***

***

   >> CHAIR: Good afternoon Ladies and Gentlemen. Please take your seats.
   Good afternoon Ladies and Gentlemen. Let's get started. Apologize for the delay in starting. We'll try to make sure that the rooms are scheduled a little bit better. I guess they didn't realize that it is not possible to have one group leave the room and another group come in within one second. We'll ask for a little bit more margin between the ending time of one meeting and the beginning of another.
   This is the resumption of Committee 3. And we will be having our second two sessions for the remainder of this afternoon. We met for two sessions yesterday. Our proposed daily agenda for today is in document ADM15 and this will pick up the two items from yesterday that we didn't get to Resolution 35 and A.7, plus the next group of Resolutions that we had planned for today. The other thing we will do is we will get I think verbal reports -- we will review our report from yesterday and get some reports of updates of the progress of Working Groups 3A and 3B and the Ad Hoc Group just concluded on Resolution 22. I believe we will have one document for that. Can I have your approval of

this agenda? I see no requests for the floor. So the agenda is approved.

The next thing I would like to do is to review and approve the report of our meeting yesterday and so DT12 will captures the documents we covered and the decisions we took yesterday with respect to a number of different Resolutions. So we had taken the decision to suppress Resolution 33. On Resolution 66 we will maintain it but add requests concerning reports on progress according to Resolution 66. No change for Resolution 31 but we will emphasize the importance of considering a fee structure, especially for associates of Developing Countries to council and then Resolution 22 we created an Ad Hoc Group and we will hear shortly about the amount of progress they have been able to make. And then we have created a couple of other groups that haven't had the opportunity to meet yet. So Resolution 55 the group will meet tomorrow and Resolution 70 will meet on Saturday. Any questions on the report of our first meeting? I see no requests for the floor. So then we will turn to the next item of business on our agenda which is the results from the Working Groups and ad hoc sessions. So Working Group 3A I'll ask Mr. Ragi shortly for a brief report and I will also mention there is one document output document ready from this group that we can take a decision on and that's the text of recommendation A.1 which Working Group 3A has concluded their work on and you will find that in DT21 and we will look at that after Mr. Ragi's verbal report. So let's see, 17 is -- take a look.

Oh, okay. So there is -- okay. Yeah, I think there is a working document with Working Group 3A report up to so far. I think that will be TD17 when available. Mr. Ragi if you can give us a verbal report of your Committee. Thanks.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Working Group 3A conducted two meetings to now. Yesterday afternoon and today morning. And the beginning of this meeting I emphasized with the participants the importance of Committee 3 and Working Group 3A, especially importance to recognize the working method and procedures since ITU sectors, especially in competition with different SDOs and we should ensure that flexible working method for the ITU sectors and based on our agenda Mr. Chairman, the group discussed three main documents. The group discussed Resolution 32 and it was two proposals for Resolution 32 and meeting agreed to maintain Resolution 22. Today in the morning session we had final draft text, the text is completed. And will be submitted for your Committee for approval. The second document in our mandate is recommendation A.1 and the meeting agreed to have no changes for recommendation A.1, beyond the approved one by the Plenary. The TSAG approved changes in A.1 and the meeting requested TSAG to undertake further updates of A.1 as a high

priority in the upcoming study period. Regarding Resolution 1 in
our morning session today we started discussion of resolution 1
and we achieved almost section 1. We have a few square brackets
but there is agreement on the principle, just we need to
fine-tuning the wording of the text and we would continue our
discussion in Resolution 1 in the coming three session for
Working Group 3A Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
       >> CHAIR: Thank you Mr. Ragi. So with respect to the two
texts that were mentioned that are complete in Working Group 3A,
Resolution 32 was done in an ad hoc this morning and approved in
the Working Group and my understanding is the translation should
be complete in time for our session after coffee break this
afternoon and we would hope to pick it up at that time and
approve it and send it onward to ED COM. The text is in DT21 and
that's identical text which you find in document 26 which is the
input document from TSAG. So it shouldn't be any surprises in
this text that doesn't require extra time to translate. So I
would like to ask for your approval of the text of A.1 in DT21
and once we approve that we can send it directly to ED COM on
have that ready for Plenary approval tomorrow afternoon. Can I
have your approval to revision A.1 based on the TSAG
modifications? I see no requests for the floor. So that's
approved. Thank you very much.
    And as I said we'll pick up and hope -- we are hoping to move
as many things as we can as soon as we can through the editorial
Committee because that's always a bit of a bottleneck at the end
of the meeting. So the more we can give them early the better.
So I appreciate being able to do at least a couple of these
documents today. The next Committee for a verbal report is
Working Group 3B which had their first two sessions this
morning. So if I can ask Mr. Bruce Gracie 3B Chair to give us a
verbal report. Thank you.
       >> BRUCE GRACIE: Yes, thank you very much Chairman.
Chairman, we as you mentioned we held our first meeting this
morning. We did make some progress. We have agreed, for
example, to the suppression of Resolutions 38 and 81. So that
work is complete. With respect to Resolution 7, it was agreed in
principle to maintain this Resolution, pending some wording
clarifications in one of the new resolves.
    With respect to Resolution 11 that work is continuing.
Although it was agreed in principle again to maintain this
Resolution we are simply trying to finalize the wording which I
believe will be accomplished fairly readily.
    Now with respect to Resolution 18, it was somewhat more
complicated series of texts that will need to be considered at
the next meeting and we agreed that it should be considered in
relation to Resolution 57. So those two texts will be considered

together at our next meeting. Although I don't anticipate any great difficulties in reaching final agreement.

Resolution 45 was discussed and first of all, it -- the majority appears to favor maintaining this Resolution and not reflecting the changed text that were proposed in another instrument, such as Resolution 1. So that will be finalized again at our next meeting. So I think with that Chairman, that would conclude my report. Again I don't anticipate any difficulties whatsoever in finalizing our work at the next meeting which, of course, is our final meeting. So I'm sure you welcome that news.

In the meantime we will consider our -- continue our consultations to make sure that there are no hidden problems that may arise which may impede our work at the next meeting. So with that Chairman, I submit this oral report. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Dr. Bruce Gracie. What I heard from that report is four Resolutions that are still the subject of work. One where the text quite -- hasn't quite be tidied up yet and then there are two items where we can ask Committee 3 to confirm the decisions of Working Group 3A in particular with respect to the suppression of Resolution 38 and 81. So can I have your agreement then to confirm those decisions for the suppression? Of course, this is easy work for ED COM when we tell them there are some Resolutions they don't have to fiddle with. Can I have your agreement to the suppression of these two Resolutions? I see no requests for the floor. So those Committee 3 decides to suppress those Resolutions. The next Ad Hoc Group that we created and, of course, Dr. Bruce Gracie was coming in to the room out of breath I think from just concluding that session is the Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 22. So if you can give us a verbal report of that, please.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Yes, thank you, Chairman. Chairman, there were four proposals to this Assembly with respect to modifications to Resolution 22. We consolidated the text. We held a drafting group for one hour beginning at 1330. And we achieved some progress in reviewing texts that was agreeable or text that was considered to be subject to suppression. So our work is continuing. I have encouraged those who have particular comments on the remaining text to confer among themselves and unfortunately we will need another meeting to complete this task. So I will ask the TSB as to what might be available to -- for a meeting to ensure that we complete our work in good time for your consideration in your committee. So that is really the outstanding item is to organize another meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Dr. Bruce Gracie. Of course, there are two days when I'm sure there is quite a lot of time available. But if you have a preferred time, we can certainly try to

confirm that through this meeting and not ask people to simply hunt on the monitors and see when and where that might pop up. So hopefully -- perhaps over afternoon coffee we can select a time. That includes the initial part of the work. So let's return to our activities then.

