

RAW FILE

WORLD TELECOMMUNICATION STANDARDIZATION ASSEMBLY
OCTOBER 31, 2016
0930 A.M. and 1100 A.M.
WORKING GROUP 3A AND COMMITTEE 3

Services provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
800-825-5234
www.captionfirst.com

This text is being provided in realtime format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning 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, and welcome to our WG3A meeting. Sorry for the delay for some technical problems, but we can now start our meeting.

According to our agenda, we will continue our business in Resolution 1, and before we start, I would like to draw to your attention that we still have 30 pages in Resolution 1, so we have very limited time to conclude our work, so please keep your interventions very brief, to the point, and, actually, I may propose to you that we can limit our intervention to three main points, agreement on a certain text; Number 2, we have some difficulty in had the wording, so we need fine-tuning; and Number 3, that there's disagreement and there's a problem of the principal of text itself, and I would like to mainly focus our discussion today for the issues with this agreement or there is a problem, so we can have some sort of discussion how we can way forward -- find a way forward for such revisions.

Also, I would like to draw to your attention some changes that we agreed in our last meetings which maybe have some inconsistency with rest of the text in Resolution 1, so we may consider that in conferee meeting so would can -- we may have some discussion on what we agreed on.

Now I would like to start our meeting with -- give the floor to Russian Federation to give us very brief presentation about the informal discussion about the new Section 2 consideration. Russian

Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman, and good morning, distinguished colleagues. At the outset, I'd like to say that I am talking not just the representative of the Russian Federation, but this morning as the moderator of our meeting on the informal coordination and discussion about Section 2.

And so, first of all, I'd like to thank each of the participants of the discussion for the spirit of compromise and constructive approaches demonstrated. We managed to reach agreement on almost all of the text. Just one issue remains open, and this concerns a number of items in the text inter alia, What we need to recall when we talk about achieving a consensus, so what goes down on paper.

This is a very important provision. It will concern not just Section 2, but there could be implications for subsequent sections also.

Consensus of Member States and Sector Members attending the meeting is the text that we should be using, or should we be saying consensus of the Study Group.

This is extremely important because in one of those cases we're talking about strict compliance with the Charter Convention and Resolution 19, and in the other case, if we simply say consensus of the Study Group, then that would mean that even invited experts could express their objections, and the document would not be adopted.

And another question, which prepares CITELE could answer for us, there is a proposal to preserve the existing text, the note below the definition of Recommendation, "and there was a preliminary opinion that CITELE may agree with this; however, it is vital that we conduct consultations at a CITELE meeting.

The RCC agreed to lift its objections with respect to the initial text, and so I would like to thank, once again, all the participants, and that concludes my report. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Alex, thank you, Russian Federation, for your report.

>> (Inaudible)

>> CHAIR: Thank you, convener, for the new Section 2.

Based on this text that we have for new Section 2, I would like to open the discussion now, and I propose to you that we can go forward to our document on Res. 1.

So in our last meeting, we will start from Item 4.4, and as I remember, there was some difficulty for some regions for the wording for 4.4, not in the principle but just fine-tuning. May I ask the chairman he may have a proposal for this point. Please.

>> Yes, thank you, Chairman, and good morning, everyone. Chairman, I'm speaking as the Chairman of the ad hoc on Resolution 22, are not necessarily as TSAG chairman, but in the discussion that we had on the text of the revision to Resolution 22, we had used the formulation in accordance with Resolution 35, full stop.

We did have an extensive discussion on the feasibility of including additional text, but it was felt by our last meeting that it would be sufficient to simply indicate, "in accordance with

Resolution 35", so I'm just reporting on the result of that discussion without any comment on the nature of the proposal put forward, so I give you that information for your further discussion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Doctor, for that, and my proposal for you for this new item under Section 4, that we can arrange a text to be online with Resolution 35 and to align our text with the discussion of the other resolution. Can we agree on that? Can we agree on that?

>> Thank you, Chair. Good morning, all. We agree with the text that indicates, according to Resolution 35, but I have a question, Mr. Chairman, what about the last sentence of that text in square brackets, the one that talks about regions are encouraged to propose consensus candidates for TSAG Vice Chairman?

>> CHAIR: I believe, CITELE, we can limit the text just to Resolution 35, can we agree on that?

