

RAW COPY

ITU
WORLD TELECOMMUNICATION STANDARDIZATION ASSEMBLY PARALLEL
SESSION
COMMITTEE 3
TUNISIA
31 OCTOBER 2016
2:30-4 and 4:30-5:23 PM GMT+1

Services provided by:

Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-481-9835

* * * * *

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: In line with what the other sectors have done here and led resolution 80 stand on its own. So let me see if there's any comment to that proposal. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. We're ready to support this proposal, the RCC is ready to support this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: To be clear the suppression of resolution 71, okay. RCC is happy with that proposal. Any other comment to that proposal? Agree to suppress resolution 71. So I'm sure the director will be very happy with us. I think so far we will have suppressed at least three more resolutions than we've created. So I think that's very good progress as far as streamlining the resolutions as we have been instructed.

So while people are having the opportunity to make sure that they are able to access the update of the DT on resolution 22, another one we have ready for our action is resolution 67. So here we have DT51 for our consideration.

So this is a document that was prepared with informal consultation with the acting Chair of the SCV and the RCC. And I think all parties were satisfied with the text put forward. So this addresses, I think, the other independent proposals. And I'm seeing nodding from the Russian Federation, addresses the other proposals that were contained in their document taken on board. So I did want to have a discussion toward the end of this document there is some text that was called to our proposal that seems to have some inconsistency with Council decision. And considering that, I think the same ideas can be taken on board with a small adjustment to the text that came forward from the Acting Chairman of the SCV.

We're trying to find the update here. Sorry for the delay here. So, the issue that was called to our attention was that the Council decision has apparently authorized the translation of a thousand pages of AAP recommendations is it per year but within a particular period of time. I know that there are ideas under discussion to translate more pages in a different way through outsourcing or other means to reduce the costs per page, but the Council decision actually doesn't mention how much they are willing to spend on AAP translation. They are simply telling us how many pages to translate. So doubling the number of pages as far as something within the Director's authority would seem to be something that is challenging to do within the framework of WTSA. So, some draft text we had prepared would be to take the item here which includes in what the Director has been asked to do, and maybe we can simply -- so to shorten that or divide it into two pieces, to continue the practice of translating ITU-T recommendations under approved under the alternative approval process within the financial resources of the Union. And that's all we instruct the Director to do. And then under "invades the Council" to move the rest of it, would be to consider the possibility of doubling the recommendations of the financial resources of the Union. So I think that would cover it. So I think if Council is provided information about a different avenue for translation that provides -- is half the cost per page, that they can authorize twice as many pages. But the limit that council had provided was a number of pages and not a cost of translation, so unfortunately we don't seem to have that freedom.

Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. I'm not entirely certain that we should change what was agreed to in this manner. The issue is when at the Council this decision was taken, in 2012, this was, in fact, a change. In exchange for free access to recommendations. And as compensation. For the lack of recommendations in AAP format. All of this happened within the budget that was set for the sector, the T sector, standardization sector. So we are not proposing changing the budget of the T sector, which should, in fact, be approved by the Council. We are saying that the sum which was allocated for translation of these thousand pages in normal translation style using the corresponding translation tools -- services with the use of outsourcing could lead to significantly lower costs which would allow, under the very same amount of financial expenditure, to translate a greater number of pages. Therefore, we don't need to ask the council about this. In the framework of a new opportunity that there are, we're asking the sector to consider these possibilities, these new opportunities. We're not asking for an increase in the financial allocation for translation. But we believe that savings made on translation with the use of outsourcing and not sending shortened resources out to be translated is not right because first and foremost it's in the interest of Developing Countries. It's important for us to have the most important resolutions available in all languages, especially since 90 percent of those are IP recommendations. And the lack of translation, in fact, restricts the opportunities that there are for them to be widely used. Therefore I would propose that we use the draft which was agreed on by the administrations. Thank you.

>> CHAIR Thank you, Russia. I fully appreciate the importance of providing as much translation of text of sufficient quality as we can within the financial resources.

So the issue, according to the discussion, is that presumably there's a cost per page of translation. And the budget has a number of Swiss francs, but the council didn't tell us how many Swiss francs. They only told us the number of pages. So we don't know the cost per page. So they gave us an allocation of pages for translation. So within the membership, that would be the only information we've been provided.

Let me seek the advice of the former Chairman of the Council Working Group on Financial and Human Resources, perhaps to guide us whether we are in any trouble if we were to stick with the original text or if we need to divide the items as indicated here. Thank you.

>> Yes, Chairman, I would be inclined to keep the original text if we tried to anticipate specific numbers, I think we would find ourselves in difficulty.

As you know, the basis for establishing the biennium budget is the plan in Plenipotentiary Conference. Council next year will establish the second biennial budget based on that financial plan. So we have some general guidelines and decision 5 from the Plenipotentiary Conference with regard to translation, interpretation and reprography, but it's only a budget ceiling rather than a budget. So I think we should keep it fairly general. I think that would be my recommendation in any case, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. So if Dr. Gracie is not worried about this, I'm not worried, either. So in that case, I can certainly go with keeping with the original text.

I did want to try to address an issue that had been called to our concern. So if this is okay for participants, then we go with the text that was provided with the consultation between the acting Chairman of the SCV and the RCC.

So with that, let me invite any other comment on this proposed modification of Resolution 67 on languages. Any requests for the floor?

United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good afternoon, everyone. I'm just recalling what was said, and I'm wondering if this is correct, whether this resolution, since it has some financial language in there, should be funneled towards the Committee 2 at this assembly. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. We'll take that on board and send this to Committee 2 as well as to EdCom.

Are there any other comments on this document or suggestions for any changes? I see no requests for the floor so the modification is approved by Com3. We will send this to EdCom and to Committee 2. Thank you very much.

Okay. With that, I'd like to return to the item we were discussing this morning, which was the revision of Resolution 22. And so here we have now available the Document 65, DT 65, Revision 1.

So there were two items where we had some remaining square brackets. So as Saudi Arabia intervened this morning, they had another proposal as concerns the editors for the A series of recommendations. So if we can go first to that, which I think is toward the very -- toward the bottom of this document, let's review that first because I think how we resolve that will affect what we do with the square brackets further up.

