

RAW FILE
WTSA - PARALLEL SESSION
OCTOBER 27, 2016
9:30 A.M. CEST

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 is being provided in a rough-draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

>> CHAIR: Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. If we can get started. We have two sessions of Working Group 3. I will try to deal with the various Resolutions that we have before us as quickly as possible so that we can complete our work on time and provide a report to Committee 3. Before I begin I would like to check the interpretation channels.

>> Good morning.

>> CHAIR: French? Spanish? Russian? Chinese? And Arabic? Thank you very much. Everything seems to be in order. So Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to draw your attention to our agenda for this meeting. It is found in document ADM11. So it provides with the list of the documents, the various Resolutions and I would also like to draw your attention to the SharePoint site which is labeled as working documents for Working Group 3B. So as you would expect we have undertaken some consultations on the various proposals and we will, of course, advise you as to the status of those consultations when we have the documents presented.

And as is our usual practice we will give the opportunity for brief presentations of all of the documents and then we will determine our best way forward in order to reconcile any differences that exist so that we can

complete our drafts and as I mentioned earlier to submit this to Committee 3. So at this stage are there any comments on the agenda?

If not, I'll consider it approved. Thank you very much.

So we will proceed then to our first Resolution but before I do I should mention that as was discussed in Committee 2 yesterday the -- this is the budget control Committee. We should bear in mind any financial implications of any of the Resolutions, any of the modifications to the Resolutions that are relevant. So this is document No. 63 I believe and we should just bear that in mind in the course of our discussions.

And that, too, should be conveyed to Committee 3 for further analysis. So Ladies and Gentlemen, we have under item 4 Resolution 7, concerning the collaboration with ISO and IEC. And we have two input documents, both of which are in the form of modifications to the Resolution. The first is from the RCC, document 47, Addendum 2 and I would like to give the floor to the RCC to present this document, please.

>> RCC: Good morning, and thank you, Chair. And so I would like to present the 47th document. This proposes changes to Resolution 7, collaboration with the International Organization for Standardization and the International Electrotechnical Commission, the IEC and ISO. There is an addition in the text in the resolves section of Resolution 7 to establish a standard form of access concerning the standards of IEC and ISO on website. This is topical because the positions of the ITU and ISO are different in terms of the dissemination of standards.

Works towards supporting through financing. There is free open access through -- for international dissemination of these standards through the above website for common work on developing standards. We need to have a single system of publication which will make it easier to ensure smooth dissemination of standards across the world. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So the floor is open Ladies and Gentlemen for any comments with respect to document No. 47, Addendum 2. If there are no comments, perhaps I could provide some information with respect to the text. There is an agreement between ISO and IEC and ITU-T, basically in the form of ITU-T will make any comments, text available to the general public for a fee during a one-year period starting from the date IEC and ISO have made the common text available for sale. At the end of this one-year period ITU-T will make the common text freely available to the public at no charge. Now about 5% of the common text have a nonnegligible commercial value for IEC and ISO and ITU-T will charge a fee for those texts as well after a one-year period. ITU-T makes the ASN.1 text freely available. That's some background information with respect to this point.

So we'll come back to that momentarily. We have a second document, this is from the United States in document 48 Addendum 5. Could I ask the U.S. to present this document, please?

>> UNITED STATES: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. Just give us a second to get our notes -- the wonders of electronic access. I apologize for the delay. So it's up. Would you like to introduce? So Mr. Chairman, thank you and again I apologize for the delay in introducing this proposal concerning modification of Resolution 7, dealing with collaboration. Our proposals are to revise this document, emphasizing opportunities for improvement within the relationship with ISO/IEC, having some specific modifications dealing with in particular the conformance and interoperability program. And emphasizing some language changes that clarify the relative role of the staff versus the ITU membership as having the authority and responsibility for decisions around the interaction. In the interest of time Mr. Chairman, I'm going to ease my introduction in my introduction at this point and be available for questions. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. The floor is open Ladies and Gentlemen for any comments. I see no one asking the floor. So I would refer the meeting to the SharePoint site where we have the two proposals listed. This is document No. 1 for the side by side view. And document No. 2, the draft revision of Resolution 7.

So we'll just display it on the screen. Please. This is working document No. 2. So the first amendment is in considering D. Any comments Ladies and Gentlemen? I see no one asking for the floor. So we can accept that amendment. We'll now move to item considering F. Any comments? Again if we could keep this document displayed on the screen.

Okay. Any comments? Considering F. No comments. So we'll move to the noting B. Any comments? No comments. So that's accepted. Noting H, concerning the common patent policy. No comments. Noting F, sorry, noting I. Any comments? No comments. Thank you very much. We'll go to the operative part of this Resolution and resolves 1, there are -- there is a minor revision to resolves 1. Any comments? No comments. So that's accepted. I'm sorry. Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you very much, Chair. I would like to know why we have suppressed the sentence vice versa. Vice versa in English. ISO and IEC are asked to cooperate with ITU and we think this cooperation should be reciprocal therefore. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Could I ask the authors of this particular amendment to respond to that question, please well, it is the RCC or the U.S.? It is the U.S. I believe.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Honestly for us it is somewhat of a grammatical issue as to well, what's the reverse, the construct there talks about an invitation to them to do the examination. It is not a significant issue for us however. So if it causes difficulty we can live with having the text stay.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. If there is no issue with that we will keep the text as it was. Any other comments on resolves 1? Resolves

2. Sorry. Ladies and Gentlemen, when you request the floor just push the button once, otherwise it will disappear from my screen and I won't be able to give you the floor. I see that Egypt is complying with that requirement. I would like to give the floor to Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chair. With regards to resolves 2, I would like to know what we mean by the leadership team. It is the responsible team of the group or what is this exactly? Thank you.

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

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, it is the entire management team of the involved Study Group. It is not just a singled individual decision that is appropriate for the consultation in the overall spirit of Consensus and collaborative activity across the broad representation of the membership, it is desired to include the entire management team. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Egypt please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chair. In that case we should therefore explain by saying in English the term management team instead of leadership team in order to avoid any confusion in understanding of this text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, thank you very much. I see the U.S. is agreeing. So we'll change that to management team. Thank you.

Okay. We have a new resolves 3 to request the director of TSB to examine the possibility, et cetera. Any comments, Ladies and Gentlemen? Japan please.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is not clear for me that a unified procedure for publishing, publishing independent matters between ITU and ISO/IEC. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yeah, I believe this is from the RCC. Could I ask them for an explanation, please.

>> RCC: Thank you, Chair. This proposal will provide assistance for Developing Countries, not developed countries. Because Developing Countries could use these standards receiving them free from the ITU.

>> CHAIR: Yes, thank you very much. So perhaps we should add the words for the particular benefit of Developing Countries or words to that effect so that we can make it clear. So that's agreed. I think Japan is agreeing. So we will add those words. Thank you. Uzbekistan.

>> UZBEKISTAN: Yes, that's correct. Absolutely right. Perhaps we need to write, for example, if Developing Countries come in to contact and demonstrate interest in receiving such standards, the ITU could provide assistance having coordinated this issue with ISO or with the IEC.

>> CHAIR: Yes. Thank you. If you leave it to us to find the right words I think the spirit of your intervention is accepted. We will find the right text. So that's agreed at least in principle. So if we could move then to the next item, and this is in resolves 4 now. I'm sorry, 5. There is an

amendment to that paragraph. Any comments, Ladies and Gentlemen? No comments. That's accepted.

The next amendment is in resolves 7 -- I'm sorry, resolves 8. Minor amendment there. Any comments? No comments. So I think we are -- have completed this Resolution. So thank you very much everyone for your cooperation in amending this text. So we will provide the necessary advice to Committee 3 with regard to Resolution 7.

So I would suggest then we move to the next item, this is Resolution 11. This is the collaboration with the postal operations council of the Universal Postal Union in the study of services concerning both the postal and telecommunications sectors. So we have two input documents, one from the African Group. So I would like to give the floor to the representative from the African Group, AFCP document No. 42, Addendum 2. I don't believe we have a representative from the African Group in the room at this time. So perhaps I could give the floor to the -- to CITELE to represent IEP Addendum 13.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chair. It is my pleasure to introduce this document on behalf of the CITELE Member States our proposal is that Resolution 11 should be suppressed because there no longer is a need for this Resolution on collaboration with the UPU since its original intent was satisfied when the ITU-T X400 series recommendations were created in the 1990s. Consistent with the TSB director's suggested principle 1 for review of the WTSA Resolutions this Resolution should be suppressed.

In fact, the ITU-T is not really collaborated with UPU on any of the specific issues of common interest. During this study period there had been only one liaison from ITU-T Study Group 17 to UPU requesting comments on the proposed ITU-T X.1341 and they did receive one response that essentially raised a number of technical issues with the draft document.

UPU also highlighted in its response that it is engaged in extensive standardization and regulations efforts. And was trying to achieve a common standard. There is no record that we have been able to detect that Study Group 17 responded to that set of UPU identified technical issues and how or if they were accommodated prior to the publication of X.1341 in 2015.

And so for these reasons we believe that in the interest of cost savings and removing the overhead of continuing to carry a Resolution that's not followed that this Resolution be suppressed. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much United States for that presentation. Is there anyone now in the room from the African Group who can introduce document 42, Addendum 2? I see not. So perhaps we will have to come back to this item. We should bear -- I see Zimbabwe please.

>> ZIMBABWE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am going to present our proposed modifications to Resolution on 11 on behalf of the Africa group. Our view is that we need to strengthen our cooperation with the council of

postal operations on a reciprocal basis and a minimal of formalities by exploring the possibilities of cooperation in the fields and issues of common interest such as quality of service, electronic services and security of mobile payments as provided for in the action plan of which was revised in May 2015.

So we -- our view is that we need to strengthen in view of emerging services, in particular mobile payments. We still need to collaborate to cooperate with the council of postal operations. Mr. Chairman I submit.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Any comments Ladies and Gentlemen? United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The United States and indeed our CITELE brethren are quite sympathetic to the issues raised and the need for improved service with respect to digital financial services that are raised by the African common proposal. However we would still like to emphasize that attempts to list specific study topics, of Study Groups are really not the role of WTSA Resolutions, except for Resolution 2. And this is consistent with the TSB director's guidance in TSAG document 532, specifically principle 11 which states that an instruction given to an ITU-T Study Group will serve little purpose until followed by a contribution to the ITU-T Study Group to drive the work to progress.

But also like to observe that UPU announced in October that it had just been awarded 1.85 million U.S. dollar grant to provide technical assistance to posts interested in developing financial services for low income populations. Under the new initiative the UPU will set up a facility to access technical assistance in developing their DFS. Over the next four years the UPU expects that 20 posts will have benefitted from this program thereby accessing affording financial services for millions of people. This has been achieved without recourse to Resolution 11. The recently published on postal financial inclusion shows that 91% of posts worldwide offer some form of financial services with most of them already on the path to digitization and this is not a situation that needs further cooperation. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I have two further requests for the floor. First from the Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. Russia fully supports the proposal of the African countries and sees positive prospects in this proposal for cooperation with the UPU and we also in favor of mutually reinforcing cooperation and strengthening the ITU-T mandate in such financial services. We also consider that it is necessary to allocate sufficient attention to mobile finance services which facilitate their development of Developing Countries and make it possible to facilitate overcoming difficulties and hindrances in expanding access to mobile financing services. Thus we suggest continuing to work on Resolution 11 because we see that there are positive -- there is positive potential in cooperation between our organizations. And Delegate to the TSB director the task of developing the

possibility of creating a joint Working Group between the two international organizations, ITU and UPU. We can provide a concrete formula when we start working on the actual document. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Switzerland please.

>> SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair. As you know the 26th Congress of the UPU completed its efforts two and a half weeks ago as was already stated by my distinguished counterpart from the United States. The UPU decided to provide technical assistance for the deployment of electronic Postal Services for low income populations. We draw from this information the opposite conclusion of that of the United States. We believe that for at least four years we need to preserve this Resolution 11. We need to see whether cooperation can be created between ITU and the UPU and to revisit this issue in four years to decide then whether this Resolution should be preserved. Given the most recent developments within the UPU and during the 26th Congress, we hope that this Resolution will remain in force, giving an opportunity for further cooperation between these two eminently important organizations, important across the world. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I have a final request for the floor from Cote D'Ivoire.

>> COTE D'IVOIRE: Thank you, Chair. Following on the words of my colleague from Zimbabwe we would like to support the idea of maintaining cooperation between the ITU and the UPU and we also support this proposal given the importance of mobile financial services for Developing Countries and particularly for the African continent. Given the cross-cutting nature of these mobile financial services across a number of different sectors, telecommunications but also Postal Services it is important that this cooperation remains in force between the telecommunications sector and the UPU and so we are in favor of supporting this cooperation with the UPU. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, and I have another request from the floor from Egypt please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chair. The Egyptian administration would like to confirm that we support the proposal and we would like to keep this document, keep this Resolution within the documents of the ITU. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: We know that UPU is active in the Focus Group on digital financial services and I would anticipate that the UPU would continue once the deliverables are completed when the focus group completes its work in December, that when these deliverables are integrated in to the work program of the relevant Study Groups that UPU would continue to participate. So in light of the interventions supporting the retention of Resolution 11 I might suggest that we take the decision to keep Resolution 11, at least for the next study period and that I would draw your attention to working document No. 3 which poses the amendment to the resolves,

essentially the resolves would include a reference to digital financial services and mobile payments are already there. So would we have any strong objections to keeping Resolution 11? I refer specifically to the United States on behalf of the CITELE Member States. Would they agree to keep the Resolution 11 and we can proceed with the amendment to include digital financial services and the resolves. United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Recognizing the rather uniform response to this proposal in the spirit of cooperation we are inclined to agree however formally I have to present this to CITELE at its meeting today. I would expect a favorable response but formally I still need to request that. So we will get back to you. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. If we could go now to the working document No. 3, and to the resolves, are there any comments with respect to the amended text? Now we bear in mind, of course, that we still need to receive the formal approval from the CITELE Member States with regard to the agreement to maintain this Resolution but in the interim we can take a decision in principle to maintain the Resolution 11. I see requests from the floor from the Russian Federation please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. We would like to propose a formula, a language for modifying this Resolution in section instructs the director of TSB. And then in English instructs the TSB director to consult with UPU on the establishment of a joint Working Group between ITU and UPU on digital financial services to share lessons learned through implementation of projects in the area of digital financial inclusion to drive standardization activities in both organizations. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Any comments, Ladies and Gentlemen, on this proposal to amend the instructs the director of the TSB? Of course, when we come back to this document after I receive the consultation from the United States on behalf of CITELE we will have the amended text in print so that people can see what exactly the amendment is. And then we can take a final decision on that further amendment. So the United States please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. We will wait until the text, the revised document for the new text. However I would like to signal that the U.S. would have some problems with adding that text and we will wait to see the document before it comes in. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: So the way I propose to proceed then would be to approve in principle the idea of maintaining Resolution 11 first and foremost pending consultations between the various Member States of CITELE on the retention. And as far as the additional text proposed by the Russian Federation we will offer a revision to working document No. 3 with the exact text so that at our next meeting we can consider whether to include that text or not.

So if there is any -- if there is no objection to that way of proceeding we

can go to the next set of documents. Okay. Thank you very much.

So the next Resolution for our consideration Resolution 18, concerning the principles and procedures for the allocation of work to and coordination between the ITU-T and ITU-R. We have three input documents from the African Group and from the Arab group and the RCC. And I do understand that consultations have already taken place between those who have submitted proposals. And that we may have an agreement on a way forward. But before we do that, I would like to give the opportunity for the presentation for the brief presentation of each of these proposals, please. First of all, document No. 42 from the African Group Addendum 3, please.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of the African Group I would be presenting this document. The main purpose for the document is to include the sector development sector in the cooperation mechanisms that are included in this Resolution. So we made some changes starting from the recalling, to recall Resolution 59 on this -- of Dubai 2014 of the world telecommunication conference on cooperation among the three sectors and recalling also Resolution 17, 26, 44, 45 of the WTSA on mutual cooperation and integration of activities between ITU-T and D. Then we added in the considering section the ITU-D Study Groups shall, per 2014 of the Convention with the specific telecommunication questions of general interest to Developing Countries including the matters enumerated in No. 211 of the Convention and also we added B, taking in to account No. 119 of the constitution the radiocommunication, telecommunication standardization and telecommunication development sectors shall keep the matters under continuing view with a view to reaching agreement on the distribution of work for avoiding the application of world efforts and improving coordination. We have also some amendments recognizing and taking in to account and in the resolves we started to add TDAG and to invite the director of the developing sector as well as the director of radiocommunication and standardization to report about the cooperation between them. Also we added an annex B the development sector to be included in the intersection coordination groups and in annex C we added also the development sector to join the intersector groups. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Unless there are any comments for clarification. I see none. We will go next to the Arab group, document 43, Addendum 1, please. Egypt again, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. Concerning the presentation of the expression and the amendment concerning the Resolution 18, the Resolution has been amended to include certain new ideas and to refer to the development sector, the ITU. So that it should be one of the participating sectors in the new assignments and new allocations. So that there is coordination with the telecom sectors and the other sectors. The amendment has been presented so that development sector should

participate in all coordination meetings and coordination groups between sectors. It should be always one of the participants in the Rapporteur group. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Any comments for clarification purposes? I see no one asking for the floor. So the final contribution is from the RCC document 47, Addendum 3. Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. Very briefly, the countries of the RCC propose reviewing Resolution 18 with a goal of correcting references to the corresponding provisions of the charter and Convention, the constitutional Convention of the ITU, sections missed and also to draw this Resolution to bring it in to compliance with Resolution from the radiocommunications sector, adopted by the 2015 Assembly. And also to clarify and correct a number of provisions. I would also like to note that some of our proposals were lost in translation. I have already received corrections of the text from our U.S. colleagues which more accurately reflect our proposals in the Russian text and correct the translated English text. In the spirit of cooperation we have worked very closely with two other regional organizations. We have no objection to merging Resolution 18 and 57 and together with the two other regional organizations we have prepared the text to do this.

The sum editorial corrections proposed by the U.S. Delegation could not be considered by us fully because we received them after working on the document but I think that when we complete our work on this text we will be able to take in to account all of those suggestions and corrections. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Yes, thank you very much. Certainly your point with regard to the Resolution, Resolution 6 from the radio sector which was revised at the last Radio Assembly which took place in 2015 I understand that Resolution contains and invites to the T sector to take the amendments to Resolution 6 in to account in the revision of Resolution 18. So I see that has been acted upon.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to given the complexity of the various texts that have been proposed for amending this Resolution, and given our time constraints, what I would like to suggest to you is that we proceed with the consideration of the other Resolutions, I do believe that we can complete them within our time allotted and then we can come back to Resolution 18 at our next meeting particularly with respect to all of the amendments that have been proposed and the integration of the text that have already been completed and the agreement reached between the three proponents for these modifications. Taking in to account the integration with Resolution 57 as well and that we proceed with No. 7, No. 8 and No. 10 so that we can complete our agenda and bearing in mind that we are coming back to various items at our next meeting. So I think if we could dispose of those items and then come back, I think that would be the best and most

efficient way of proceeding if there is no objection. So what I would like to suggestion is to proceed to item 7 on Resolution 38. We have two proposals for suppression of this Resolution. I would like to first of all, give the floor to the APT in document 44 Addendum 11 please. Before I proceed I see a request from the floor for Korea. Korea, please.

>> REPUBLIC OF KOREA: It is a great pleasure to introduce this document there on behalf of APT Member States. This document proposed to suppress this Resolution 38, APT member countries agreed to propose a new Resolution for IMT-2020 for WTSA-16 in order to accelerate the standardization activities on IMT-2020. It is also recognized that the existing Resolution 38 is completed and Resolution -- other Resolutions such as 57 already could be enhanced to include the main content of this Resolution 38 so that Resolution 38 need to be suppressed. This is all my comment. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Any comments for clarification purposes? I see none. So I will proceed to IAP, 46, document 46, Addendum 28, please. Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, to everyone. Similar to the previous presentation CITELE proposes to suppress Resolution 38. The arguments are somewhat similar to the ones presented by the previous presenter. So I will go very fast through my arguments Mr. Chairman. Given the IMT, it is an issue of interest to all three sectors in Resolution 57. And Resolution 57 that deal with the strengthening and cooperation among the three ITU sectors on mutual interest and to that extent Resolution 57 could be modified to reflect current actions to improve such coordination and cooperation. Given the issue of intersector coordination team representing from the three sectors and establishment of task force of level of ITU Secretariat, Resolution 38 no longer serves of any use and it can be in line with guidance No. 1. So that concludes my short presentation Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Any comments Ladies and Gentlemen? If not, I would like to ask the room if they have any objection to the suppression of Resolution 38, given the arguments that have been put forward by both the APT and by CITELE with regard to the Resolution. I might add one comment. Resolution 38 was first adopted in Montreal at the 2000 WTSA and its purpose was in relation to the establishment of Study Group 19 at the time. And as you know Study Group 19 has completed its work. Its work has been integrated in to Study Group 13. So in that respect the -- all of the work and the items that are pertinent to IMT2000 in this case in Study Group 19, all that work is taking place somewhere else. Given that fact that might lead further credence to the need for suppressing this Resolution. Bearing in mind that the work on IMT-2020 will continue, and be integrated in to the work program of study group 13.

So any objection to the suppression of Resolution 38, Ladies and

Gentlemen? I see none. So we will convey that decision to COM3. Thank you very much. If we could move to the next Resolution and No. 8, Resolution 45, again we have two proposals. One for suppression and one for modification. I first like to give the floor to the representative from CITEL for document No. 46, Addendum 27, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you. This is a proposal to suppress Resolution 45. Mr. Chairman, there is no apparent purpose to serve in maintaining Resolution 45 given that this has ongoing role and responsibilities defined in Article 14A of the ITU Convention and the ITU-D Resolution 1, Resolution 22 which includes such coordination functions. If we look at the resolves of Resolution 45, we notice the following: The first one is the identification of high level objectives and priority for ITU-T study from a global perspective. Mr. Chairman this can be achieved through the recent establishment of the T sector group. The next item resolves 45 then deals with cooperation between Study Groups. Including the avoidance of duplication of work and anticipation of linkages between related work items. TSAG's ongoing responsibility includes this function supported by regular meetings, conferences and calls of the Study Group management team. In addition resolves 45 calls for the plan for time frames and deliverables and objectives for the activities. The Strategic Plan for ITU based on resolves based framework are on the review ongoing basis of T sector group of operational planning. So that is addressed to. Another item in resolves Resolution 45 deals -- talks about interest of Developing Countries are taking in to account under the involvement in these activities is encouraged and facilitated. Mr. Chairman there is a directive implemented throughout the entire sector to buy shares to specifically tasked with relating to bridging the standardization gap. Resolves 45 talks about cooperation and collaboration with ITU-R and other standardization bodies. Relating to intersector coordination are undertaking in TSAG's intersector group. This is supported at membership level by the new intersector coordination team and task force. In relation to coordinations TSAG established a Rapporteur group on strengthening collaboration with external entities and SDOs. Given the actions Mr. Chairman Resolutions are be addressed on an ongoing basis. CITEL Member States propose that the Resolution be suppressed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Any comments Ladies and Gentlemen? If not, we can proceed with the presentation of the document from the APT, document 44 Addendum 5. I understand Malaysia will present this document.

>> Malaysia: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of APT I would like to present a proposal to modify Resolution 45. Distinguished Delegates this era of digital is an era of convergence. Therefore we believe that the rules and functions of Resolution 45 has never been more needed. It provides a specific focus on coordination works in unique and specific text.

For instance, several ongoing activities of TSAG are mandated from this Resolution. Ladies and Gentlemen in this proposal we have included several lines of text to further enhance Resolution 45. This will describe the term active roles by listing several action items in coordination work between Study Groups. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Any comments for clarification purposes, Ladies and Gentlemen? No comments. So we have two proposals. One to suppress the Resolution and one to modify it. Now if I understood correctly in the CITELE document the proposal is to integrate the main features of Resolution 45 in to the existing either the existing Resolution 1 or Resolution 22. Perhaps that could be borne in mind as a possibility to ensure that the main points that Malaysia and the APT put forward are reflected somewhere in the text of ITU-T, the WTSA Resolutions and preserving these main points that are currently reflected in the revision to Resolution 45.

So Ladies and Gentlemen, could I ask for comments on the possibility of either preserving and modifying Resolution 45 versus reflecting the amendments in another Resolution, namely Resolution 1 I think would be the most appropriate. Comments Ladies and Gentlemen? China, please.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We support the view of Malaysia for Resolution 45. We think that modification is more appropriate. At the last TSAG meeting we can many Study Groups have overlapping research projects. Therefore they should strengthen their interactions in key technical areas. This is very important for the next study period. Especially for topics like Internet of Things, Smart Cities, cybersecurity and IMT-2020. It is extremely important and significant. China also supports the modification of Resolution 45 in order to strengthen the interaction and collaboration among Study Groups for key strategic emerging areas. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Further comments? United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to add our voice with the support of the America's common proposal to try to consolidate instructions and guidance for Study Groups in Resolution 1, dealing with procedures or even more appropriately recommendation A.1. It is very challenging as we continue to attempt to expand the involvement with those who haven't been around as long as some of us in the activities of ITU-T to understand the processes and procedures and attempt to consolidate them in to a single place we believe would go a long way in improving the effectiveness and the ease of introduction in to the organization. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Yes, thank you very much. Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair. We would also like to add our voice in favor of the question of effective coordination

being clearly and precisely ascertained and laid out in the Resolution of the Assembly. Therefore, we support preserving Resolution 45 with the corresponding amendments as proposed after which we would review them and adopt them. As regards inclusion of these provisions as contained in Resolution 45 in Resolution 1, on the whole I would say that we don't have -- we don't see any particular problem here. However, Resolution 1 at the end of the day is dedicated to procedural issues. And has no direct connection with specific research aspects which are reflected in Resolution 45. Resolution 45 identifies the frameworks for research and studies and not just procedures. And so given these circumstances we believe that the Resolution 45 should better be preserved. And to one last argument in favor of us not working on the inclusion of Resolution 45 provisions in to Resolution 1, is that Resolution 1 is already a fairly complex document. Resolution 1 contains various procedures and if we were to put in to the mix in addition components from Resolution 45, Resolution 1 would be even harder to read. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, thank you very much. Just one point of clarification we are dealing with only section 4 of the Resolution 1 if that were to be amended. I see a request from the floor from Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chair. In light of what has been said we think that we should maintain Resolution 45 as Resolution 1 focuses on procedural matters. And it further clarifies these fears of cooperation with regards to new technologies and it is for that reason that we are in agreement with China and Russia to maintain Resolution 45. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So Ladies and Gentlemen, it appears that there is some differences of opinion as to where these amendments and the spirit of where Resolution 45 should be reflected, whether to maintain the Resolution or to reflect these particular issues in an integrated fashion with Resolution 1. I think in view of the time, Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't think we have sufficient time to go through the specific amendments offered by the APT at this point. What I would like to do is come back to this at the next meeting and, of course, we'll take a decision as to how we proceed but I would invite those who have taken the floor, namely Malaysia, China, the Russian Federation, Canada the United States and Egypt to undertake further consultations as to how we might best procedure and come back to this issue at our next and final meeting. Before I do that I would like to offer the floor to the UAE please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chair. With regards to the proposal put forward by the Asia-Pacific Group, and to align myself with those who spoke before opted to preserve Resolution 45, we think that for the same reasons on the importance of Resolution 45 and for cooperation between TSAG we think therefore that it would be more appropriate to preserve Resolution 45. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. It would appear that there is

majority support for the maintenance or at least the modification of Resolution 45 and again we don't have time to go through the specifics at this stage in our meeting. So I would still encourage those who have taken the floor to confer, particularly with respect to the CITELE Member States who have suggested a suppression and removal of the various components of 45 in to Resolution 1. So we'll come back to this at our next meeting on Monday and finalize the text that have been put forward if that's agreeable.

So we have two additional Resolutions on our list, Resolution 57. Now 57 is very much associated with Resolution 18. So perhaps we should deal with those two Resolutions together at our next meeting. So that we can complete the task of the amendments to both Resolutions.

But I would like to deal with the final Resolution to see if we can reach agreement. This is Resolution 81. Again it is an inter-American proposal, document 46 Addendum 21. So I would like to offer the floor to the representative of CITELE to present this document, please.

>> Thank you, Chairman. CITELE proposes the suppression of Resolution 81. Mr. Chairman I would like to remind, remind all the audience that Resolution 81 was created at the last WTSA. And as a consequence of this Resolution TSAG established a new Rapporteur group to undertake and approve actions associated with strengthening collaboration. Over the last four years a lot has been accomplished with approval by TSAG of modified ACU recommendations A.25. Incorporating text between ITU-T and other organizations. In addition there is a new supplement, supplement No. 5 that was agreed and deals with guidelines for cooperation and exchange of information with other organizations. In order for the work on strengthening collaboration to be more specifically reflected in the ITU-T procedures, it is suggested in a contribution presented yesterday in Resolution 1, that a new paragraph inserted in section 4, Resolution 1, indicating that within the framework of TSAG's responsibility defining Article 14A as well as objectives to strategic plan -- and meanwhile we will continue in the TSAG Rapporteur group strengthening collaboration. So Mr. Chairman having said that CITELE Member States propose that this Resolution be suppressed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. So the floor is open Ladies and Gentlemen. Perhaps I could ask if there is any objection to the suppression of Resolution 81 given the fact that this work is integrated in to the work program of TSAG, there is a separate Rapporteur group on strengthening collaboration and that work will continue in the next study period. So any objection Ladies and Gentlemen to the suppression of Resolution 81?

I see no someone asking for the floor. So we will convey that agreement to COM3. So thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen. If I could just recap as to where we are with regard to the actions that we need to undertake at the next meeting. As you -- as we have just mentioned,

what we need to continue our discussions on Resolution 18 and by extension Resolution 57. We will need to continue with regard to Resolution 45 at our next meeting. And to consider the amendments put forward by the APT. And I do believe that once we have completed that we will be able to complete our tasks on time and with the -- within the time allotted to this Working Group.

So it is almost the complete -- the time for completing our work at 10:45. I'd like to take the opportunity at this stage to thank all of you for your participation. And for your spirit of cooperation. I would ask simply that you continue your consultations so that at the next meeting we can proceed as quickly as possible. If there are any concerns that remain, I would encourage you to confer with your colleagues and try to resolve them as quickly as possible. So with that Ladies and Gentlemen, again thank you and we will continue our next session on Monday, the 31st of October at 1615 to 1730. So with that the Working Group 3B will adjourn. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Good morning, everyone. I would like to welcome to our second meeting for Committee 3A. And first of all, I would like to draw your attention to agenda of our meeting ADM8, Rev 1 and as per the agenda we yesterday we concluded the discussion for A.1. And regarding Resolution 32 we proposed a drafting group to consider the proposed amendments on Resolution 32 and I would like to invite Cameroon, the leader of this drafting group to give us a report about the -- update us about that work of this drafting group. Cameroon, please.

>> CAMEROON: Thank you, Chair. And good morning, dear colleagues. So we have worked on the time slot proposed by ITU on the proposed modification of Resolution 32, strengthening working methods for the work of the ITU standardization sector and we have reviewed the proposal modification proposed by Russian Federation and Japan notably. We reached agreement on the modifications, made to the document. These are more modifications of the form. We have managed to review in that time the entire document and we are in agreement with the modifications. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Cameroon. Ladies and Gentlemen, we now have the result of the drafting group. You can see that in our SharePoint website as working document 3 for our Committee. And I would like to have your approval for the final text for the amendments on Resolution 32. Any comments? United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We were able to participate in the drafting group and appreciate the cooperation that was extended in trying to accommodate the text. My purpose in taking the floor is to just to note that given what would seem to be the agreement if we are going to go forward and agree to the changes as proposed they do ask for

specific programs of activity within the Secretariat and therefore would require that we pass this revised Resolution before Committee 2 to assess its potential financial impact. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United States. And we will send all our results as Committee 3A to Committee 2 to consider any financial implications for the approved Resolution and I would confirm you that we will do this exercise.

Any other comment on the text of Resolution 32? Okay. Thank you. Now I could have your approval to send this document to Committee 3. Now we can go to our next item, yesterday we presented the regional contribution for Resolution 1. And today we will -- I would like to draw your attention to our SharePoint website for the working document No. 2 which include all consolidated contribution. And my plan to go through this document one by one to consider the approved text for Resolution 1.

Now if you can go to considering A, any comments, APT proposal? Russia please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Mr. Chairman, I apologize sincerely but I would like to go back to Resolution 32, if that is possible. 32 mentions Resolution 66 of the Plenipotentiary Conference of 2010. If I remember correctly that Resolution no longer exists.

I would suggest that the Secretariat verifies the text and if it is true that the Resolution is modified or suppressed, then editorial comments should be proposed as appropriate. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Russia for that. And we will provide you with updates regarding Resolution 66 and I think this will not prevent us from approving. Now back to Resolution 1. Any comment in considering A? Key proposal? Okay. No comments.

We can accept the proposed changes. Now we can go to new text from Arab group considering C. Any comments? Okay. And we can go on.

Russia, Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. We have no problem with the modifications proposed but in the footnote below an addition is required. A reference to Dubai, et cetera. This is an editorial comment. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Russia. We will consider that. We can go now to the next point, consideration F. United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. You were -- your speed this morning is incredible. Can we please go back to considering C? Through you can we confirm that this text existed in the original Res 1? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: It is an add new text. United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. Through you can we ask the representative of the Arab States the purpose for adding this text here? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United States. Arab states would like to give clarification for that? Any representative from the Arab group? United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chair and good morning, to everyone. Chairman, this is an addition of general character. The Articles are mentioned in ITU-R regulations. In the Arab group we believe that these Articles enter in to Resolution 1.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your clarification. Is that okay with the United States? United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Could we please square bracket this text because we are not convinced that we need to add an addition to a considering that relates to the international telecommunication regulation. So we would like to square bracket this text and have some further discussions. Thank you.

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

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. We would like to support the proposal of the Arab States and explain the reasons for the additional appearance of this sentence. First of all, the International Telecommunications Regulations are active since the 1st of January 2015. Second, in the ITU-R in addition to other provisions there is a reference to the standardization sector rules. In this way I won't list all of the contents but even this means that the standardization sector has a direct relationship to the international telecommunication regulations, ITU-R. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Russian Federation for your comments. ITU-R is one of the main texts for the union and it reveals all (inaudible) itself. Any comments from the floor for this point? Put in square brackets, please.

And I would like to invite United States and Russia and United Arab Emirates to consider some informal consultation regarding this point, that we can come back again to this provision. Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. In this case it is simply not enough to list three countries. This was a proposal of which was submitted by regional organizations -- regional organization. That means that it is not the Emirates but the Arab States regional organization. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. For sure your comment is valid. Switzerland.

>> SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair. The text unfortunately has disappeared off the screen. With regards to the proposal I think it would be good to have the advice of a legal counsel. It refers to Articles here. In French it sounds to be a little strange. The WCIT adopted International Telecommunications regulations but also Resolutions only reference to Articles and this excludes some elements that will be in the final Acts. Therefore we think mentioning Articles alone might raise an issue and perhaps mentioning Resolution might be less of an issue. There are also

legal aspects which we must bear in mind when constructing this sentence here. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Switzerland for your comments and let me ask the legal advisor to give us more details about this issue. ITU, please.

>> ITU: Thank you, Chair. I'm going to reply in French to the question posed by Switzerland. I am unfortunately working on the English text. I am not sure there is any difference. Perhaps Switzerland and myself might be able to look at this together after this morning's meeting. With regards to the comment made by Switzerland the final Acts do contain a series of Resolutions which is right. I'm not sure if the intention of the contributor here was to make reference to the final Acts here or to the Treaty itself. Perhaps this point might be clarified. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. May the Arab group clarify this point with reference to the Resolutions or final Acts.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman. We are referring here to the final documents and not to the Resolution. We are referring to the Articles that have been adopted in Dubai in the framework of the WCIT. Thank you very much sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I would like to invite you all as I proposed before for all interested parties from different regions to conduct this informal discussion regarding this provision.

Now we can go on in the next point, point F. Any comments for that? Then we can go to -- United States please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. Can we have an explanation as to why we wanted to leave Resolution 165? It could be that it was suppressed at PlenPot14.

>> CHAIR: Could you give us clarification about that. China please.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We think Resolution 1 is a basic working document and it is very important. It has already mentioned Plenipotentiary which has adopted Resolution. Our recommendation is do not mix it with specific Resolutions, Resolutions adopted in 2010 which need to be updated from time to time. That's the reason behind it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you China for that. Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. As far as I know Resolution 165 was excluded at the 2014 Plenipotentiary Conference. And formally speaking it would probably most correctedly delete this text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Russia. Simply the point is not to reference Resolution 1 to other Resolutions which are the updated, suppressed, something like that.

Can we approve the text? Any comments? United States please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you. Resolution 165 actually deals with proceed ours for submitting proposals to the conferences. So perhaps this text can go in a different section because I will have to say as we were

preparing in the U.S. to come to the WTSA there were numerous documents that were received -- numerous documents that were received and had caused us difficulties in preparing for the meeting. This text while it is important it may not fit in this section but will fit in a different section. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Legal advisor, please. ITU.

>> ITU: Thank you very much. If you allow me, I would like to point out that if it is proposed to delete Resolution 165 from F, the rest of the sentence on deadlines for submission of proposals and procedures for registration of participants in conference should also be deleted. There are no references in the general rules to the procedures for registration per se. These are contained in 165.

>> CHAIR: Thank you ITU for that comment and we will suppress the Resolution. We should also suppress the rest of the paragraph. So can we approve -- get your approval for just keeping the point F, that the general rules, adopted by Plenipotentiary? United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. I have no problem if we want to move it from this section. However I would like to see the text retained somewhere so it can be maybe a new considering. But we would not like to see it deleted. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United States. Actually I prefer instead of creating a new considering even you keep it in the same place which in the Resolution is still in our Resolution 61, 165 is under operation now. So can we maintain it as a compromise? There is no problem for all regions. China, please.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. China agrees with your proposal on the compromise, keep it as it is. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you China for your understanding. Any other comments? Okay. No change in the text. Now we can go to proposal from the United States, some new text. Recognize it. Any comment on that? United Arab Emirates, please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman. As the document is in English will speak in English if you permit me: Thank you United States for the proposal. In recognizing the new addition, which refers to Resolution 72 Rev Busan recognizing A, requires transparency in operation of all union activities. So by adding this text my concern Mr. Chairman is that we are judging or we are saying indirectly that the operations in the T sector are not transparent. If we have a higher body of the Plenipotentiary Conference which adopted this Resolution do we need to introduce this specific recognizing in Resolution 1. Perhaps colleagues in the United States they can clarify why this text was added in Resolution 1. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United Arab Emirates. Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. We also have a question to the United States of America. First of all, what does this sentence mean. That does it mean that we must include similar texts everywhere and the second question is why does this fall under recognizing and not under considering. Like in all other Resolutions and one-third question, Resolution 72 now I will speak English because I have the Resolution text in English before me. Linking strategic financial and operational planning in ITU. I don't think that we should pick up one item from that Resolution. We would not object to mention that Resolution but not as Resolution in whole. Why we pick up one item which is in reality linked to strategic financial and operational planning.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Russia. And now I give the floor to United States for to give us clarification about that. United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. I will answer. So for Resolution 72 for us as making strategic financial and operational planning in the ITU that goes hand in hand with Resolution 71. Well, we could agree that maybe picking up one recognizing A may not be prudent we do think this Resolution has relevance in this discussion because it does talk about how the ITU-T, the Strategic Planning and how it should be linked and its operational planning and every element of this Resolution applies to the ITU-T's activities. So we would insist that we keep this Resolution here. Perhaps we just make it broad and include the title. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United States and this is exactly what I would like to propose to you, recognizing the Resolution itself and not mentioning certain points.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: We are grateful to the United States for their proposal and we agree with them. However we would like to move this reference to fall under considering as in other similar cases. Because if we have a reference just to one Resolution under recognizing, it appears that we are making that look like a more important reference than the others. I think that the United States will probably agree to move the reference to that Resolution together with the others under considering. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Russian Federation. United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would prefer to leave this paragraph but we should do that. But once we have heard what has been said by the U.S. in our opinion Mr. Chairman we have to take in to account of what has been said by Russia, transferring this to a previous paragraph under recognizing. In this case we would like to support transferring this paragraph to another paragraph and we should keep it general. And if you refer to the Resolution 71 in general terms that would be acceptable. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Propose to have it under considering and just stating the Resolution 72. That's okay United States? We can approve this point?

Thank you. Now we can move to the next point and resolve part. Just changing of old due to the new add from the Arab group and I think we didn't reach agreement on the proposal of Arab groups. We will keep this point that we reach agreement for the point of the ITU-Rs. So we can go now to section 1. And now we have a different proposal from different group. So the Arab group proposing to deleting point A and B. And propose new text for that and we have also proposal from CITEEL for new text. So I would like to have your comments to deleting A and B.

Would like to give the United Arab Emirates to give us clarification about their proposal.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman. After discussing this item in particular with a number of Delegations and in order to cooperate with everybody and in order to encourage cooperation we agree to keep the text as it is and especially A and C. And there is also proposal from the Arab group. There was initially proposal to delete the two subparagraphs but after discussing things with the regions and the various Member States we would like to keep the text. Thank you, sir. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: We would like to thank the Arab States group. We thank them for their position which they have just expressed because in our opinion this is the correct approach and we would like to thank them for that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Russian Federation. And now I would like to give the floor to the CITEEL to give us clarification for their proposal for adding new point D. Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The addition of this text is to emphasize the importance of suppressing Resolutions which have accomplished their objectives. And this is in line with the director TSB director guidance provided at TSAG. And the American United States consider that this is the way to go when we have a document, not document but Resolutions that have completed the work and it should be suppressed.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Canada. Any objection to having new item D? United Arab Emirates, please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you. With regards to this proposal from the CITEEL region we would like to clarify Mr. Chairman who will decide the actions proposed having accomplished? As we all know the Resolutions are very broad and there are no specific tasks in those Resolutions. They are broad in the results part and other parts, very broad. So who will determine whether the proposed actions have been accomplished and also there is another point Mr. Chairman with regards to this proposal is that whether those recommend -- Resolutions needs amendments in order to enhance the work in specific areas and take it forward or just suppress the Resolution. Well, in this Assembly

Mr. Chairman we have noticed that there were a number of Resolutions being proposed by different regions for suppression. But at the same time there are other regions who are proposing to maintain the Resolution and enhance the work on those specific Resolutions. So my concern Mr. Chairman if we keep the text as I said who will judge that the work has been accomplished or not. Secondly we would like -- we prefer that this text be clarified or suppressed. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United Arab Emirates. Egypt please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. In order to draw on what has been said by the Emirates and to add an idea I think personally that this text will create some problems. We will never know if we do need or not need Resolution. We don't really know if the procedures have been respected. So we are going to create some trouble for everyone. This is why we believe that we shouldn't keep this text in this document. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Egypt. Brazil please.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you. Just to clarify, the whole point of this item is actually we were having items to consider when we are looking at Resolutions from the WTSA. So I would suppose that item D if we were to enforce it, the entity who is supposed to do this evaluation would be a WTSA meeting. And as we seen in this conference already and some other colleagues already mentioned, we have had proposals for suppression of some Resolutions and we had proposals to modify the same Resolution. And the outcome was to maintain Resolution and change it. So there you have a decision on whether to suppress it or not. Some regions thought the work was complete and other regions didn't agree. So the outcome basically was no, we will keep it and change it or not change it. So, of course, I can't see any other entity able to do this kind of evaluation that's not a WTSA meeting.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Yes, we would like to support the CITELE AIP on this. As we were discussing in our preparatory meetings and we receive the director's document related to Resolutions and streamlining the Resolutions, we realized that this was a perfect place to put this text as others have mentioned. We have had suppression of Resolutions in this conference and we are -- others have decided to maintain them. We really believe that we should start to clean up our Resolutions in the T sector. And get rid of the ones that are not relevant anymore. So we strongly support maintaining this text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United States. Our last two speakers Mexico and the United Arab Emirates. Mexico, please.

>> MEXICO: Thank you very much Chair. For us it is very important to maintain this provision as to Resolution 1 with a view to guarantee efficiency in the development of the work and activities of ITU-T. It is clear that it has already been mentioned the report of implementation of each of

the Resolutions will help us to take decisions in the Assembly and it is something that we do and we think that we should really include it here. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Mexico. The last speaker United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When the distinguished Delegate from Brazil he mentioned that this is an ongoing practice. So if it is an ongoing practice, do we need to insert such text. So if it has already been ongoing and the WTSA is doing so. Do we need to include this text in this specific part. I have a proposal Mr. Chairman. I hope that this proposal will satisfy colleagues who are from CITEC on proposing specific text. I would -- the proposal is as follows: The actions proposed have been accomplished. The Resolution should be viewed as fulfilled and should be questioned -- should be questioned for suppression. So we use the same text in the previous parts. So if this proposal is acceptable then we can move forward. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United Arab Emirates. Actually my -- I may propose that this text with the new adding text by CITEC it is reflecting matter of fact in WTSA to considering suppression of some Resolution and I believe that Canada can work with United Arab Emirates and all interested parties to consider remassage of the text itself to get agreed text for all parties. Can you Canada work on that, please? Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair. I tend to agree with the suggestion from the Delegate from UAE because the language is consistent with the previous item, question question question question. So I wouldn't have any problem with the question to considering.

>> CHAIR: Sorry, Canada, please get to your point.

>> CANADA: I'm sorry. Not a problem. I was saying that I agree with the suggestion from the Delegate from UAE. So we will have a new item the word question question question and the last item D we have question and we still have consider. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Canada. United Arab Emirates, it is okay? United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. We tend to agree with the text. However if we could work out the English grammar portion of it, if principle we agree. But we would like to work out you the language a little bit. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Exactly what I proposed that we can agree on the principle of United Arab Emirates. Russian Federation you need the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Please not put square brackets because if you put square brackets you have to put square brackets on everything and we agree that some administrations will work on English but you do not need to have square brackets.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Russian Federation. Yes, I would like too

have square brackets. We will use the proposal by United Arab Emirates. But if any party would like to enhance the text please work with Canada and United Arab Emirates, United States to have a final text for this point. United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. While for us we really need a way to distinguish that this is still under consideration. So I am in your hands as to how you want to identify that. So I'm asking how are you -- how does a Delegation identify that this work is still under discussion? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United States. Saudi Arabia please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. I think that the modifications proposed for this text are on the whole acceptable. But I also have a proposal which could open up a path to a sort of review of this Resolution. Are we talking about using the term updating the Resolution or suppressing the previous Resolution? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

>> Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and English is not my mother tongue and I would be happy to work with the colleagues from Canada and United States to modify this text and also take on board the proposal from Saudi Arabia to include the word modified or modify and leave. So we will work together Mr. Chairman and hope we can come back to you with an agreed text. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United Arab Emirates. Last speaker Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. In order to respond to the question from the United States of America, I think that in all cases we should be consistent and therefore place all of the text in square brackets. And after the final version is discussed then most naturally we will place that text which will be found to be most appropriate and acceptable to all. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Actually I feel that the meeting has agreement on the proposed text but what in our hands now is fine-tuning, some massage for this text. Somehow I prefer not to have in square brackets for this point. But I would like all interested parties for this text to work with Canada and United Arab Emirates. Please do give us the final text for this point and I believe it will be an easy task for all of you to agree. So can we agree that there is in principle we agreed on the concept and just we need the final tuning fine-tuning of the text itself. So we can agree on this point in principle.

Now we can go to the next item. 1.5. Amendment and point B. Any comments for that? Can we approve the proposed amendments from the Arab States? Okay. We can -- United Arab Emirates, please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Of course, I am not taking the floor to oppose. It is an Arab group proposal. When this document was translated

from Arab to English it seems there is an English error here. I believe one of the ands should go because there are some TSAG reports submitted to the Assembly and Chairman of groups and the proposal. Perhaps a comma. Editorial modification. Thanks Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Editorial change and now I think it is approved. United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. Just a question. Are we saying that the Chairman of the Study Groups can make proposals to the WTSA because that's what the text will read because TSAG can make proposals to the WTSA. Now are we saying that the Chairman of ITU's T Study Groups can make proposals? Thank you. Clarification.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United States. United Arab Emirates can you give us clarification about this point?

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Yes. Thank you very much. Thanks to the United States for the question. We are adding the text to reflect the Assembly will review the reports of TSAG and the reports of the Chairman of the Study Groups. It is the case that all Chairmen of ITU Study Groups have sent reports. Some of them do contain proposals from the Study Group to the Assembly in order for the assembly to look at those sometimes amendments to the structure, proposals on the questions, future work within those Study Groups. So just to reflect that even Assembly looks at the reports from the Chairman of ITU-T Study Groups. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. I want to thank the Arab group for that explanation. For us as we read this text it read as if the ITU-T Chairman, via their reports can make proposals to the WTSA and we could not accept that text. So we think that the original text is clear. And that this text kind of muddies the waters for us and we prefer not to have this text for us.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United States for that. Any other comments from the room regarding this proposal? Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Perhaps we could change one word in the second line and this would satisfy the United States and resolve their problem. I will now be speaking in English. Instead of reports including proposals we may say the Plenary reports including suggestions.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation for your proposal. Can we accept the proposal from the Russian Federation on the text? United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. I really appreciate the suggestion by our Russian colleagues here but that still does not address our concerns. So we think that the original text is very clear. It identifies who can make proposals to the WTSA. Suggestion from our standpoint is a

quasi proposal and we would not want to see that suggestion made in this text. Thank you very much.

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

>> BRAZIL: Claire, just real quick, Brazil has no problem with what has been proposed on the reports by Chairman of ITU-T Study Groups. Actually this is a common practice. If you look at the meeting documents for this Assembly, documents 1 to 27 are reports from ITU-T Study Groups to the Assembly. And I suppose this is what the Arab group was mentioning when they proposed this text. At least if this is the case we would have no problem with what they are proposing. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So since there is no -- Bahrain, please.

>> BAHRAIN: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. As a possible way forward I note that the concerns seem to be about the paragraph being a very large run on sentence essentially. The paragraph actually talks about two sets of documents. First set of documents is those reports and proposals submitted by the Committee on the ITU-T work program and organization. Those documents are submitted on the basis of the second set of documents which is the TSAG reports the reports of Chairman and proposals of ITU Member States and sector members. So perhaps what we could do, if you give me a moment to find the text, in the third line after the word priorities, if we insert -- if we insert a full stop, and then the second sentence continues as follows: Such documents should be submitted and then it continues, on the basis of the TSAG reports and so on and so forth. So it clarifies that one of the inputs for consideration by the Committee on the ITU-T work program is the reports of the Chairmen of the ITU-T study groups which happens today and that may address the concerns that I have heard in this room.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the proposal. Can we agree on this text? United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. No, while that kind of clarifies the document -- the text a little bit it still does not address our concern because as we read this text the reports of Chairmen of ITU-T Study Groups it appears as if the Study Group Chairmen are submitting their reports to the WTSA and they are on par with Member State and sector member proposals. That is the issue for us. If we can take this offline and discuss it with the Arab group maybe we can find some text that is acceptable. We don't believe they can submit proposals directly to the WTSA.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Argentina.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. Now we are working on a document in English. The proposed -- the original proposal from the UAE in the Spanish version it is clear to us what is presented are the reports of the Chairs and the reports are reserved for the Member States and sector members. It seems to me that the concern is a problem of either

translation or drafting. But for us in the Spanish version we don't see any drawback because it is clear and the proposals are from member sectors and Member States. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Argentina for reflecting the main point of this item. There is no disagreement on the principle. But think the -- we need to fine-tuning the wording, using exact -- using good terms to representing this provision. So based on that I would like to put square brackets for this text for now and would like to invite United States with United Arab Emirates and all interested parties to try to consider a new text for this point and raise this for our next meeting. This is my proposal for this point.

Now we can go for the next item. Proposal from RCC. Any comments for that? Can we approve? Amendments? Okay. Approved.

Next point, any comments on this point? Any comments? Can we approve that? Approved.

Next point, Latin 4. Any comments for this point? Can we approve the text? Approved.

Next point, any comments? Can we approve this text? United States please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. It is not -- we are not opposing the text. Just clarification. Before it had decides and now it says recommend. So is the idea here is that Member States recommend to the WTSA, who is making the decision I guess. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United States. Russian Federation please for clarification.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: I should clarify the issue. The decision taken by the Plenary meeting of WTSA. In this case we are not talking about the Plenary session. But rather I should find the text myself. But we are talking about separate Committees. The Committees do not have the right to take a decisions. Only it is the Plenary session that has that authority. Thank you. So this is really just a formal minor change. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Russia. Is that fine for you United States? Can we approve the text? United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. Yes. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United States. Now any other comment? Okay. Approved. Next point. Any comments for this point? Can we approve that? Approved.

Next point, please. Seek proposal, can we approve that? United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Sorry to take you back to the previous text here. So is the idea behind this proposal to accept a proposal of the ITU Member State or recommendation of TSAG where they differ, are we saying that TSAG will trump a Member State proposal? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United States. Russian Federation could you

clarify us about that?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Under existing practices and the provisions of the Convention proposals are made by Member States. In the case of the standardization sector, TSAG also has the option of making proposals. However we would not want to forget about the Member States. Perhaps the language could be ameliorated but I have attempted to explain the idea behind this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Russian Federation. Is the clarifications fine?

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you. I think this is one that we -- it is not very clear to us. So perhaps I can work with our colleagues from Russia to get a better explanation and better text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United States. So we will put it now in brackets 'til informal discussion.

Next point, please. Can we approve this point? Any comments? Can we approve the point? Approved. Then next point, 1.6, proposal from Russia -- sorry, from RCC. Any comments in 1.6? Can we approve the text? Approved. Next point, 1.10.3. Editorial change depending on our discussion for section 2. We will keep it until we conclude our discussion for section 2. We go for the next point.

1.11.4. Any comments on that? Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. We have no objection in principle against this text. But the need for this text might vanish if a new section 2 is adopted. I'm not quite sure how to put that down. Adopted nominally conditionally. It is difficult to resolve this immediately. We can only review this after reviewing our proposals in section 2. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Russia. We will delay this point when we conclude our discussion on section 2. We go now for the next point. I think the same thing, same issue, the section 2 discussion. Based also on section 2. So we'll come back to those changes after our discussion on section 2. So go immediately to the note part.

We will have CITEC proposal. So we like to give a chance for CITEC to give us brief presentation of their changes for note 1. CITEC please, Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. The intent of this change is to provide low precise definition of a recommendation to add clarity to the comments. We have B recommendation, but the definition is not as precise. So we need to add extra information that obtain the note. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Canada for that. Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. We have a similar proposal for clarification of the definition of recommendations of ITU-T and they coincide to a certain degree with the proposals of the American regional group but even at the very beginning there are some

minor differences. In our proposal we state directly and clearly that ITU-T recommendations are standards. Not standard documentation but they are actually standards as in, for example, the constitution and the Convention. So this means that we need to review these proposals together. Our proposal can be found on page number, it is not coming up, just one moment. I'm looking for the number of the page. It is lower. Lower. So our section is 251. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Russia and I think the text my CITELE is linked to the proposal by Russia to have a new section for more definitions for many texts of the ITU-T and since we reached -- it is now 12:30 I propose to continue our discussion in our coming session tomorrow morning. We will have our meeting tomorrow morning at 9:30. So based on that Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to thank you all for your participation in this group. I would like -- I would like to invite all parties that will be participating in the informal discussion for the square brackets text to work together to get us an agreed text for our next meeting tomorrow. Thank you and see you tomorrow morning. Meeting adjourned. Thank you.

(Session concluded at 12:30 p.m. CEST)

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