>> (Inaudible)

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. So we can agree on the new item on 4.4.

Then we can go to our next item, proposal by the African -- proposal by APT and on the original text of 4.4. Any comments for APT proposal?

Just an editorial one, just reformatting the text of 4.4, the original text. Can we agree on that? Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN: Thank you, chairmen. I would like to ask once again the Secretariat, after we reach agreement on the text, to clarify the resolution, because here there are references to the old resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation, and good work on that, for sure.

>> (Off microphone)

>> CHAIR: Yes. Just want to read the reference for that.

The next point for -- for the African Common proposal, it's also on 4.4, but it's adding a complete new sentence, a new paragraph, TSAG chairman, please.

>> TSAG CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Chairman. At this time, I am speaking as TSAG chairman. I think we need to bear in mind that TSAG is an advisory body, first and foremost, so we advise the director. We do not inform him, we don't give him proposals. We simply act as an advisory body, so I think we need to bear that in mind in the review of any additional text that may be proposed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for this clarification. Any other comment regarding this add in 4.4?

>> Thank you, Chair. I am in agreement with what Mr. Gracie said, but moreover, it's also a question of the issues that were studied by the plenipotentiary, so I in agreement. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: My proposal for this point, we consider draw up drop proposal, can we agree on that, since this will be discussed in Council and in other meetings? Any comments? Okay. Can go forward.

Then a new -- the African Common Proposal at 4.7, and this point

regarding the submission of documents for the TSAG meeting, and I may ask the ITU legal advisor to give us some insights about this proposed amendment to 4.7 and its link to general rules. Antonio, could you please give us some insight about that?

>> ANTONIO: Give me a second to read it.

>> CHAIR: Okay.

>> ANTONIO: I think the point here is that the group should be reminded that under the General Rules, a Member State can submit a proposal, and if seconded by a Member proposal, it should be considered by the meeting. So these are the rules that actually apply to any meetings, including meetings in the T Sector and the TSAG, so one should pay careful attention here not to come up with a rule that might not be strictly in line with this.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, legal advisor, for this clarification, and with this clarification, Russian Federation, please, you would like the floor? Is it

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. I do not completely agree with this interpretation. The issue is that apart from the General Rules, there's also a special resolution from the Plenipotentiary Conference on the presentation of documents.

Moreover, in sectors, in T and in R, there are rules laid down in resolutions. I can't quite remember what is written for T, but for Sector R, it is written that contributions can be submitted no later than seven days before the beginning of a meeting, and, therefore, we must approach this issue in a comprehensive fashion for small Delegations, for example, for our own, which is very modest in size in TSAG, it is extremely difficult to analyze documents that have just been thrown upon us, and so we would support the African proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia, for that. Any comments for this proposal from African Group in line with the interpretation and clarification from the legal advisor?

Actually, I would like to draw attention that such situation for proposing new text on new document in the meeting, it could be up to the meeting to accept or reject this document, so we can give the flexibility for the Chairman and the management of the group to consider such documents. Can we agree of no change on 4.7 to align the text with the other procedures in ITU meetings? Can we agree on that?

Okay. No comments, so we agree to drop this proposal

Next item, 4.8. Any comments? Any views? Can we agree?
Thank you.

Now we can go to Section 5. And we have here a new -- a new item from USA for the duties of the directors. Any views at this point? Can we agree on the new 5.3? Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Mr. Chairman, from this sentence, we essentially agree with the proposal, but we would suggest deleting the words "technologically neutral." Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation. The with this proposal, can we agree on the text? USA, please.

>> USA: Thank you, Chairman. Can we -- for us, technologically neutral is basically what the ITU-T is supposed to be doing, and so we're not understanding why we would want to delete this phrase. We can we have more context, please? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, USA. Kindly, I would like to open the floor for more discussion about the point, kindly, because as we agreed, there is agreement on the principle, just fine-tuning of the words. I will give a proposal if you can agree on it. If we couldn't agree on that, we'll continue in formal consultation, so please, Russian Federation, asking for -- can you please (Off microphone)

Just my proposal, since we are talking now -- united Arab Federation, insisting to take the floor? Russian Federation, 30 seconds, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. We agree, and we invite the United States and the United Arab Emirates to conduct informal consultations because we also have additional comments on the end of this sentence where it says "conduct for international civil servants," but we'll do all of that offline. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation. So there is an informal offline discussion between the Russian Federation and USA to complete that task.

We request now go to next proposal from USA. Amendment on 5.4. Any comments on the USA proposal on 5.4? The last two lines is a new add for this item. Any comments? Can we agree on that? Okay. United Arab Emirates, please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was lost on the document of 5.4. This is a big section. What section are you referring to?

>> CHAIR: 5.4 from U.S., proposal from U.S., Contribution 48, Item 16.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Okay. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay. We can agree on that. Then we go for 5.6, the new one. Any comments on that? Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: In principle, we are in agreement. We have a number of questions about usage of the words "bottom up," but I think that we can clarify this at this stage. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. We'll consider this for more fine-tuning, fine-tuning of the words, yes, so Russia and U.S. will consider fine-tuning the text.

Last section of this proposal, 5.7. It is the same text that deleted from 5.4, so it's almost original text. Any comments on that? Any views? Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you very much, Chair. As regards 5.7, which is in 5.4, we prefer to integrate the old text with 5.7, so there's no need for any additional modification. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Can we agree to keep it within 5.4? Just moving it. Okay. Then we can go to the next point.

Amendment on 5.5, proposal from U.S. Any comments on that? Can we agree? Changing required (Inaudible)

Okay. Agreed.

Next point, 5.6, the APT proposal. Just merging 5.7 to 5.6. Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. In principle, we agree with this proposal; however, when we started to list what needs to be taken into consideration, we completely omitted the resolution of the Plenipotentiary Conference on the financial plan of the Union as a whole, and so on and so forth. Perhaps this could be resolved as we continue to work because we need to take into account the decisions of a senior body, but this would require an editorial adjustment. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation. So just fine-tuning again for the words. And also, we need to consider the proposal from U.S., just changing the word provide, communicate by provide. So we can consider this in the fine-tuning so they are linked together.

So 5.7, 5.6, needs a formal consultation to provide the full text for these two points. No problem in the principle, just fine-tuning.

Now we move to 5.9. Amendment from U.S. Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. I am somewhat surprised to see "active in in the sector," those four words added. This addition implies that we have passive groups. I would ask the United States to perhaps think about this a little while. Perhaps it would be better to delete these words which create what I hope is a false impression. Thank you.

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

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. I agree completely with the Russian Delegation in terms of the word "active." I think this has to be eliminated from the text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Can we agree to remove "active in if the sector," so to not give understanding that there is inactive groups in the sector or passive group in the sector? Any opinion, views? Can we agree? Okay. Agreed.

Now, 5.9. New text from African Group. It's addition for two lines. Can we agree on that? Okay. Thank you. Agreed.

5.10. We have two changes on 5.10 from APT and United States. I will take it one by one. AP. It's considered an editorial one, simple one. I think no difficulty on that. Any views?

United States proposed adding in the last of the provision this line, reflect expressed -- Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Perhaps this is not completely correct for a nonnative English speaker to make such a proposal, but nevertheless, I would suggest replacing "decision" with the word "consideration." Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. My proposal to keep 5.10 as it is, no change. Can we agree on that? United Arab Emirates

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, this was my proposal. We agree with your proposal to keep the text as

is. Thank you.

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

>> CHINA: (Off microphone)

>> CHAIR: Sorry, China, we can't hear you. China, please.

>> CHINA: (Off microphone)

>> CHAIR: The mic is not working. Kindly, can someone help us on that? Okay. Korea. The China, mic of Korea. Just give the floor to Korea, please. So give the floor -- sorry -- to China, the mic. It's not working.

>> CHINA: (Off microphone)

>> CHAIR: It's working. Go ahead.

>> CHINA: Thank you. We think the consideration is fully not clear. We think to make a decision in this meeting. If there's some misunderstanding, we propose to use original text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China, for that. Can we agree to keep the original text? It's -- okay. Thank you for that.

We can go to the next proposal. It's from APT. It's a new item under Section 5. Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. I am now speaking on behalf of the RCC countries. We would like to say that it is not appropriate to include this new item for the following reasons: The issue is that conducting any surveys or analysis of the level of satisfaction of Sector Members and Member States working in study groups could put the Director in a somewhat even embarrassing or uncomfortable position.

Moreover, conducting such an analysis or survey, well, even the Questionnaire itself, the list of questions would be a very difficult text to compile, so we would prefer for the Director to avoid such difficult positions. We would like to try to avoid such proposals, which would be so very difficult to implement. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation. Any other views for that?

China, please.

>> CHINA: So on behalf of APT members, we think it's very good for collect our members' comments for study groups. It will improve the working efficiency and the working product in the future, although it's difficult, we understand it's difficult to implement in the future, maybe we can take the start point for us to improve the working in study groups, which is very important for the long-term development of ITU-T. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China. Russia, you insist to take the floor again? Okay. 20 seconds.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: In this case, I'm speaking not as a representative of the Russian Federation but on behalf of the RCC countries. I would like to recall a saying which exists in many languages, "The road to hell is paved with good intentions."

We have TSAG, and we can submit our proposals to TSAG. We would insist on this new text not being included. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia, and would like to close the floor -- close the discussion at this point, and in my proposal, it will

include in my report for the invitation for TSAG to seek the feasibility and the ways to consider how the -- the Director how the TSAG can arrange improvement of the participation to reflect APT point can we agree on that?? Thank you.

Next point. New item from USA -- sorry, changes from USA. Any views on that? Can we agree? Thank you. Agreed.

Now we can go to Section 6 about the contributions, and we have only one change from APT, and I think it's editorial -- from an editorial nature, and I think there is no problem in it. Can we accept it? Any views? Okay.

Now to Section 7, Development and approval of Questions. First change by RCC. No numbering, so we can go -- ah, okay.

>> (Off microphone)

>> CHAIR: That's editorial one. Can we accept that, any views on that editorial? Okay. No comments. Agreed.

Next point in 7.1.0, the change, Amendments by RCC. Just adding new or revised. Agreed? APT. Also consider editorial one. Agreed.

7.1.1, the same global changes. We find many changes in this section to just add new or revised question before the word "question," and I think we can agree on the principle at large, so instead of repeat these changes many times, I could agree on all changes of new or revised. If you have any problems at a certain point, just ask me that you have a problem on a certain one.

Then we can go to 7.1.2. Here we have proposal from CITELE and proposal from Africa. Africa no change. CITELE required amendments on 7.1.2. Any views about that, ladies and gentlemen?

Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chair. Concerning this proposal, I believe that we should keep the original instead of adopting any new proposed amendment that will make the work more difficult for the different SGs.

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

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. We concur with Egypt on this. We prefer not to have any changes on the text -- to the text.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. United Arab Emirates

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Yes, thank you, Chair. We, as well, concur with Saudi Arabia and Egypt on this. We wish to retain the original text.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Arab Emirates. Any other views about that? Bahrain.

>> BAHRAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and good morning, everyone. I would like to echo my colleagues from Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and United Arab Emirates. We'd like to see no change to the text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Bahrain. Madagascar, please.

>> MADAGASCAR: (Off microphone)

>> CHAIR: Okay. United States, please. United States. Sorry. Floor now to United States, please. United States.

>> USA: Thank you, Chairman. United States would like to retain

this text in the CIT el proposal. It's very important, and -- CITELE proposal, it's very important. So thank you.

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

>> LIBYA: We agree with the United Arab Emirates and Bahrain. We would like to keep the original text as it stands.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Lebanon. Canada.

>> CANADA: I have a number of states supporting Egypt's proposal because they said it would make it more difficult. What is it that this text provides? Can I get some clarification?

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. I would give the floor for Egypt for a very brief clarification, and then I will conclude to go forward about that. Sorry. Our last speaker, Egypt. Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll start speaking English maybe to be more clearly in my words. What -- we feel that the consensus in is a process itself. It's a process that the Chairman is trying to reach an agreement between the people in the room; however, this process is based on the past experience that the Chairman has, the effort that is made in the session during the discussions, so to make the consensus of having the Member States' agreement with no objection, this is going to be a step like a voting, which is not the spirit that was in the Study Groups' meetings that we are used to, so we feel that retaining the original text will be much appropriate to enhance the work of the ITU-T. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. I see here on screen ITU Sector Member. I believe it's orange, huh? Yes, orange. Okay.

>> ORANGE: Yes, thank you, Chair. Yes, it's Orange speaking. There are several proposed amendments in this clause A and B which concern Member States more than others, in my opinion, but there's also a sentence been added to a paragraph a bit down below, which, for Sector Members, are very important, I think, and a compromised position here might be to maintain this sentence in the second paragraph, which, in English -- (Off microphone) ITU resources and to avoid duplication of efforts and optimize resources. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Arrange for that. The issue of reflecting -- Russia is again insisting to have the floor? Very brief.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: I think that the last proposal is a compromise solution because the previously added text is from the Convention Charter, and we usually do not copy text from the Convention into resolutions; otherwise, we could end up inflating these documents by a factor of 10 or more. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia, for that. Cameroon.

>> CAMEROON: Good morning, Chair. I would just like to reiterate the African position by showing support for this text.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Cameroon, for that. Ladies and gentlemen, yes, most of the references are very clear articles from Convention and Constitution. Some countries believe that it is important to have this to be reflected in this provision; others believe this is overloading provision about creating new question and using the -- the statements using provision from Constitutions and Convention in

many resolutions could somehow inflate the resolution itself.

My proposal to you, can we agree on no change on that? Can we agree on no change, since there is -- the references are very clear in Convention and Constitution. It will not change the current text about the approval of new question. Can we agree on no change? Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Question for clarification, Chairman. What about the last part of the text that was indicated by Orange?

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Orange, can you confirm that the text is exactly what you'd like to introduce in the document? The text is on the screen. Orange, please.

>> Yeah, thank you, Chair. What I was proposing was to maintain the text as we find it in the factual paragraph here and this we have -- right above the green zone on the screen, perhaps we could highlight it with something that starts with an intent to manage it efficiently -- yes, exactly. I propose that we maintain that sentence because for the Sector Members it's an important point. We have to be able at any time to decide where we put our resources, and the growth in the number of questions, I think, demands this, especially once we got to developing countries. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chair. Well, as concerns the second paragraph here that Orange has proposed to retaining, we would like to keep the original text as it originally stood, and I'm going to go into English now because the document is in English.

In the second paragraph with (Inaudible) as efficiently as possible the scarce ITU resources and avoid duplication of efforts. What do you mean avoid duplication of efforts? This is not clear to us, Mr. Chairman, and optimize the use of resources. I believe this point was already covered in previous text, so there's no need to repeat in this specific part of the resolution. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and our position is to maintain the text as is. Thanks.

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

>> CHINA: Now I'm speaking on behalf of China. I use Chinese now.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We also agree with the comment from UAE because we need to seek clarifications, what do you mean by to avoid duplication of efforts and optimization of the use of resources? Is ITU should have simple and transparent process to improve the work, and Resolution 7.1, there is one goal, to meet the increasing need for interconnection and to get the standards ready for the industry. If the process is too complicated, it cannot meet the increasing need of the industry in a timely manner. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China, for that. I would like to close the floor. It will be Orange to clarify, and our final speaker, Argentina, so finally, Orange, give clarification, and then Argentina.

>> ARANGE: Sir, this concept has already been mentioned in a previous part of Resolution 1, and I would like Emirates to signal,

to flag that clause so we can find it, and in that case, we wouldn't need to say it here because that would be a duplication, so kindly ask Emirates to tell us if there is in existence elsewhere.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. This time I'm speaking on behalf of CITELE. We believe that in this case we really need to include this mention of avoid duplication of effort because we're talking about a series of questions, and with all of the requirements that we have to meet in dealing with questions, I think it's very important to have a list of questions and ensure that there is no duplication of efforts in dealing with all these, so independently of any other reference in other parts of the text, here when we're talking about the definition of this task for NSG, it's very important that we mention that we don't deal with the same topic twice, that it's not being dealt with in some other instance; hence, we would request that we maintain CITELE's proposed text.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Argentina. And I believe, according to your views, that we have some sort of disagreement on the principle on this text, and since we are very limited in time to continue discussion, I may propose to put it between square brackets, that we go to our conferee and see how we can go forward in that.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, and we can go to the next item. 7.1.3, and the same editorial change, the global editorial change, new or revised. I think there's no problem in that, so we can go directly to Item Number 3 under 7.1.5. Point 3 under 7.1.5. Yes. This one. Change by RCC. Any views on that? Can we agree?

Okay. And the next item 7.1.6. We have here a proposal from CITELE. Any views? