governing the participation of various categories, and I think there should be kept -- this issue should be kept and in any case we will respond to those proposals which were made in the previous contribution, and we will request the advisory group to -- to monitor this participation, the interests of all countries, first and foremost developing countries.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Dr. Minken for my own recollection of this resolution, I believe the category of associations first -- first started, I believe, as a trial, and this resolution has been amended many times since its first adoption in Montreal to now govern the conditions of memberships.

I don't have any specific memory of a discussion in TSAG in either of at least the two most recent study cycles of anything about examination of the financial implication of associates or the role of associates which I think has been stable for a long time.

I certainly -- certainly associates in my mind are a well established category of member Knipp and I think nobody questions whether we should have them. Nobody questions the rights of participation. I think everyone has accepted the rules. So it doesn't seem like it's something we are doing on an ongoing basis.

So let me ask the TSAG chairman to remind me whether I'm misremembering something or whether this is correct that this seems to be a stable category and not the original trial.

Dr. Gracie, please.

>> Yes, thank you, Chairman.

As I mentioned earlier, the review of the current methodologies for the participation of associates, as well as sector members and academia is under review pursuant to resolution, Plenipotentiary resolution 187. Now at TSAG, we have taken into consideration the status reports from the Secretariat with regard to any strategies that are being developed pursuant so that resolution. So you could say that the -- that the issue of participation of associates as well as the others or any other new category are under consideration by TSAG and have been under consideration. So I would anticipate that at the next meeting we would have an item on our agenda requesting a report from the Secretariat on resolution 187, which would include the participation of associates in the work of the T sector or the sectors in general.

Again, recognizing that any definitive decisions with respect to participation that affects the members and the participants would have to be taken by the Plenipotentiary conference. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for that clarification, Dr. Gracie. I hope we can -- we can conclude this discussion in a few minutes time, but let me ask if the interpreters can indulge us for a maximum of ten minutes but hopefully less. Is that okay.

>> INTERPRETER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Ten more minutes is fine.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Any additional requests for the floor or discussion on this issue? Zimbabwe, please.

>> ZIMBABWE: Thank you. From a developing country perspective, we would like to associate ourselves with the use of the Russian Federation, which is advocating for the retention of the -- that clause, which the United States is proposing to remove.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any other requests for the floor?

Okay. So let me summarize, while I didn't feel like I felt -- I heard very strong views on either side of this issue, I think what I did hear was that while it would seem in practice this is something that TSAG isn't doing and doesn't need to do by Dr. Gracie's explanation, one could reason that TSAG does look at certain things that might be considered to -- to be under the terms of the particular subclause that was supposed to be deleted.

So I will pause in the middle of what I was going to say because I see one more request for the floor from the United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you,ism Cha. We have no problem in keeping this instruct. So we would recommend we keep it in the spirit of compromise. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States, and I appreciate your saying that because that was pretty much what I was going to conclude. I heard support from a couple of administrations for keeping it and some rationalization that while it isn't very evident activity within TSAG, there's actually an activity that could be considered under that item. So with that, I think we would be able to conclude our discussions of resolution 31. So I think our conclusion is no change to this resolution and the action we'll take with respect to the first of the proposal is something to record in the report.

So we are behind the schedule that I had anticipated and we have reached the time for lunch. So let me just inform you how I would like to proceed in the afternoon session. So there are three of the items on this afternoon's agenda where I had anticipated we would be unlikely to conclude discussion, but we would -- we would have introduction to proposals and questions of clarification and then creating a drafting group or an ad hoc group to consider these matters further.

The three I would like to get to are resolution 22, the topic of gender, and there are actually agenda points 7 and 8 are both on gender. So we have a question of whether to modify

resolution 55 or suppress it and replace with a new resolution and we have the topic of accessibility with resolution 70. So that would be my highest priority for this afternoon. We will get to resolution 35 time permitting, but I wanted to make sure we got to everything where we might create another group so that we can get those established and get the times scheduled for them.

Any questions on that proposal for our afternoon time allocation?

Okay. I see no requests for the floor. So thank you very much for your work this morning and for your cooperation and I will see you again at 14:30 for our continuation of our discussions. Thank you.

(End of session)