So the first of the documents that we had listed that we didn't get to from yesterday was Resolution 35. This is the appointment in terms of office of Vice Chairmen and Chairmen from TSAG. The first is from APT, document 44, Addendum 4. Can I have a short presentation of this proposal? Someone from APT prepared to present this proposal? We don't have a -- okay. China, please.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Chairman. I'm glad to on behalf of APT members to present this common proposal. The members of this contribution is to enhance the standard strategic function of ITU-T long term as we all know that standards group has been establish in the TSAG meeting in February. So we think this were important and to connect the work already -- also in the Study Group level.

When we elected the Chair men and vice Chairmen for the Study Groups it is important to collect all their strategic suggestions for the Study Groups in the next periods. We propose some modification in the Annex B part in this. Only two modifications. First to add clarification on knowledge and experience. And to clarify relevant professional knowledge. The other is to add new items for the clarification of -- hence we would like to collect strategic knowledge for standardization related activities for this study group. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you China and I think we'll try have one discussion but let me ask first if there are any questions for clarification on this proposal. I see no requests for the floor. So the proposal is clear. Thank you very much.

The next proposal is from CITEL in 46/A24 proposal 1. May I have a short presentation of this contribution? Okay. The microphone says Algeria but it will be somebody in the row behind. Thank you.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you very much, Chair. On behalf of CITEL we are going to present the modifications to Resolution 35. As you know CITEL has been working during the different assemblies and conferences to improve the procedure of appointment of Chair men and Vice Chairmen and support for gender equality and appointing and presenting candidates by Consensus. And following Resolution 166 approved by the Plenipotentiary Conference we would like to introduce some modifications. For example, the possibility to establish a number of Vice Chairs, not only for the advisory group but also for the Study Groups. This number would be two candidates

allocated regionally and we understand this would therefore
facilitate the discussions in the Assemblies and conferences and
would also allow to have a better representative across regions
in each of the Study Groups.

The other major change that we would like to propose is the
need to establish clear functions to the Vice Chairs who are
then elected. We understand that the principle is to have the
minimum number of Vice Chairs necessary in order to move the
work forward. We think that for this to take place and to be
measured and to be effective we need to allocate clear functions
to accomplish the mandate.

Between these functions we therefore propose that each time
there is a new work item, if there is no Rapporteur who is put
forward it would be the Vice Chairs who would be the first to be
considered to look at these work items. These are our proposals
and we are open to any suggestions or clarifications that may
arise. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Argentina. So just to clarify for
myself the proposal in resolves further 2, so I know -- there
has been I think an unwritten rule in TSAG of selecting one Vice
Chair per region, but that hasn't been applied 1 or 2 or any
number of per region 4, any of the other Study Groups. This
intention was to apply across all Study Groups just to clarify
for myself and then I will open the floor for additional
questions.

Yes, screen shows Algeria but Argentina please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. I'm going to also reply on
behalf of CITEL. What we would like to bring with regards to
this point is an experience which we think which is very
beneficial which is adopted during the last -- the world
telecommunication conference to allocate candidates by Consensus
and in this case we would like to allocate this to the advisory
group but also to the Study Groups. We understand this would
have the spirit of the Resolution of 166 which is approved by
the PleniPot and this would be a modification. I am not sure
whether this is clear enough for you Chair. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. I think at least for me that's
clear. May I ask if there are other questions or clarification
on this proposal. Japan please.

>> JAPAN: Taking in to account D it start with the
convenience of nominating and I like to know what's the
convenience. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Okay. Thank you very much for this question.
We don't quite understand what is the practical application. We
understand as was said including by the director in the office
when they sent us this circular by administrations and members

to present candidates for the different positions. These are not honored positions but what we are looking for is a work which is proposed by the Assembly but also requires work in collaboration with those who have been elected as Chairs. Therefore we think that it is necessary to allocate work, so this is achieved and the management team of each of the Study Groups would work effectively based on the reports that they can bring to the Study Groups if this was an efficient way of working, if we needed to have more people to work on these -- on this work. So if this is not quite what you are looking for then we might be able to give you further clarification.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And we have seen from the queue to be fully in to discussion now which is fine. So next I have Saudi Arabia. Sorry. United Arab Emirates. Thank you.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chair. We would like to thank CITEL for having presented these modifications to this very important Resolution. In this section taking to account H with regards the skills and expertise of a regional geographical distribution we would like to change -- sorry this is E. With regard -- with regards to the Vice Chairs of the Study Groups, taking in to account the expertise and geographical equitable distribution in the Study Groups of the relevant Study Groups. In considering D the provisions applicable with regards to the appointment by Consensus the current TSAG group has only one Vice Chair from each region. Therefore we should clarify this position. Are we going to increase the number of Vice Chairs in TSAG or are we going to have just have one candidate for each region. And also Chair, in resolves 2 there are two candidates for the position of Chair. As I have already said Chair, we do not have text for the moment which decides upon the number of Vice Chairs in the Study Groups. When we say that the number should not go beyond two candidates, this is not really very convenient. Let's take in to account that in the Study Group within the T sector for the moment there are three candidates in some regions. Taking that in to account we would like to seek clarification why we have decided that it would only be two candidates for each Study Group. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Emirates and I had seen a request for the floor from Russia but -- no? Still like the floor?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: We had the same questions. So we are withdrawing our request for the floor.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Argentina, can you respond, please? If we could have the document projected because we are talking about the text and it is easier. People can see it.

>> Can we show the text on the screen please?

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Now if I could ask Argentina to take the floor to respond to the questions, and I think this was

down under the -- under taking in to account C, D and E. There were some questions from the Emirates, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you very much Chair. I would like to thank the UAE and Russia for their participating in this conversation. With regards to the question raised by considering, the intention which we had from CITEL to endorse within considering what are those questions which we would like to include in resolves, where do these precedents come from. And as we said at the beginning this is something which we have tried to work upon in the format of different conferences. The WTDC conference, the Plenipot and therefore our interest lies in putting it forward here. Obviously we are very open if it is necessary to put forward any suggestions of improved drafting. We would find that difficult to debate over. With regards to the reason why we have included in resolves further up to two candidates for Vice Chair, because Resolution 166 was approved at the last Plenipot conference refers to both the advisory groups, the Study Groups and other groups across the three sectors.

And therefore we are talking about for at least the regions are represented by at least one or two candidates. We understand this would be a limit and we are trying to reflect this number up to two candidates which we -- which comes from resolution from 166. Was therefore approved at the last conference. That's our understanding. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Argentina. Are there further questions or discussion? Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much Chair. We have carefully considered all the proposals. We don't have any significant problems with adopting this proposal. The only thing is which raises issues or the same question that we regularly raise at all conferences and Assemblies when we are discussing similar Resolutions. Increasing the number of Vice Chairs the most important issue here is for it not to be a Vice Chair on paper and therefore, in the radio sector, for example, the RAG is limited to only one Vice Chair from each regional organization.

TDAG has two from each regional organization. But in the development sector it is very important to have representation particularly from Developing Countries. And in the ITU-T sector now for TSAG they need to have two Vice Chairs. It is a question. And the question of the obligations that should be given to each Vice Chair which has very clearly noted in the contribution from CITEL. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Brazil please.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you Argentina for the presentation of the CITEL proposal. Just

trying to ensure the question raised by the distinct Delegate
from Russia, actually the proposal, the CITEL proposal doesn't
expand the number of Vice Chairmens of TSAG, for example.
Actually they limit pair -- their proposal is limited to two. So
it keeps the possibility to have just one. So it is -- so the
proposal -- I mean to ensure that every region is represented by
at least one or two competent and qualified candidates. That is
the wording that we are proposing. So it is not about expanding
the number of Vice Chairmens but limiting it in to as we have
some guidance from the Resolution on the last PP-14. Thank you
very much.
        >> CHAIR: Thank you Brazil. Yes, certainly corrected at
least over the previous two cycles in TSAG not through any
written rule but I suppose by mutual agreement practice, heads
of Delegation they have decided to assign TSAG exactly one Vice
Chairman per region and I think it has been the practice that
people have been happy. In study groups the practice is
different. There are some regions with many Vice Chairmen and
some regions with none in various Study Groups. This would
propose to change that.
    So...we seem to have no particular objection in principle to
these proposals. The proposals are not incompatible. In fact,
they -- the APT proposal is proposing only changes in annex B
where there are no proposals in the CITEL proposal. So I think
they merge very easily. So I'm told we can have -- we can make
available an integrated document to look at and we can try to
make a quick pass through the document point by point and make
sure that we are happy with that text to send forward as a
revision to Resolution 35. So if I could propose that as a way
forward, we were consulting to see whether we thought we needed
an ad hoc for this and I'm thinking the changes are small enough
and distinct enough among the two proposals that we can get by
without an ad hoc. If the discussion were to bog down obviously
we can create an ad hoc. Let's try to handle it in that way if
it is okay with the group. Emirates please.
        >> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chair. I'm completely
in alignment with your suggestion. We do not need to have a
working group to move this forward. But we just have a few
modifications on this Resolution and we would like to
participate in the drafting in particular with regards to
resolves, to not nominate more than two candidates. And this is
therefore limited which would therefore not allow for the
appointment for more than two candidates for the post of Vice
Chair.
    We have a problem with the definition of the number of Vice
Chairs for the regions. Two candidates per each region is going
to limit in our opinion, although the work and the -- of

candidates and in the Study Groups, sometimes this goes to three people and therefore if we limit this two this is going to complicate things in our view. Therefore to not take up too much time we would like to participate in the group which is going to look at the modifications in the texting.

      >> CHAIR: Thank you Emirates. I think the intention is we would try to take in a future session of COM3 and I am hoping that we can do this without needing to create a separate Ad Hoc Group. With your permission we will proceed in this way. And considering any possible adjustments to the various proposed modifications. So with that -- okay. So we may try to do that as early as after coffee once this combined text is posted as a working document that everyone has access to. For the moment I would like to move to the next point in our agenda which is recommendation A.7. Here we have one proposal from Europe. Who would like to propose and this is for no change? Europe, please. Who is the spokesperson for this proposal? Germany please.

      >> GERMANY: Thank you. In this case we are the spokesperson. I do not intend to speak very long on that. It is quite obvious what we propose. With regard to the recommendation ITU-T A.7 on Focus Group that this should not be changed at this WTSA. There is no proposal for a change. So I do not intend to speak any longer on that. If nobody else has a problem with it, then it is up to you now what to do with it. I hope the right thing. Thank you.

      >> CHAIR: Thank you Germany and, of course, without any proposal to change hopefully this is very easy decision for us to take. So we can -- can we agree to the proposal for no change to recommendation A.7? I see no requests for the floor. That's agreed. If this were an IEEE people would applaud every time you take a decision. So that's an easy decision.

    So the next item on our agenda is Resolution 71 admission of academia. Here we have two proposals. One for modification and one for suppression. So the first is from CITEL. The document is 46 Addendum 6 and I guess we are showing it on the screen and if we can have a presentation of this from CITEL, please. Argentina, please.

      >> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. I'm going to present the modifications to Resolution 71 on behalf of CITEL. In principle the main modification that we would like to make is the title of the Resolution because we understand that the admission of academia within the framework of Resolution 169 for the Plenipot conference and we would like to refer to the participation of academia in the work of the union of ITU-T.

    Also within these modifications which we have made we are trying to update all the references of the Resolution 169 which is ratified in Busan in 2014. Resolution 80 of the same

Assembly, active involvement in the membership in the development of ITU-T sector, and recognizing the objectives which are -- which can be found in Resolution 71 which was updated in Busan 2014 where it states expects to increase the number of ITU-T membership including sector members associates and academia but we would like to update some points in the resolves. Our intention is to be able to really strengthen the references to participation of academia in the work of ITU-T. Therefore we would like to promote the participation of academia within the framework of establishing what we set out in Resolution 169 to enable these institutions to have access to documents of ITU-T and they can therefore participate in the different study groups and questions which they currently do and to also invite them to participate and formulate proposals, whether that's remotely with reference to Resolution 10177 established in Busan in 2014 and also allow them to participate in parallel in side events. For example, in different events that ITU-T would set up and above all to promote the involvement of academia in developing technical reports and publications of the union such as ITU news technical journal and other publications which these institutions can carry out research and monitoring and follow up of modern technology which corresponds to the expertise of the ITU-T and they can contribute to the work of the union and finally we would like to invite the council to consider to present their reports at the next conference of the Plenipot and to continue to promote and expanding the participation in the ITU-T of academia. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Argentina. Are there questions of clarification on this proposal? El Salvador, please.

>> EL SALVADOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just -- one comment on the resolve 5. That representatives representatives from academia may serve as Rapporteur and Vice Chairman of Study Group. I think that Vice Chairman from academia can be joining as a Vice Chairman for the Study Group. So maybe need to be change this words. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you El Salvador and indeed that was a point that we had some consultations, including with the legal advisor. So there were some concerns raised concerning the possible implication as far as the fact that academia as well as associates are not permitted to partake in decision making. Now it is a little bit tricky here because I think the subtly is not who the individual works for but who is permitted to nominate individuals for these positions. I think as a practical matter nominations can come from sector members or Member States but they nearly come from Member States and in fact, if you search the CVs I think you will find that at least two of the current nominees for Study Group Chair positions are in fact, University

professors who are employed by academic institutions. They are
nominated by the Member State. I think from the perspective of
ITU they are seen as being a nominee of that country. I think
many nominees are also from sector members but normally when
someone who works for a sector member is not nominated by their
company they seek the endorsement or the nomination they would
like their nomination to be put forward by the administration
rather than having that be a company nomination.

So in principle someone who -- who is an academic can be
there if they are nominated by a Member State. What's tricky is
accepting a nomination from an academic member, from a legal
standpoint. So I think we have many Chairman and Vice Chairmen
who are employed not necessary by sector members and Member
States but they are nominated by one of those. Is that something
that we can clarify? Argentina, please and then Emirates.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. Firstly I would like to
thank you for that clarification. With regards to this item our
intention here was to see what was seen as Resolution in 169. We
have seen also in the English version it is perhaps not all of
the modifications have been seen. I don't know whether this
translation actually reflects the change in the title of the
Resolution. Therefore you will send an updated revision to the
text with these changes in place with understanding all of the
further translations will be based on the English version and,
of course, we are working on the Spanish version. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Emirates, please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just
wanted to point out that this Resolution recalls Resolution 80
and there is a proposal by the Arab countries to remove
Resolution No. 80. So what I wanted to highlight again is that
this refers to 80 and we half proposes our countries the removal
of 80.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Emirates. So I -- we have not only a
proposal for the suppression of Resolution 80 but I'll note that
we have a second proposal with respect to Resolution 71 and
perhaps we have an introduction of that. It sounds as though we
have perhaps a -- some edits to clarify some differences between
English and Spanish language text on contribution 46 Addendum 6
but we also have a proposal concerning suppression of Resolution
71 that we should bear in mind and consider. So if we can have a
presentation next of Arab states contribution 43 Addendum 8 and
if we can see this on the screen. So United Arab Emirates
please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It gives me
pleasure on behalf of the Arab countries to present you this
document on the proposal of suppression of Resolution 71 on
admission of academia to participate in the work of the ITU

telecommunications standardization sector. The Arab states
consider this Resolution 71 referring -- as referring to 80. And
academia have been allowed in accordance with Resolution 169 in
the activities of the work of ITU telecommunication
standardization sectors.

    We believe that this would require alignment of Articles 2
and 3 over any -- and any other provisions of that document. And
now with regard to the participation fees as believe, one out of
16 for the members of the sectors for organizations are
Developing Countries and one out of 32 for advanced countries
which, of course, applies or requires the application of this on
academia or academic institutions for their participation.

    Now the Arab countries would propose to suppress Resolution
71 as well as -- because 169 already covers all this and
academia have now become members of the three sectors. And
instead of revising Resolution 71 in view of the Busan
Resolutions then this would reduce the cost especially in
relation to translation thereof. Thank you.

        >> CHAIR: Argentina, please.

        >> ARGENTINA: Thank you very much, Chair. And thank you to
the UAE for their presentation. We would like to express the
intention of this modification to this Resolution 71. This
precisely to make a differentiation with Resolution 169, we have
taken out some text which made reference to ITU because within
169 all the criteria can be found. And therefore any academic
institution which would like to participate in it across the
three different sectors. What we would like to show here and
which should be reflected in a resolution of the Assembly are
the specific criteria for participation and the benefits that
can be drawn from academic institutions which they can bring to
ITU, in particular to the ITU-T sector. Therefore modification
which can be seen from the title of the Resolution and
fundamentally looking at the content basing ourselves on the
admission criteria within Resolution 169, applies to academia
across all sectors of ITU. Here we would like to make specific
reference to the ITU within the standardization sector itself.
Thank you.

        >> CHAIR: Thank you. Sorry we were having a little
consultation here. If I understood from the discussion there was
an intention to propose a change to the title which is not
reflected in the English version. So I wanted to check that
understanding because strictly now that Resolution 169 defines
the determines of or -- of that membership category admission is
not the business of our sector. It is an admission of someone to
all three sectors at one application. So if there is a proposed
change in title we'll look forward to understanding how that
bears on the discussion. The observation -- the other

observation based on consultations with TSB, so we are urged not to have WTSA Resolutions that replicate Plenipotentiary Resolutions and so I think what we will be looking for is a common understanding of what is -- what needs to be added to 169 from a T sector perspective. So those are two items I think would be helpful for all of us to understand. The other observation I would make is that subsequent to the Plenipotentiary Conference, once the academic membership category was defined on an ITU wide basis, the Radio Assembly in 2015 suppressed their equivalent recommendation 63. We should understand the merits of having a unique Resolution here. So those were some additional points. So if I understood correctly from Argentina there was an intention to give us the appropriate edits in another document that would make sure we see the proposed change of title in the English version and if we can take a look at that perhaps after the coffee break, along with some other things, it might put us in a better position to decide a way forward.

And speaking of that, we are now almost at the point of 3:45. So time for a 30 minute coffee break. And we can resume at 4:15. As I said we will hopefully have available to us the text of Resolution 32 and we'll see if we are prepared to continue our discussion of Resolution 71 as soon as we return.

Thank you.

(Coffee break)

>> CHAIR: Good afternoon. Let's resume. Sorry for delay but just to clarify we were having a discussion on the way forward with the proposed modifications to Resolution 35. We had anticipated perhaps going through something that you will find posted as a working document in the COM3 area as a way to try to move forward but the contributors on this point have asked for some time for some further consultations where we may be able to sort out some of the different understandings and so we will come back to Resolution 35 in our session tomorrow afternoon.

We can get back as we mentioned Working Group 3A did conclude their work this morning on Resolution 32. So it had been agreement for modification, the drafting had concluded their work and Working Group 3A agreed to it. We now have this posted and translated as DT25. So I would like to take a decision here if we can. So this is the proposed modification of Resolution 32 and just to clarify, once we agree to this we would forward it to ED COM who will hopefully have it ready for tomorrow afternoon's Plenary and we will forward it to Committee 2 because of our -- or to evaluate the financial implications of the proposed modification. So Ladies and Gentlemen, can I have your request for approval to revision to Resolution 32 in DT25? Any comments? I see no requests for the floor. That's agreed.

The situation with respect to Resolution 71 is that there seems to have been some missed material. There is some errors that were I think made in the translation of the original from Spanish to English and I think the other four languages were translated from the English version. Had missed some of the input. CITEL was going to try to provide to TSB a correct English copy that we can try to get the correct text available for us to look at. We will also look to have that available in time for our session on tomorrow afternoon.

The next item of business for us is Resolution 80. Here we have three proposals. So we have one which is a report on the implementation of Res 80 in document 59. Who will present this? So Tatiana please and if we can see it on the screen, please. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So I'm looking at the document 59 which is the TSB director's report on acknowledging active involvement of membership in the development of ITU telecommunications standardization sector deliverables. It was submitted to clarify how is Resolution that was implemented and at the beginning part of it gives some background. The first proposal came at the Assembly 2012 delivered by Brazil. Since then it was discussed in TSAG and the pilot implementation as well as the finding way forward how to better implement this Resolution was given to Study Group 9. Study Group 9 reported to TSAG on its findings and tried it in its group and it is submitting in July 2016 agreed to spread this experience to the other Study Groups.

It was doesn't on a voluntary basis for implementation of Study Groups. And then this document specifies exactly some options found by Study Group 9 during the pilot. And the document concluded with the statement what was not clear last TSAG meeting. This is how to evaluate significant contribution. And this method was deferred to WTSA. The document is submitted as a report from director. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Tatiana. So if I understand correctly at present we don't have a criteria for evaluating significant contribution. Any contribution independent of the merits, independent of the degree to which it was accepted, any contribution against the recommendation qualifies for acknowledgement, is that correct?

>> I better address this question to the Study Groups who already implemented it.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. Are there any other questions of clarification on this document? Okay. We have two proposals regarding Resolution 80. We have one for modification and one for suppression. So the first proposal for modification is from CITEL. The document is 46 Addendum 12. Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair. It is a pleasure to present this proposal on behalf of CITEL. Thank you very much. As you can see in the report just presented by ITU-T many work has been done on this topic since 2013 in this last study period. Now have trials being deployed by at least three SGs. SG9, 11 and 17 where we can find some Web page for each study period that acknowledge per meeting management team, Rapporteurs, editors and contributors to all deliverables of those Study Groups. Recently in the last TSAG meeting there were proposing establishing stable proceedings on how acknowledge the value of active participation on -- of the membership but as we -- as we just listened from TSB at the end no decision was made and the discussion was remitted to this Assembly.

So Mr. Chairman, based on all the TSAG discussions and especially based on the TD460 Revision 1 that proposed solutions that are being deployed by the SGs that are doing the trials, this IAP proposed to change especially the instructs parts of the Resolution 80 in order to clearly define the proceedings to be taken by TSAG and Study Groups and acknowledges the active participation. The director of TSB there are some provisions, the first one is the instructs of the director of TSB to develop guidelines in consultation with TSAG for drafting ITU-T recommendations, bearing in mind the necessity of acknowledging the contributors. And other provision to encourage the use of bibliography references which support technical references made in ITU-T recommendations and also in the proposal there are clear instructs to list the members of manage team, Rapporteur, associate Rapporteurs and editors and contributors and other approved in the Study Groups. There is a list in the ITU-T recommendations and on its publication page the contributors who submitted at least one contribution to the progress of the document. And the at the end it instructs Study Groups to list that -- that this list should include the contributor's names affiliation and country of origin and when available, of course, if this contributors are affiliated of one particular ITU-T member. Or just contributor's name and the country of origin in case of contributor's not affiliated by an ITU-T member. At the end as we know this is the first part to acknowledge the contributors, there is a national level part to -- so that's why we are proposing to invite Member States to encourage research institutions in their contribution, in their countries to acknowledge the criteria established by Resolution 80 in acknowledging the contribution in the evaluation process of the productivity of professionals from academia and other associated research establishments. That's a big -- that's a picture of this proposal. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And open for questions or clarifications.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Brazil for that presentation. Are there any questions of clarification? Okay. I see no requests for the floor. So the proposal is clear. The other proposal is for suppression. This is from the Arab States. May I have a presentation of that proposal. United Arab Emirates please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much Chair. I am delighted to be able to present this document on behalf of the Arab States administrations. This proposes suppression of Resolution 80 acknowledging the active involvement of the membership in the ITU-T telecommunications. As you know Chair, we have already discussed this topic under the TSAG. There were some reservations as regards how we could acknowledge the participation and participants in Study Groups. Are we going to take in to consideration participants who have submitted proposals during the meetings and not only proposals that were officially submitted. We also have reservations that deal with Copyright and patents on this topic. So our administrations would propose to suppress this Resolution. Indeed we do have other mechanisms in place which allow us to invite academia to participate in our sector not only just the fact of acknowledging them. Contributions are submitted and we need to include the name address, et cetera, of the contributor. This could solve the problem. This is why we are proposing to suppress Resolution 80. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United Arab Emirates. I think strictly speaking we on a contribution we have a contact point who may or may not be the author, depending on industry contributions and so forth. But I take your point. Any questions of clarification concerning this proposal? Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. We would like to note that in line with the charter and Conventions from ITU and also Resolutions from the Plenipotentiary Conference and in terms of participants in activities of the ITU we recognize Member States of the ITU, members of the sector, associated members and academic organizations. However it is not -- we don't -- as I mention recognition of individuals as members of the ITU participating in the process. Thus we could conclude that the Resolution 80 sometimes slightly goes outside the framework of the basic documents and the resolution of the Plenipotentiary Conference. Also acknowledgement as authors of individuals could in the future lead to problems in terms of copyright in the future.

And also conflicts as regards the prestige of the organization. Considering this we believe it is sound idea to support the proposal from Arab States as regards suppressing Resolution 80. We would also like to draw your attention to the fact in the director's report there is acknowledgement given to

difficulties that we have not been able to solve and additionally this work requires further costs from the ITU.

Thank you very much, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Russia. Is there additional discuss regarding the merits of suppression versus modification? Any other views? Brazil, please.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chairman. And thank you the distinct Delegates from Russia and also from Arab countries to present their views. Just some comments about the views that were presented by them, first of all, in terms of property rights, this issue was raised in WTSA-12 and the -- when this Resolution was proposed by the first time and it was made a consultation for legal advisor, ITU legal advisor at that moment and the conclusion was that yes, the ITU-T recommendations states that all the property rights of those documents are -- belongs to ITU. So this should not be a problem. The acknowledgement of the contributors and the distinct Delegates that is -- that were involved in the -- in those documents, in the approval process of that documents, whatnot, was not in any way granted them the rights in terms of property or patent on that document.

In terms of consultation in Convention matters that was raised by the Distinguished Delegate from Russia, in our view the -- this problem is solved because after many discussion on TSAG the proposal was not just to acknowledge the name of the contributor but the name and the affiliation in the country that the contributor is from. And if there is no specific affiliation from one member, actually the country of the origin, of the contributor should be placed side by side of the name of the contributor. So I think we are not here acknowledging just the name of the contributors but we are totally aligned with the consultation and also with the Convention. And after many, many discussions that we had placed in TSAG meeting these last four years we had trials at beginning SG9 and in a voluntary process the SG11 and SG17 decided to go in this way and to acknowledge also and to proceed in this way to acknowledge the contributors. This is one example that is very important issue and very important process that should be done by ITU in terms of boosting the participation, especially from academia. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Brazil. Are there other views? Uruguay please.

>> URUGUAY: Thank you very much Chair. What we see here in this proposal as well as the standard organizations of which ITU works in close collaboration and recognizes the contribution which the different contributors of the research documents we see that this is a way of recognition of the activities of the academic sector. Without recognition of their work therefore it

is a way of generating a dynamic work between ITU-T as well as within the other SDOs having the academia being recognized. And without this it would be difficult to achieve the work. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Uruguay. Any additional views? Japan, please.

>> JAPAN: My understanding is without this Resolution academia's contribution has been -- will be recognized because we are already made a system in the TSAG. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So just to clarify and let me ask a clarification question of the last intervention of Japan, your understanding is that the trial of Study Group 9 and two other Study Groups would continue without this Resolution, is that the meaning of your intervention? Okay. Perhaps I have understood it correctly. Brazil please.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair and thank you, Japan, for the question. Actually for the point raised. Actually the proceeding that is being done in the trial it is just -- it is just in terms of the mandate that this Resolution gives for TSAG, the Resolution as it is now, it is at -- as it was approved in the last, instructs TSAG to study, how to implement this acknowledgement and in this regard it was discussed and it was decided to a trial should be done. So without this Resolution, probably this -- this trials will be killed since we don't have any strong mandate to TSAG to continue with these trials. So we think that there are not -- there is not a system established in TSAG. It is just a trial. The proceedings to acknowledge the contributors. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We were getting a little bit of clarification here but I see another request for the floor. Emirates please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, if I go back Mr. Chairman to WTSA-12, the proposal that was submitted by Brazil was focusing on academia and how we recognize them in the work of ITU-T Study Groups. Now although we have proposed to suppress this Resolution we would reconsider our position Mr. Chairman if this Resolution will focus only on academia. I have heard Brazil and Uruguay taking the floor and the main purpose or aim of having this Resolution is to encourage academia members to join the work in ITU-T which seems to be that this is a practice within the academia atmosphere where they are recognized, they do work that is recognized. But again we recognize academia members as universities but not as individuals. So the focus is now on -- if we turn the focus of this Resolution to academia only, then in this case we might -- we would be happy to work with Brazil and other colleagues on this specific Resolution rather than suppressing

the Resolution entirely. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Emirates for that willingness and that offer of perhaps a compromise and a way forward and will allow some time for additional informal consultation. A couple of things that we have had with respect to some of the discussions with the legal affairs unit and others. So first of all, I would remind everyone of information that is currently in A.1 which applies to anyone submitting a contribution and I hope this would cover the IPR concerns. We do have clause 3.1.4 of A.1, patent information that contributors are reminded of and then we have further by submitting a contribution to ITU-T contributors are acknowledging that there is no restriction on the reuse by ITU-T of the text and diagrams that are included in the contribution. So contributor actually doesn't give up their own copyright to the material but they have given the implicitly the ITU by the process of making a contribution, the right to reuse their text and to produce derivative works. So I think there is no new IPR issue that comes about here given that those still apply to contributions.

The other clarification we did receive was that with a decisions taken by TSAG it is true that this was given as a -- as something that study groups could implement on a voluntary basis. There is nothing in the current TSAG decision that requires all study groups to do this but elected to implement the practice would be free to continue the practice with or without the Resolution. So I think it does seem to be incorrect, that this practice would necessarily disappear without that. The other thing I wanted before we allow the time for informal consultations to call the attention of people too, is the current contribution template doesn't list an author. It lists a contact. And perhaps with academia normally those are one in the same and often they are one in the same for industry, too. But also in industry contact isn't necessarily the author. People back homework on and contact is the person who brings the material to Geneva and presents it and may or may not be the author of the material. There may be some disconnect if there is any automatic reuse of the contact point of the author of material in terms of acknowledging those contributions. So with that back drop it sounds like there is some opportunity for some informal consultation among the contributors. And a way of perhaps forward between those who propose suppression and those who would like to modify to find a way forward to at least allow for academia to have an appropriate recognition without violating some of the other conditions that were present or concerns that were expressed in the Arab Proposal.

So I will look for that informal consultation to take place and we'll revisit this issue tomorrow afternoon and see if we

have an agreeable way forward.

So the next and looking at our time the next item of business on our agenda is Resolution 68. So we have two proposals here both for modification. So the first is from Africa. The document is 42 Addendum 30. Can we have a presentation of this proposal, please? Kenya, please.

>> KENYA: Yeah, thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to present this proposal which is a common proposal from the Member States from Africa. Regarding the proposed modifications to Resolution 68. Mr. Chairman, the essence of this proposal is basically to ensure the continuation of the chief technology officer's meeting and further to that we also wish to propose some changes to the Resolution 68 that will ensure or encourage ITU study groups to consider the outcomes of this particular meetings. And the TSAG Rapporteur group on standardization strategy bear in mind the outcomes of this particular meetings Mr. Chairman while defining their strategic standardization issues.

In doing this Mr. Chairman, we do additionally recognize that since 2009 the director of TSB has organized about six meetings of the high level industry executives to discuss the standardization landscape and to identify the standards priorities. We also recognize that the conclusions of the chief technology officer's meetings have been reflected in the official ITU communities over the years. Mr. Chairman we wish also to note that it is an essential part of its work in the development of the technical standards has been done by representatives of industry. We also note Mr. Chairman that in addition TSAG has recognized the need for a strategic function in ITU-T where the inputs of all concerned parties including the industry and Developing Countries in to the strategy is highly desired. For this reason Mr. Chairman we propose two additional resolves to instruct the director of TSB to encourage participation of CTO meetings, over wide representation of industry from the ITU sector members from all regions. Again Mr. Chairman in addition to that to instruct, to disseminate the outcome to the ITU-T Study Groups and T sector and to invite them to report to TSAG on the consideration of CTO proposals in their activities. And in addition to produce a report to the next WTSA assessing the outcome of CTO meetings over the period and examining need to continue such activities and finally to instruct the director of TSB to coordinate the director of development bureau to follow-up on the continuation of the global industry Forum, GILF, and to provide its outcomes to T sector Rapporteur group on standardization strategy for consideration in its activities. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Kenya. Are there questions of

clarification on this proposal? France, please.

     >> FRANCE: Thank you, Chair. Just a request for clarification. There is reference made to the GILF Global Industry Leaders Forum. We wanted to know which group this is exactly. Is there not confusion with a group that existed in the development sector?

     >> CHAIR: Thank you France. Kenya, are you able to clarify on that point?

     >> KENYA: Mr. Chairman, I would need to confirm, but my initial understanding yes, it is the same group. Thank you.

     >> CHAIR: Thank you. Are there any other requests for clarification? Okay. I see no requests for the floor. So other than that point the proposal is clear. Thank you very much. We have one other proposal which seems to have at least some overlap with this one. This is from CEPT, the document is 45 Addendum 4. Can I have a presentation of this proposal? France, please.

     >> FRANCE: Thank you very much Chair. So I am yes, presenting this contribution on behalf of the CEPT Member States. It is a contribution that seems indeed to be similar to the African Republic but actually it is rather the opposite because it was introduced actually a little bit beforehand. In Europe we would favor continuation of activities of this group and we propose not only to add some modification to the Resolution but also to set in stone the role of this group and to clarify its formal outcomes in the future work of ITU-T. So it does seem important from a ministerial Point of View that's why we are proposing a change to the title. We do think that this group is the appropriate mechanism and that has been recalled. This group has been working since 2009 when it was launched in Paris and have given some great results and had held excellent discussions. I do think we should reaffirm and continue the work of this group. Our proposal is a bit like the African proposal. I am going to go in to detail here. But given a clearer wording to define the participation of this group then as regards participation we want to strengthen this role so that the representatives from all regions across the world, particularly Developing Countries. We also looking to see the work taken in to account by the ITU-T sector, particularly by TSAG a more formal way. We do think that the new mechanism which could be created by TSAG could be the appropriate modification for these mechanisms. Apart from the title that we are going to limit to the industry, we are proposing to encourage cooperation with other standardization organization. This is very important because ITU-T belongs to a very broad ecosystem which is a standardization landscape. And industry players participate in many areas of standardization. So we are very much aware of this

in our group and we encourage participation from other standardization bodies. Now as the outcomes of the work we propose that this be addressed via TSAG to its strategic function and that this should be recognized clearly by TSAG and all of ITU-T members so that this group can live in a long term, we would call for a regular report be made, for example, WTSA to give the main ideas proposed by industry during the work of this group. So Chair these are the main considerations in this modification to the existing Resolution as it regards the CTO group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Are there any questions of clarification on this proposal? United Arab Emirates please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman and I thank France on behalf of CEPT and also thank Africa region for their amendments and comments from this Resolution, Resolution 68. I have one comment or one modification Mr. Chairman, that's on part considering B. I can see that the previous A was deleted. However, with regards to considering B we would like to see that this text is modified as follows: To replace the words avoid duplication with minimize conflict. And this is specific thing. So would read as follows: That ITU-T should encourage cooperation with other relevant SDOs in order to minimize conflict of standardization activities. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. I also thank you to the African administrations and the CEPT for these proposals. We have a similar question and a similar question on proposal to our Arab colleagues because I also believe what I can see in the Russian version at least under considering B means that if there is any organization to finds a similar aspect they shouldn't stop everything and not do anything in this field. So if I read the -- that's how I read the Russian version anyway. I don't think this was the main task, the main aspect of this proposal. So if we change it slightly, then perhaps the wording proposed by the Emirates would be more clear including in the Russian version of the text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and good afternoon to all. I would like to thank the African region and CEPT for their contributions. Mr. Chairman we would like to see the representation of CTOs in the CTO meetings to include a broader mix of CTOs. CTOs from multiple regions and various industries. It seems that many of the CTO meetings that I have or we've been observing so far and the reports that we have seen so far reflect on meetings that have own been taking place in certain regions and the reports reflects the views of that

region where we believe if we have a good distribution of CTOs that are represented in these meetings, the views would be more of an international flavor rather than specific to one region. So we would ask that the director take that in to consideration and maybe those words would also be reflected in this text. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United States. Other views? Russia please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. Also we have a question regarding under noting B. Again when I'm reading the Russian version how it is written anyway, it would imply that practical -- the whole sector of standardization is representative of industry. Is representative of industry. I think it should be changed slightly, noting that the important role that is played by industry representatives when working on technical standards.

So to rephrase it slightly, industry plays in the development of technical standards. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Other views? Okay. I'm -- while we were consulting on possibly setting up an Ad Hoc Group for this we have three other interventions. So first of all, Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good evening, all of you. Mr. Chair, with regard to paragraph B starting with considering, we observe that this paragraph seems to state that cooperation with other organizations is to reduce duplication and remove conflict with regard to standardization activities. But we would like to say here that cooperation extends to more than this.

And it is not limited to just avoiding duplication or avoiding conflict. Article 50 of the Constitution sets the main objective for cooperation with other organizations and the text is in English as follows: This of complete international coordination on matters affecting telecommunication the union should cooperate with the international organizations having related interests and activities. So this is the purpose of the cooperation with the other organization, not only limited to avoiding conflicts. So I suggest that we remove the part starting from in order to avoid duplication and replacing it with the words in the Constitution. This is my proposal, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Russia please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. As regards the proposal from Russia we think that to reducing this length we could change the text. Start industry, the first word should be that. The industry plays an important role and then delete, yeah. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Our point concerns also the B which was just mentioned by our colleagues from the Russian Federation. Instead of saying that industry plays an important role, we would prefer much more an essential role instead of -- I think when you are important it is not absolutely necessary. When you are essential, then it is quite stronger and we would like to underline that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So before moving on in the queue, let me announce that it is my intention here to create an Ad Hoc Group to facilitate the combination of these proposals and the tuning up of a few of these items. My perception is that there are two or three of these points where we need to improve the language. We need to clarify that the cooperation with other relevant SDOs is a -- not only a negative cooperation but a positive one. We have things where we work at different network layers and we map Ethernet signals and we talk to each other to figure out how to do that. So it is a lot of times there is no inherent conflict. It is just that we work together. We need to get a positive sense, I'm not sure of the words of the Convention mean that much to the rank and file but let's try to find the right words for that. So given the fact that we would propose to create an ad hoc to produce this text, if the remaining interventions are to propose further wordsmithing on these points I would suggest we move that to the ad hoc. So let me ask France and Kuwait with the understanding that we will create a group do you still want the floor? Okay. I still see requests for the floor. So I'll take those two interventions and then we'll announce the way forward with the proposed ad hoc. So France, please.

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chair. To be very short because you have already seen my proposal and have anticipated a proposal on a way forward. Perhaps without having an Ad Hoc Group we could have a drafting group because there is a great convergence between the African proposal and the European proposal. Therefore we might be able to have an editorial group led by Kenya on behalf of myself and with regards to the different remarks that should be made, they could go really in the spirit of the text which has been forwarded. Just more nuances between the text and make it more positive in nature. In particular an important point with the close collaboration with SDOs, as you have underlined this cooperation is very important. There -- it already exists ITU-T also exists in organizations but if we can find a positive way forward to draft this text and I think we are very close to reach a final agreement on this. So I'll leave it up to you in how we are going to proceed therefore. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you France. And thank you Kuwait for withdrawing your request for the floor. I think I would like to create a group. I think the reason I would like to call it Ad Hoc Group and I agree we are very, very close and there is very little conflict between the proposals to be able to come up with a text that's agreeable to all participants. The reason I had wanted to call it an Ad Hoc Group rather than a drafting group I think there were some ideas that were voiced which don't appear in either of the contributions that may be important to include. I think they are small things. I think it is things like the United States intervention concerning the geographic distribution. I don't want to lose some important input from that. We have the suggestion from Saudi Arabia, we should have a positive sense there that didn't appear in either contribution. I don't want to lose that. I think they are small things and he had r easily resolved. If Kenya is willing to Chair the Ad Hoc Group, I am happy with that proposal. I would have elected one of my Vice Chairmen if I didn't have a volunteer among the contributors. So Kenya if you are willing we are create that group and we need to select an appropriate time. I did have some consultations on the time for the continuation of the Resolution 22 discussions. We are suggesting to do that at 11 o'clock on Saturday following the Resolution 70 discussions that are scheduled at 10 o'clock. So I think we have -- Cesar 1 would be the Resolution 22. And then perhaps for Resolution 68, if we could do that I suspect people maybe don't want to do it in the evening on Friday, but sometimes Saturday afternoon if that's agreeable to participants. So -- so how many would plan to participate in the Resolution 68 discussion? So we know what size room to look for. We got about six, seven. Okay. So fewer than ten. Okay. So 1400 on Saturday gives people time for lunch between the various ad hocs if there is an overlap of participation.

   I am seeing some chuckling there. People are watching their weekend disappear. Okay. 1400 on Saturday then we'll find a room.

   Okay. Okay. So I know France had volunteered Kenya. Let me double check. Is Kenya willing to Chair? If not we can look for a volunteer among our Vice Chairs. Kenya please.

       >> KENYA: We accept Chair. Thank you very much for that. Thank you.

       >> CHAIR: Thank you for taking that on. So that gives a way forward. So I expect this is easy once we produce that single text from the Ad Hoc Group. So the other one we have and we have quite a few proposals. So we probably won't finish it. Okay. Just checking whether Paul was in the room. So -- okay. Terrific. So it probably makes sense to take first even though

it is not listed that way on the agenda, document 50 from the
SCV. So I can ask for a presentation by the Chairman. Paul,
please.
        >> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good evening. As the
acting Chair of the standards Committee on the vocabulary I'm
pleased to present the proposed modifications to Resolution 67.
By background, these proposed revisions were initiated at the
request of REVCOM that was forwarded to us by the TSAG asking to
converting its status to a joint group with the radio sector and
in particular with the coordination Committee on the vocabulary.
So that was the background of this. And I should clearly say
from the beginning that the -- that our counterparts from the
coordination Committee on the vocabulary on the radio sector did
not concur with the proposed changes that we came up with in the
SCV. So the radio sector counterparts did not concur with these
proposed changes at this time.
    The reason for these changes in particular in the resolves 7
and 8 part of the document is to study the feasibility of
creating a joint group and in our research we did not find any
possible way through the various working methods that we have
that would allow the two groups to join together as a single
joint group between the radio sector and the T sector. Even
taking in to consideration Resolution 18, Annex B it does not
conform to this proposal.
    And the reason is not that it is not possible to create joint
groups. The reasons are procedural. The standards Committee on
the vocabulary does not produce recommendations. It has no
mandate to produce recommendations. In fact, these Chairmen of
the standards Committee on the vocabulary doesn't even get
recognized at the WTSA. He name doesn't appear at the opening
Plenary. While on the radio -- the RA side the CCV produces
recommendations in the V series, submits a report to the
radiocommunications Assembly and they are recognized at the RA.
Because of these procedural differences it is not possible at
this time to create a joint group. So that is what is being
proposed here and I would just basically kindly ask you if we
could go to the RCC contributions and we can take some questions
for clarification. Thank you.
        >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. So are there any
quick questions? I think the situation is clear but are there
questions specific to document 50? Okay. With that I would ask
for a presentation of the RCC proposal 47 Addendum 5. Russia
please.
        >> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. We considered the
issue of equal use of languages from -- including various
aspects. First of all, we would like to draw your attention to
the fact that work on improving is ongoing. Including in the

ITU-T sector. But there is a lot to do still particularly from
the point of view of the website. Then we would like to draw
your attention to translation of recommendations under AAP when
first time at the 2009 council we made the decision that the
financial consequences were considered based on the fact that
this work would be carried out by the corresponding services.
However after this we took further measures wider for -- and we
used outsourcing for a lot of these translations.
     Thus the costs were lower. So based on this and
understanding the importance of recommendations approved under
the AAP in sectors of standardization, perhaps we have 90% or so
of these recommendations in ITU-T. And translation of a thousand
pages over two years is too little. So we would propose doubling
this quantity. So 2,000 or a thousand pages a year using
outsourcing as much as possible.
     The -- then the financial consequences won't be greater than
they were in 2009 with this -- with only the service being used.
Then we also as Paul just said we considered the idea of having
joint work on languages across all sectors. For -- we have been
in reality we have been having the joint SCV meetings for awhile
now and they have been successfully led by Dr. Habola who also
led the council Working Group on languages. So we think it is
important to organize a closed type of cooperation between the
SCV and CCV and then experts should be chosen from the
corresponding sectors so that they have the author,
authorization to speak on behalf of the sector.
     And how can we create this joint body, I think that the
Assembly does not have this -- the authorization to do so. We
would have to go to the council. So we would have to two sectors
involved. So these are the main proposals that we have and these
proposals were included in our proposal as regards revision of
Resolution 67. I thank you very much Chair.
       >> CHAIR: Thank you Russia. So I think bearing in mind the
time I think I would like to allow a little bit of time for
discussion but we are now at by my watch 5:28. If we can ask the
interpreters for another ten minutes but not more than ten
minutes we can have a little bit of discussion of these
proposals. Contained in this document are five proposals. It is
a markup of Resolution 67 which is the primary element that's
within our remit. So can I ask for any questions or comments
with respect to propose 5 in this document which is the proposed
modifications and there are a small number of changes on this
proposal in particular. Okay. I see no requests for the floor.
So I think this is -- this part of the proposal is clear. And
then I see also contained in this document four other proposals.
It says ITU sector member but it is the acting Chairman of the
SCV. Please.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman and I do not wish to take more time but in the interest I think we could informally work for -- first of all I would like to thank the RCC for their contribution. I think there are many elements that are within purview of the SCV and the others are within the purview of council. There are many elements that could be supported including proposal No. 2, 3 and parts of No. 5. I should also inform that regarding their proposal for the feasibility of establishing a single working body I think -- I would advise that we should seek the -- this process for both the TSAG and the RAG for both advisory groups to initiate process and that's how I have been advised for it to work. In the interest of time I think we could work with informally with the RCC in producing a consolidated text that we could bring forward for your approval Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much Paul for that proposal. And I assume this can occur on an informal consultation basis. We don't need to create an official group here. So I think what I would look or hope to come out with would be an agreement about what we would put forward as a revision to Resolution 67 and then which other decisions we would record in the summary report. Some of these as you say are for council. Some of these feasibility of creating a single body I think you reported on the frustration with that. Obviously the practice of having common meetings of the two existing groups certainly can continue as it has been. But we'll look forward to a report in our next session on what's been agreed as a way forward on these items. So that was actually easier than I expected unless there are other views to be expressed or other comments going in to that informal consultation.

Let's see United States and then Russia please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman this is more of a procedural question for clarification. That is first of all, my intervention is not to oppose this. It is a great idea to consolidate these two groups. It is an answer to a more efficient process but Mr. Chairman, normally Chairman of groups or Study Groups do not bring in contributions to modify Resolutions. It is best to bring those in from members themselves and I think we have had those discussions at TSAG we would prefer to not have Chairmen to bringing in contributions. We should keep that in mind the next something like this happen. It is written in Res 1 I believe. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Russia please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. I would like to hear your conclusion as regards that other proposals. What as regards changes to Resolution 67. This will be the group that will consider this. The rest of our proposal, so 1, 3 and 4 what is

to become of them?

>> CHAIR: Thank you Russia. My understanding of the proposal was that all five proposals would be within the scope of the informal consultation and that we would look to come back with some view as to which of these we had the authority to take action on and which we didn't. Some of them are within our scope and some not. And the view I heard from the African Chairman of the SCV was that it would be easy to decide on which of those we could decide. We can put certain decisions in our summary report which would invite action in some other areas. So we have the ability to do that. I think with respect to the United States' intervention, certainly we wouldn't look to Chairman of groups to be proposing modifications to Resolutions but we do indeed look for Chairman of groups to provide inputs and those are considered by the members and members take the decision on what to do with those inputs. It is not so much in our Committee but certainly we see inputs in COM4 that the Study Groups give us their view on questions going forward and Resolution 2 modifications. While those are brought in by the Chairman that's understood to be the view of the Study Groups. So I would view document 50 as being a view of the SCV with Chairman having been appointed by previous WTSA and that being brought back in for our consideration. Of course, it is the members who will take the decision on what to do with those inputs. So we'll look forward with the informal consultation to give us perhaps an update from 47 Addendum 5 about what we can take action on and look to try to progress that forward in our session in the third quarter of the day tomorrow.

So any other requests for floor at this point? I see no requests for the floor. So that concludes our session for this afternoon. Thank you very much for your good discussion today and productive way forward on many issues. Tomorrow morning is sessions of Working Group 3A who will continue their discussions on Resolution 1 and then we have one session tomorrow afternoon before the Plenary. Thank you very much. We are recessed for today.

***

***