We are not seeing the numbers across the left. But we had item No. 3 under instructs the director was the one that we moved this morning to provide information about any work item that has not given rise to any contribution. And then the next is the proposal of the Arab States to report the experience in implementation of the A series recommendations for consideration by ITU membership. And provide assistance, including to provide editors when it deems appropriate in the development process of ITU-T A-series recommendations. So can I have any comments on that proposal?

Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Good afternoon and thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me the floor. On behalf, considered the proposal from the Saudi Arabia, but we cannot accept the proposal put

forward. We still believe that editors should come from the membership and are not to be provided by the TSP. So we expect the new item 4 to be either removed from the text or to remain within square brackets. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> UNITED STATES: We have no perceived issues with having the membership do this in the past. It provides more transparency. And we believe that this part of the text should be removed and we should continue having the editors. Thank you.

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

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Chairman. We agree with Germany that the membership chose the rapporteur. But sometime when deem appropriate can provide help in some cases. So we think this is consistent with the Resolution 1 of WTSA and we would like to keep this in here and we would drop for the sake of compromise noting further up there if this will help. Thank you.

>> Just to clarify the process. So I think we need to make a distinction between the role that we referred to as editor per A.1 clause 2.3.3.3 and the publication editors who are part of the TSP staff who prepare the final text for publication and the cleaning up of that text and those publication editors if you will which is not a role we described in our A series actually will provide assistance before the process.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We hope that the TSP secretary can collect comments from the Member States and can be reflected in a fair and equitable manner. That is very important. We agree with the comment proposed by Saudi Arabia because it can improve the efficiency of our meeting and make our meeting more smooth. Thank you.

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

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. Just to indicate Canada supports the views expressed by Germany and the U.S. We don't see TSB providing anything support for the proposals put forward by the Member States.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Switzerland, please.

>> SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chairman. After having considered this proposal, we want to align ourselves with those who do not support it. It seems to us in particular that the part on editors is in fact something which the advisory group should be able to do, should be able to organise itself independently. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, Switzerland.

-- please.

>> Thank you, Chairman. I would like to associate myself with previous speakers who were opposed to the addition of this clause. In fact, it is not clear why the A series should benefit from different treatment from all the different series of recommendations. I would like to hear a classification of what justifies this difference here. Up to now, I haven't heard any clarification with regards to this difference. Thank you.

>> I have either the TSAG Chairman or the resolution ad hoc.

>> This time it's TSAG Chairman. I just wanted to comment on my understanding of the process without commenting on the proposal.

My understanding is that the rapporteur is responsible for the text. It's up to the rapporteur to decide whether or not to appoint an editor.

Now, the TSB's role, from what I understand, is to assist the rapporteur and the editor in the production of the ex the. But in all -- text.

But in all cases, it would be the rapporteur and the editor, which of course arise from the membership, to produce these texts. That is my understanding. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you very much, Chairman. In listening to the interventions that have just been made, we note that there is a problem arising with regard to the provision of editors. The same time when reading this text that has been introduced, it's clear that this text was written to include the words "when it seems appropriate."

So I propose that such situations might arise during the work of the TSB, so we don't see any great problem with the text proposed with it allowing us to have a request for editors when we don't have them we can request them from the TSB.

So on the whole, with regard to a neutral approach to this proposal, we would propose that this provision doesn't have a negative consequence, therefore we could even support it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well we are now at a stage where we come back or want to go away from a compromise that we have already made. And I would like to remind that we have already provided compromised solution to address the proposals from the Arab group which was included as invites 1 of the revised resolution. So I really wonder where we are. Going away from one compromise to the next compromise? Thank you.

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

Okay. Emirate, please.

>> UAE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, we support the position of Saudi Arabia, Mr. Chairman, on this specific point, and we were happy to discuss it outside the meeting and come back perhaps with a compromise back to you, Mr. Chairman if this is a way forward. We had proposal from our colleague from Russia, so we would consider that, as well, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And since there was a request for some time for consultation and given that after the conclusion of the Working Group 3 B meeting we do intend to reconvene as Com3, I'll suggest we take up the issue after that.

I think that -- and we see it in the bracketed text above, I think to report the experience and the implementation of the A-series recommendations is something that occurs in a couple of places. I suspect we can find easier agreement to that part of the proposal in the rest. So I wouldn't want to lose that.

In fact, during the discussions of A4, A5 and A6, we did have valuable input from TSB in their experience with these recommendations. But editor seems to be a little bit trickier. So I will allow, until that we reconvene for discussion, but then I'd like to take a decision.

So we can leave that, and we will re-visit it a little bit later in the afternoon. So I'm informed that there's now another document available that we can move to. So the drafting group on Resolution 70 concluded this morning, and DT93 is now currently available as the output of that drafting group. So if I can invite the convener Ms. Saks, to introduce this output for us.

>> ANDREA SAKS: If you could put the document up because I haven't quite got it up on my computer, thank you.

We met today there was a very successful drafting session that was done outside of our meeting the other day. And they came to many conclusions and had basically agreed on the text.

And we did the rest of it this morning in about 20 minutes. So we have complete agreement on this particular text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And if we can sort of scroll through it slowly enough so

people get an appreciation of what's here. So this is as some background combining the three proposals and I think drumming a little about it to eliminate some things that were redundant with the plenipotentiary text to produce something that was agreeable to all participants.

>> ANDREA SAKS: Thank you, Chairman. You did a better job of stating it.

>> CHAIR: Microphone, please.

>> ANDREA SAKS: Thank you. You did a much better job much representing it. I want to express that there were many people coming to support accessibility and there are many more members of the ITU who come to the WTSA for accessibility. And I think that the new work that has been added here, the new standards and technical papers that will assist writers are very important so if everyone would kind of take a look at those new documents to help you write accessible features within your standards, that would be absolutely magic. And thank everybody for their cooperation. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I think one other thing that was reflected here was the movement of the human factors question from Study Group 2. So that's been tidied up here in this text. So I think this text at this point is in good shape.

Are there any comments on this? Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. I do have a comment. There's something that I would like to add into taking into account as regards Resolution No. 57. This issue going to be debated within committee 3 B. There's going to be proposal to suppress this resolution, so I think it's important to take into account that point. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And let me look to the Working Group 3 B Chairman concerning the future of Resolution 57 which we haven't yet seen from your Committee.

>> Yes, thank you, Chairman. My understanding is that the consensus is to suppress Resolution 57 and to place its relevant provisions as part of Resolution 18. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So with would the appropriate adjustment of this text, then, be to replace Resolution 57 of Dubai with resolution 18 of -- would that be an appropriate modification here?

Dr. Gracie, please.

>> Yes, thank you, Chairman. It would read Rev Amament. Okay, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Any objection to that update? Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair, we align ourselves with Mr. Gracie. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any other comments on this text? And thank you for catching that.

I see no further requests for the floor, so we can take it, then, that Committee 3 agrees to the modification of Resolution 70 in the document we've just seen with the adjustment to the one reference on the resolution and we'll send that forward to the Editorial Committee.

Now do we also need to send this to Com2, I would think? I guess I'll ask the Convener for some clarity on that. Are there changes to the provisions of this resolution that should be examined by Com2 as far as the potential financial impact? Andrea, please?

>> ANDREA SAKS: Thank you, Chair. I don't think so at this particular time because Res 1 PP75 rev Buzan does clearly mention within financial constraints that takes within the entire ITU. So they have never ever put in resolution 70 anything to that degree, which I presume that would take precedence over the entire ITU. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the clarification. And that seems to be consistent with the view of my Councilor, so we will not, then, send this one to Committee 2, but only to Committee 5 for their further publication to send onward to the plenary.

Then we have the next item of business would be Recommendation A.12. And here we have four proposals. And I would group them because there seem to be three different subjects among the four proposals.

So the first proposal is for no change from Africa.

Then the next two we'll take as a group because they are both proposing slightly different modifications to the title of the D-series of recommendations.

And then the final proposal from CEPT is concerning identification of the approval process in the published recommendation. So we'll take them in those three basic groups.

So the first from Africa, the document is Document 42, Addendum 19. May I have a presentation of this proposal, please? Nobody from Africa? Oh, Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could you please postpone our discussion until somebody arrive to the meeting? Sorry for this.

>> CHAIR: Okay. I'll move to the next group of items on A.12. So we have two proposals, as I said, on modification of the title of the D-series. The first of these is from RCC. The document is 47, Addendum 24. May I have a presentation of that, please? Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. We would like to introduce the proposal from the RCC countries. And I would like to draw attention to the fact that our proposal has two components. As you know at the moment, A.12, Recommendation A.12, physically consists of three documents: The recommendation itself from 2008, and two corrections to it, which make amendments to the names of the L and the Y series.

In our proposal, we would like to unify all of this in one document so that we don't have various different additions or supplements. And these have not been noted in the document as corrections because it's already approved.

It's simply editorial work to unify the documents.

In the part of the direct proposal from RCC countries, it proposes that there be a change made to the name of the D-series with regard to the work of SG3 and the Q series, which mainly pertains to the work of SG11. You can see the direct proposal that we're making in the document itself. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. So I'll first ask if there's question for clarification then we'll look at a similar proposal and have a discussion. United States, please?

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And we thank the delegate from Russia for presenting his document.

In regards to 2 D, the results of the discussion today in Committee 4 has a tariff back in the title of the Study Group. And I'm wondering if we would need to re-undelete the word tariff here and bring it back. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. There was a discussion in our Committee 4 this morning where I was present on the title of Study Group 3. It was for about an hour just on the title. And there was a compromise. The compromise did not include the word "strategic" or "regulatory" and in particular there was an emphasis that it was not regulatory.

But if I can recall precisely, tariff and accounting issues in relation to international telecommunications and associated economic and (something) issues would need to check. But what is proposed there is in complete contradiction which was agreed this morning. And indeed at the moment -- and it's been going on for nearly an hour and a half is a discussion on Study Group 3's role. So we cannot agree with these here. They are in direct -- D-series in direct

contradiction to Study Group 3's role. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UK. Russia, please?

>> RUSSIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I'd like to thank my colleagues who made these comments. I would like to point out that I am introducing a regional contribution from the RCC countries, and today Com4 some amendments were made. And I do agree that there is a need to bring the naming of the D-series in line with these modifications that are being made. The only point which I would like to touch on as far as I understood from the discussions and it's possible that colleagues may wish to correct me on this, the agreed name of the Study Group may be corrected as its mandate is reviewed. And if so, we need to take the text from the document of Com4 and make the corresponding modifications here. Or we can do that based on the outcome of the discussions of the mandate of Study Group 3. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Germany, please?

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That is also our point. Discussions are still going on there. It has not been finalised. And when we once have the short text for the Study Group as such in the heading and clearly defined the mandate, then of course it is time to change here the text accordingly. So from our perspective for the time being, of course, we can use what was this morning as a working assumption from my perspective agreed, but all that has to be in brackets until the discussion of the mandate as such has been finalised. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Emirates. Please.

>> UAE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We support our colleagues from Germany. This discussion is still ongoing. And once the discussions are finalised, perhaps we can come back.

Mr. Chairman, with regards to the proposal from the Arab group, it's also on the same topic, so if we keep this in Section 2 or recommendations in brackets until this specific, on the mandate, title and mandate of Study Group 3 is concluded. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And if I might offer, we did have some discussion of this in our management team meeting at lunchtime today, some discussion with the Com4 Chairman and in deed we did hear reports of the length of the discussion to arrive at a title with discussions still ongoing for the mandate of Study Group 3 and the questions of Study Group 3. But as far as concerning the title of the series of recommendations just for your consideration, it seems like we're one step even removed from that because once Study Group 3 receives its title and mandate and questions from this assembly, Study Group 3 will then go agree on initiation of various work items. And as Study Group 3 completes those work items and we see the scope much those work items, it would seem like that's when we know there will be new recommendations in the D-series that require a new title or a broader title of the scope. And we have done this, as you know, several times in TSAG. It tends to be easy once you see what the scope of the actual work that gets done is.

So I think that this assembly, through Com4 will reach an agreement about the mandate and the title of Study Group 3. But the work to be actually carried out will be something that happens later once Study Group 3 receives that mandate and starts actually developing recommendations. So that's food for thought. Whether this is something we could defer until we see a request from Study Group 3 in particular to cover the scope of the work they actually decide to do and the work items they create.

Of course, it will be up to you, Ladies and Gentlemen. We did have that discussion at lunchtime. Emirates, please.

>> UAE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your proposal. I conclude from your proposal

that you would prefer to defray this discussion to TSAG since TSAG also can amend the D-series recommendations. However, resolution 2 will have, once approved, you're going to have -- we're going to know exactly the mandate of Study Group 3, therefore we prefer to keep this text in brackets until perhaps the discussions on Study Group 3 specifically on Resolution 2 and the title of Study Group 3 is finalised and then we come back to this, rather than defraying the discussions to TSAG. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We can consider that. But final Committee 4 has many issues and I suspect that we may conclude before they do. So it may be more difficult to take that into account.

So let's set this aside for now. Let's have an introduction of the second proposal concerning the titles of the series of recommendations so we're clear on it.

So the next one is from the Arab states, 43, addendum 13.

I see a request for the floor from Russia before we move to introduction of that next document.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you very much, Chairman. I'm sorry to return back to the previous topic, but we would like to support our colleagues from the UAE. We believe that if there is approval of the name and mandate of SG3, even at the plenary meeting, then we can amend our recommendation. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. So, let me request -- and we can't act on this because the discussions in Com4 are complete. But let's have a conversation so we will understand the proposal of the next document, which is -- addendum 3 from the Arab states.

Emirates, please.

>> UAE: Thank you very much, Chair. I have the pleasure on behalf of the Arab states administrations to present this document 43 addendum 13.

Chair, the modification proposed by the Arab states administrations is with regards to the suppression of the previous text and to add the following text, which is "economic, regulatory and policy issues for telecommunications and ICTs, including tariff and accounting principles which can be found in D."

So this is the proposal put forward by the Arab states administrations. It is quite similar in terms of content to that of the RCC region. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Emirates. Any questions or clarification on this proposal?

Okay. So as was observed, we can't take action now until Committee 4 completes its work. So there is a nonoverlapping proposal from CEPT that document is 45, addendum 5. May I have a presentation of that, please? Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I'm going to propose addendum 5 to document 45, which is the European proposal. And the proposal is to -- recommendation A.12 in order to increase clarity. This regards to the layout of ITU-T recommendations.

It's obvious that all recommendations as such have the same status. However, those recommendations having regulatory or policy implications and are therefore of particular importance for Member States when taking respective decisions.

Nevertheless, the big majority of ITU-T recommendations is mainly targeted to industry and operators in order to promote international telecommunications.

Users and implementers of ITU-T deliverables in particular recommendations who may not be familiar with all the specific details of the particular Working Group procedures applied may have, however, difficulties in probably estimating a deliverables nature.

Having this in mind, we think a clear indication of the approval process applied should be given in every ITU-T recommendation in order to avoid any potential confusion and thus fostering the meaningful and widespread application of high quality ITU-T recommendations.

So, we have already our proposal there on the screen. It is just, in fact, an addition of Clause 2 of recommendation A.12.

Of course, we think that in addition some further work from TSAG might be necessary, but for this meeting here, we'll just be okay to say let's add that. And that is the core issue of our proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. Are there any questions or comments to this proposal? Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Canada would like to express support to this proposal. We find it very useful to have the information that this proposal is providing or suggesting.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Emirates, please.

>> UAE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We thank Germany or CEPT for their proposal. However, we believe that the approval process is something internal to determine how the recommendation will be approved by AAP or TAP. Plus we don't want to have a higher -- we don't want to differentiate between the two recommendations. If we say the TAP will have a higher -- will be higher than the TAP recommendations, you will have serious difficulties. Therefore, our preference is to keep the text as is. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Emirates. I would remind all delegates that while it's not printed in the recommendation, this is information that is available certainly during the time that a recommendation is in the approval process, every Study Group web page has a link for recommendations currently under AAP and recommendations currently under TAP. In addition, the work programme database you can query for approved work items. And you can find from those records the approval process that was used. So it's certainly something more that members are more aware of than nonmembers, but we don't keep it a secret. One can find out this information from the work programme database.

Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We're ready to present the African common proposal if you allow us.

>> CHAIR: May I have a sort of wrap up a bit of the discussion, see if there are anymore comments with respect to the proposal on identification of the approval process? And then we can hear the Africa proposal, thank you. Any other comments to this one? Germany, please?

>> GERMANY: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, I have carefully listened to the comments from our colleague from the Arab Emirate. I think there might be some misunderstanding with regard to our proposal. It is not in any case to have higher status for TAP or AAP because everybody knows that this approval process at the end do not make a difference with regard to the legal status. It is only to give and not somewhere hidden in the database a clear indication to the user that a recommendation has policy and maybe regulatory indications. And that is quite obvious without looking in any database. And we would appreciate very much in the interest of the users and it is in particular our industry who puts always this question ahead that we can just make this short decision, maybe an additional clarification in our proposal behind the word approval process saying; i.e., TAP or AAP would make it quite clear that we only want that specific thing and nothing else. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany. Any other comments to this proposal? Okay. We can then have an introduction of the next proposal, which is the proposal from Africa. So Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm now presenting the proposal from Africa on the position regarding the change of the recommendations A.12, A.1 and A.13. Africa proposes no change for the three recommendations for the following reasons: For the recommendation A.1, we, the Africa Member States, are of the view that the A.1 recommendation has reached a very stable state during the previous assemblies and hence should not be prone to further revisions.

>> CHAIR: Excuse me, Egypt. Could confine your presentation to only A.12 which is what we are discussing here.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. With regard to the A.12. We are also proposing change, in particular tagging the with the approval process TAP or AAP. Any recommendation will have the same legal status. And accordingly, it is in the views of the Africa Member States that that could potentially lead to more confusion to the implementers.

And the ITU should target to promote its recommendations to the furthest extent possible to assure the global spread and the prevalence of these recommendations. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Are there any questions to this proposal? Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, we tried to arrange some informal consultation with the spokesperson here for the African Group. We have not had -- received a response up to now. So we have still some confidence that we come up with something that is acceptable. But there is some more discussion, I think, between Mr. Rahmed necessary. I do not know whether Egypt wants to confirm that or whether I'm totally wrong. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Well, Egypt, of course, confirms that we had informal discussions with our dear Distinguished Delegate from Germany. We have still some holding issues that we need also to discuss. But in here, it was requested to present formally the original proposal of the African common proposal, so we have presented the proposal so far. And we are still engaging in discussions with the proponent from Germany, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Emirates, please.

>> UAE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, there are going to be informal consultations with regards to the European proposal, we would be happy also to join these discussions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So if I could invite the interested parties to consult perhaps over the short break people will have for stretching between the time we turn the floor over from Com3 to Working Group 3 B for the conclusion of their work. So I'll try to leave about 10 minutes' time for that.

In any case, we will have two issues to consider. One of them will be this issue about whether there is any agreement or consensus concerning the proposal of identifying the process used in the identification and the other which we would need to have clarity on the outcome of Com4 to see if it's appropriate to update the title of any of the series of recommendations. And that's something that presumably comes very late in the assembly.

So we will not complete the work on A.12 today. So I'll set that aside for now.

So perhaps before we take that short stretching break, I refer to we can have introduction of the proposals related to A.13. So one of those is the next proposal in the same document we

just had open, which is no change proposal from Africa for A.13. So I presume it's still Egypt to present this proposal.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We propose no change for A.13. And we have noticed that contribution document 46 addendum 20 to this assembly from the Member States of CTEL regarding the A.13 it contains big changes to the existing clauses trying to specify working methods with the aim to improve efficiency for the benefit of all members. However, sole examination of the proposal feels that eventually they are not supportive to encouraging the implementation of these documents, either supplement reports, et cetera. By always and bluntly minding that these do not contain any mandatory provisions and do not form an integral part of any ITU-T recommendations which is providing a negative sign to end user where ITU-T is striving that recommendations be implemented. Already recommendations are voluntary and are not fully adhered to. So such signs in other texts will greatly -- the status of nonnormative ITU-T-- so this will not help members.

Additionally in document addendum 20 add to start the, would item including many interpretations ambiguities that can pass or stop any work item. This would also not be helpful to the members.

In conclusion, while it appears attractive to organ/or streamline the working methods, the way that it is being proposed in Document 46 addendum 20 is not conducive at all to the work of the ITU-T. Accordingly, the Africa Member States' common proposal is no change to Recommendation A.1. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Soh I think we will try to see if we can get quickly through the introduction of these three proposals and then allow some time for offline consultation as we move from Committee 3 to Working Group 3 B.

So the next proposal is the friendly Arab states, if's 43, addendum 30. Emirates, please.

>> UAE: Thank you, Chairman. I'm very pleased to present to you this document on behalf of the Arab countries. This is addendum 30 to document 43.

As we have very little time, Mr. Chairman, this proposal by the Arab countries is no change to keep the text of the recommendation as is. We would like to keep A.13 as is without introducing any amendment in A.13. The Arab group thinks that if there is any amendment or addition to the text of the recommendation, A.13, it would be more suitable to discuss it in the consultive group, TSAG.

As far as the reasons why we are asking for no change on this recommendation, as we have explained before, this was explained by the African Group. Thank you, sir. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I see an intervention from Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Japan also would like to propose to discuss it in TSAG because my experience as Study Group Chairman, non-normative documents are very different from technical papers, supplement and editorial comment in implementive guide. So it would be better to ask the opinion of the real engineers of the Study Groups and discuss it, rather, in TSAG. And if it is necessary, of course we can change it. But it should be discussed in TSAG. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan. And then if we can have an introduction of the final proposal and then everyone will be aware what the proposals are and we could have some offline discussion and come back and discuss and take a decision.

So this is IAP 46 addendum 20. United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. The United States is pleased to introduce this inter-American proposal on behalf of CTEL. This document proposes edits to

recommendation A.13 with the goal of making the procedures and documents of the sector clearer. The sector's complex working methods might be clear to the experts here in this room, but not all Study Group participants have your expertise. And counter to some of the portrayals you may have heard, our proposal notes the importance and the value of non-normative documents of various types, including supplements and technical reports, and our goal is not to impede their use but, rather, to streamline it and make them easier to use.

During Study Group meetings, there are oftentimes where the work would be well suited for one of these documents types but the sectors documentation much how to achieve that isn't very clear and, frankly, it's not very complete. And so our goal was simply to make this clearer so that the work can go forward, not to be stopped but to go forward. The simple goal is to provide a how-to guide for how to do this. And that how-to guide can mean that representatives of all countries and people of all experience levels can participate easily in the work of the sector and that the sector can be more welcoming to newcomers from all countries.

The note that was mentioned on mandatory provisions was something that was actually discussed at TSAG three years ago with actually a positive response at that time. And that portion of our proposal simply has the goal of operationalising a discussion and an agreement that was made at that time.

We also propose a template by which the initiation of these work items, the ones that result in non-normative documents can be noted. And again is goal is to get a little about it more clarity to help everyone understand the type of work that's being launched. We actually hope, counter to what you may have heard, that this will allow more new work items of these types to be launched more smoothly. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Any questions or clarification on this document? Yeah, I would simply add for perspective of Study Group 15 Chairman that we use this sort of thing even for non-normative documents and the advantage is that people know we're working on them and know that they can come contribute to them, so they're not under radar, if you will. They're evident in the work programme database just as the recommendations we are working on.

Russia, please?

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair. I'd like to thank our colleague from the United States for her work.

Now with regards to -- we have the feeling that this proposal doesn't really give us a very clear enough idea of the situation. For example, we asked TSAG to undertake consultations of item 2 and take consultations with -- director. This might slow down our work. We feel that we need to follow the discussions on this point.

And consequently, we would therefore prefer to not modify the current recommendation in this assembly, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So I propose that we don't take a decision on A.13 in this session because we don't have enough time to conclude the discussion. But it does provide an opportunity, while people are stretching between Com3 and Working Group 3 B to have some discussions and maybe reach some common understandings on these issues.

So with that, Ladies and Gentlemen, we'll conclude Com3 for the moment, and we will turn the floor over to Dr. Gracie to begin in I think 7 minutes' time with committee 3 B to conclude his work. And then as we announced earlier, the intention would be after Dr. Gracie is complete, he's assured me no more than 20 minutes (laughing), we'll return and see how much more work we can get through if Committee 3 because obviously we have other important

documents coming to us from both Working Group 3A and 3B.

So I see two other requests for the floor, so it's going to be fewer than 7 minutes, sorry about that. Argentina and then Emirates.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. And I'm sorry that we're taking time out of the break. But we had had various side events at the same time and would like to know what point we're going to look at Resolution 71, which we thought going to be addressing this afternoon because there still had to be presented once again because there was a mistake in the English version of this draft resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We had returned to 71 for a discussion after the discussion of Resolution 80. And at least what we had recorded in our notes up here was that the feeling was that Resolution 80 could stand on its own and we could follow the lead of the other sectors in suppressing this as it was covered, the terms of participation of academia was covered under Resolution 169 of the plenipotentiary. So I think my notes and my Secretariat's notes in that regard were consistent. So I think that was a decision we took.

So Emirates and then Argentina again.

>> UAE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With regards to Recommendation A.13 and the amendments proposed by the CTEL group, well, I have doubts, Mr. Chairman, that during the coffee break or informal consultation will help. If you would like us to proceed with modifications proposed in that specific document, we would need a group meeting because there are many amendments on this specific recommendation. But of course our position is no change. But I don't think informal consultation discussion in the coffee break will help, my point of view. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. I'm sorry for taking the floor once again. But we had understood that we were in consultation with regards to the two proposals with regards to Resolution 71 and this would not be included in Resolution 80. Therefore we'd like to address this you separately. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. I will open the floor for discussion of that after we have reconvened as Committee 3 after the time of Working Group 3B is complete. So we'll at least understand the circumstances regarding that document.

So in 4 minutes from now, Mr. Gracie will take over here and conclude his work in Working Group 3B.

[WG3B meeting held and Committee 3 began again here:]

>> CHAIR: Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen, for the continuation of Committee 3. We have been consulting on how to proceed and how best to spend our time. So for those of you -- and I think it's really the same people in the room who were just here for Working Group 3B while we haven't put that onto our agenda, I would ask if there would be any objections to proceeding with three of the decisions from Working Group 3b and take advantage of the opportunity to get text sent forward to EdCom. So of the documents that were available in 3b, which they approved to send to Committee 3 with no change, there was the modifications of Resolutions 7 and 18 and the resolution of 57. 11 was waiting for confirmation from Emirates and 45 we need to pose a revised document because there were some edits.

So would there be any objection, Ladies and Gentlemen, if we proceeded with those three documents and took a decision so we are able to get some text more quickly in the hands of

EdCom? So I see no requests for the floor, so let's proceed, then.

So let's proceed, then, so there are plenty of things to keep us busy and let's keep the pipeline going. So DT-- was the modification of resolution 7. So can I have any comment to that document? And can we approve this for sending forward EdCom in the plenary. I see no requests for the floor, so that's agreed. The next is 18. The document we have is dt88 which I think essentially everybody was in the room at the time we did Working Group 3b so this is the resolution of 18. Can we agree to this text to send forward to EdCom in the plenary? It says sector member United States.

>> UNITED STATES: I'm really sorry to bring us on really what I would hope to be viewed as an editorial item. There was a small typographical error. I don't have the text open at the moment. The one place it talked about members. It's the place where members is misspelled, which I think actually was intended to be Member States. If you do an M-e-m-e-b search, you will find the place I am concerned. It's in the resolveds, I believe? Resolveds 5? 1. Resolveds 1. This is why we need radios. So I believe the intention while we were discussing that was to be Member States, but we should verify that with the group. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. So the proposal, then, would be to replace the misspelled word member with Member States. So I'll give a moment for people to consider that and see if everyone agrees that that was the intention. Orange, please?

>> Thank you, Chair. I'm sorry, but the colors on the screen are really not visible. It's not really accessible for us to view clearly on the screen, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I can see what's on the monitor in front of me but not what's on the screen behind me. So maybe if we could just take that Resolveds 1 and make the text bigger just for viewing purposes. So this would be distribution among ITU-T, ITU-R and ITU-D for approval by Member States in accordance with the procedures laid down for the approval of new and/or revised questions. I see nodding head. Any other comments to this proposed correction?

Okay. So with that correction taking the misspelled word member and replacing with Member States in Resolveds 1, can I have your agreement to the approval by Com3 of modification to resolution 18 to send forward to EdCom in the plenary?

I see no requests for the floor, so that's agreed. Thank you very much.

And then the final decision I think is ready without an additional document coming from Working Group 3b is proposal from Working Group coming from 3b suppressing this agreement. Do I have the agreement of suppression of 67 by Committee 3?

I see no requests for the floor, so that's agreed.

So the pending business that we had from earlier were Resolution 22, which required some additional consultations. I think we are not going to take all the way until 5:30 with that, with our business of Committee 3, and so I would propose to continue those consultations in this room with the interested parties immediately after the conclusion of Committee 3. I would like way forward, if we can, for when Committee 3 begins tomorrow, and that will be as soon as Committee 2 finishes its work.

So speaking of Committee 2, we did have some requests from the TSB that in spite of our assessment, resolution 70 likely did not have financial implications, it was requested to nevertheless allow Committee 2 the opportunity to look at this and verify that they agree with that assessment. So with your agreement, we will send resolution 70 to committee 2 for them.

We have some titles of recommendation series and that was pending completion of

Committee 4. Considerations and we felt we couldn't take action before that work was complete. So this is something that we will see if the information is available to make a decision tomorrow afternoon. So resolution 22 I hope we can complete the consultations and take tomorrow morning A.12 as I said tomorrow afternoon we'll check the status of committee 4. The other item with respect to A.12 was subject to some completed. Germany, please.

>> GERMANY Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. With regard to the consultations on A.12 these are ongoing and we hope that we can come up tomorrow for your final meeting with some outcome.

I have also understood that consultations on Resolution 22 you expect to have after your meeting? Or thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes. That was my proposal. And if those don't conclude satisfactorily we can arrange a room for early morning tomorrow before the Com2 meeting. So if it concludes this afternoon, then we don't need that time; but otherwise we'll find a room. Let's try first immediately after this session because we don't have too many other items. So another item that was pending was A.13. So I'll explore quickly a possibility to maybe conclude on that.

And then the other item of business I have is presentation for the proposed new resolution AFCP1. So I think that's all that's on the agenda.

[Silence.]

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Argentina, please?

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. And I'm sorry that I'm really persisting on the issue because it's really confusing for us to follow the agenda. We wanted to know when we will address Resolution 71, please, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And that was additional information that I had. So the legal adviser informs us that we're not able to go back on a decision because a delegation was not in the room. So several of the delegations who had been involved in some discussions regarding 71 were here. Several other CTEL members were in the room at the time that we took this decision. And the legal adviser informs us that we should not go back. This can be raised again at the plenary. So I think that is the only recourse available.

Of course, we hope that that's not necessary. But I think for the handling of the conference, I'm sorry, Argentina, but at least the guidance we've received is that we shouldn't touch Resolution 71 again after we've taken the decision because we put the work of all committees at risk if the committees have to re-visit things because of delegations that weren't in the room.

Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. As you have said, the proposal is not from Argentina but from our region, from CTEL. And members that were here in the room in the morning on the one hand looked at resolution 18 and later we would come back to address resolution 71. And unfortunately, those who were in the room didn't understand that the resolution, decision had been taken resolution 71. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Argentina, I think for those that were in the room that we took the discussion, it was only a few minutes after resolution 8 Study Group but I think those who were in the room at the time we had the discussion and took the decision were clear on the decision that we took.

So I'm sorry for any delegation who wasn't in the room at the time, but I'm informed that once Committee 3 takes a decision, we shouldn't go back because of delegations who were not present in the room at the time the decision was taken. I understand it's a regional proposal and

I'm sorry for the misunderstanding, but I think the advice from the legal adviser is clear on that point. So the two other items much business that I think we can conduct prior to turning it over to the consultations on resolution 22, I wanted to see if we could conclude on A.13. So we have a proposal for modifications which if I can summarize at a very high level are to extend A.13 to other types of non-normative documents besides supplements and then some more details to follow, procedures with respect to the work programme that are more similar to what we do for recommendations. We also have two proposals for no change. And while I personally am sympathetic to some of what I see the proposal, this in fact mirrors a lot of what we do in at least one of the Study Groups in terms of tracking our non-normative documents in the work programme. It would seem from the discussion that the chances are slim to reach an agreement in this meeting on applying some of these procedures to non-normative texts. So my proposal would be to invite TSAG to continue the discussions of procedures for handling non-normative text and for the approval of recommendation A.13. I would invite people to indicate if they believe that if they think there's a promising avenue forward in this meeting to revision of recommendation A.13. But from my assessment of the earlier conversations, it seemed that the chance of a successful conclusion to that discussion were not promising. So if you concurred with my observation of those discussions and we could handle it in that way to invite TSAG to proceed with the improvement much procedures for the handling of non-normative text and the improvement of a.13 if we could handle in that way, let me put that forward to you.

United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And since we are the ones who introduced modifications to a.13, we agree with your way forward and we'll come to TSAG and reintroduce the document and those changes, thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you very much, United States. Orange, please.

>> Thank you, Chairman. As a compromise, I can also associate myself with your proposal, but I would like for us to request TSAG to consider this issue urgently. There was a proposal from Orange at TSAG previously. And this proposal was not handled at all. So we had to put it off to the next meeting. But there's a need to address this issue as a priority. Delegations have had months to consider proposals. There were proposals from the U.S. and from Orange at the previous TSAG.

The WTSA, we thought, could take every decision we wished. Now we have to wait for the next TSAG for decisions to be made. And there's an issue here because we would be applying the same principles. So we would like to insist that TSAG ought to treat this issue as a matter of priority. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Orange. And we will try to craft something suitable to put in the report to convey the urgency of the issue.

Yes, WTSA can do any of these things where we have consensus to do so.

Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Although we agree with your point to forward this to the TSAG for further discussions, we are proposing that the report show that there are two proposals come from the Africa region and from the Arab region for no changes. So this could be considered at TSAG that two regions were proposing no change. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. But indeed that's part of why we decide in this meeting for no change. That doesn't mean that we won't ever update A.13 or whether A.13 is really the right document to cover other non-normative texts, but I think there's clearly also a desire to have some clearer procedures for how we produce non-normative texts. And that's

because this seemed to be too detailed a proposal to comprehend or to adopt in this meeting doesn't mean we have no need to improve procedures for non-normative texts. So I think I can certainly reflect both points of view. We weren't anything to do anything in this meeting, there was no agreement to do anything in this meeting and no change is our decision for A.13. But we will invite TSAG to continue the discussions and continue the work and to develop procedures as appropriate.

Okay. So hopefully we can conclude that. So we have one other proposal on our agenda for today where we've got documentation available. In fact it's one that we haven't discussed yet. So this is the proposal for new resolution AFCP1. So this is from the Africa region. So can I have an introduction of this proposal, please?

>> CÔTE D'IVOIRE: Thank you, Chairman. The proposal from the African Telecommunication Union administrations, that's in Document 42, addendum 1, is going to be introduced by Côte d'Ivoire. It will be to evaluate the resolution. In this, we note that the assembly adopt resolutions which contain numerous instructions for TSAG or TSB. And there are also invitations to Member States and to members. And this means that the Director usually has an awareness of the level of implementation of the resolutions by all stakeholders. We also believe that the fact that WTSA resolutions be -- should be recognized and applied by all should favor the development of telecommunications and could contribute to reducing the digital divide while taking into account the concerns of Developing Countries. Therefore what we're proposing is that this resolution be adopted to evaluate or assess the WTSA resolutions by all stakeholders who I just cited. So Member States, Sector Members, associates. And this with the support of TSAG and the collaboration of the Directors of the three different bureaus. In order to do this, we would like to invite all Member States and certain members during priority meetings for the WTSA to provide assessment to the level of implementation of WTSA resolutions which were adopted previously in the previous period. We also request that proposals be formulated to improve the implementation of these resolutions. This resolution also instructs TSAG along with the director of the telecommunications standardizations bureau and in collaboration with directors of other bureaus to take the necessary steps to assess the implementation of the resolutions of WTSA. We also instruct TSAG to take account of the implementation of the resolutions WTSA and submit proposals for improvement TDs to the next WTSA. So that's what we are covering in this draft new resolution that comes from the Africa region, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Côte d'Ivoire. Is there any comments to this proposal? Italy, please.

>> JAPAN: Sorry. Japan pressed the button.

>> CHAIR: It was an Italian microphone but we understand it is Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I have question in 2, it starts with TSAG to take account. And how much, I don't know what's the actual action of TSAG expecting from this instruct? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Côte d'Ivoire for the proposal African proposal. I would like to make some aware that this new resolution describes work that has been carried out for at least the previous three study periods under the name of WTSA action plan. This is a document that is created under WTSA and updated and presented at each TSAG during their meeting of the study period. So all members can review and comment on the work carried out due to all the WTSA resolutions at

each TSAG meeting. So we do have the most recent one for the WTSA action plan that was presented to the final TSAG meeting of the study period which is TSAG TD 547 where you can find all those resolutions. And the final report of the action according to WTSA resolution is submitted to this WTSA as Document 35.

So, Mr. Chairman, it may not be -- not everybody will know or would know if this exists, but it already exists. So we believe that this resolution may not be needed because we've already had this process in place.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Are there other comments or questions?

So if I could ask Côte d'Ivoire to confirm whether the action described by the United States which you'll find the final action plan related to the resolutions in the opinion of WTSA 12 is something that this resolution is proposing to institutionalize? Or is this asking for a process that differs from what's been done in the last few cycles with the document that's been reviewed at every TSAG? Côte d'Ivoire, please.

>> Côte d'Ivoire: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think in the presentations that we did in the introduction, we mentioned that the TSAG did in fact take stock of the implementation of the resolutions. But the problem which we see is that we realized that the implementation of these resolutions by other stakeholders is not clearly defined in the account or assessment made by the Director of the TSB. So we have come up with this draft resolution which covers all of the stakeholders of the ITU-T, the ITU generally, Member States, Sector Members and Associates, too. So that they can also increase the level of implementation of these resolutions so that we can have a better idea of how these resolutions be implemented by all the stakeholders.

I think that it's also an issue of credibility in the ITU-T, the implementation of its resolutions which it takes during its WTSAs. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Côte d'Ivoire. Cameroon, please.

>> Cameroon: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. While supporting Côte d'Ivoire because it is from African countries, your second idea in that it is more to officialise, to make it seem clearly that this resolutions are evaluated is behind this idea. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So the proposal would be to have a resolution to institutionalize, then, the WTSA action plan along the lines it's been carried out in the past.

Canada, please?

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. It is somewhat difficult for me to accept high level solution to -- access because we already have work in progress as has been mentioned before. So maybe we can find another way to implement that work that this calls for. But not necessarily a resolution. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Russia, please?

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. We share the concerns which were voiced by African countries. Perhaps as a compromise we could try to include this in resolution 22 where we have a review progress and implementation of ITU-T work programme. And so on and give rights TSAG and draw attention TSAG. To carry out such an assessment which the African countries mentioned. Perhaps that's a way we could find a compromise here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And indeed resolution 22 is still open because of a different point. So that might be an interesting option to explore forward that could presumably include something inviting or instructing the Director and to invite TSAG to do this sort of review that it does on a regular basis. I thought we may actually already have something in Resolution 22 on that, but we can double-check. Are there other views? Côte d'Ivoire, please.

>> Côte d'Ivoire: Thank you, Chairman. I think that it is a question of a resolution which is important for the Africa region. We believe that the resolutions which are adopted during the assembly are quite important, and they allow us to make progress in the implementation of rollout of telecommunications in our various regions. We believe the assessment of the implementation of these resolutions is very important, would allow us to go even further in the progress that you make in implementation. So we are in favor of keeping this resolution as we've proposed it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Are there any other views? Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman. I understand the concerns of the delegate from Côte d'Ivoire. The only or the main part which is relevant in any resolution is the resolveds. The rest of the preamble is just information. And the resolveds, as it was mentioned by Distinguished Delegate from Russia, could be incorporated in Resolution 22 to some extent if there is already no text that indicates that type of action. I would lean to say that that be perhaps the best solution. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So I hear proposals from Canada and from Russia to try to address this through something else put into Resolution 22. And we have the original proposal to address this through a new resolution.

I suggest that we try to consider this in the consultation we have upcoming on Resolution 22. And then come back to this and determine whether there was an ability to come up with a satisfactory resolution if we're able to address it through a Resolution 22, it keeps the Director happy not to have more resolutions. If we're not able to reach a satisfactory agreement there, we can take that up at our session in the morning.

So with respect to Resolution 22, what I had proposed is that we give this room over to some informal consultations. If we're able to conclude that before the Com1 meeting occurs in this meeting I believe at 6 p.m., we will do so. If we can't conclude it in that period of time, we'll find another room for the continuation of those discussions in the morning before the meeting of committee 2. So can I propose that as a way forward that we ask the informal consultations on Resolution 22 to consider whether the spirit of this proposal could be taken on board if there's an agreeable way to do that within the context of Resolution 22, we'll take that way forward. If we don't reach agreement to do that as part of Resolution 22, we'll consider this proposal as a stand-alone resolution when we reconvene in Committee 3 tomorrow morning.

I have your agreement to move forward in that way? Côte d'Ivoire, please?

>> Côte d'Ivoire: Thank you, Chairman. In the spirit of compromise, we can accept informal discussions as part of the discussion on Resolution 22. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you very much, for your compromise in this regard.

So I think at this point, we have reached everything, the conclusion of everything we have documentation for. Tomorrow -- while it seems we've completed almost anything and there aren't too many documents to consider, one of the things on our agenda for tomorrow is Resolution 1, which is of course very, very important. And we still need to test understanding on that.

We'll also have what should go fairly quickly, Resolution 45, when we get the revised document from Working Group 3 B. And let me look for advice on what else is still outstanding. And A.12, of course, which we'll look again toward the end of our business to see if Committee 4 has made sufficient progress to give us a way forward on A.12 along with the informal consultations on identifying the approval process.

[Silence.]

Okay. So I think we have a full tally. And I'll invite people to advise me if we've forgotten anything. So there's still consultations outstanding on Resolution 11 from Working Group 3 B, 45 we're looking for a revised document. We have Resolution 1, Resolution 22 which may or may not include AFCP1 proposal and A.12.

So let me inquire whether we've forgotten anything to put on our agenda for tomorrow? Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. Please do remind me, I'm sorry for the question, on Resolution 66, did we already make a decision not to touch it? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Resolution 66 we agreed no change. And we were going to put something in the report asking the Director to report to TSAG on the implementation of Resolution 66 because it seems like some of the reports published under the guise of technology watch didn't have that name so the activity wasn't visible. So we'll put something in the report asking the Director to report and then we can evaluate next time whether to keep it.

Any other items that we've forgotten? I don't want to reach the end of our time for Committee 3 tomorrow and find we're missing any resolutions because I'm sure Moktar would not be happy to find we have some unfinished business in Committee 3 that he needs to take up.

Okay I see nos can for the floor, so well then adjourn the session of Committee 3. Thank you to the interpreters. We can let you go for now. And we'll proceed immediately to some consultations on Resolution 22 in this room. And if those don't conclude in time, that we have to kick you out for Committee 1 meeting, we'll get a room for the morning to finalise those discussions. Thank you very much.

* * * * *

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.

* * * * *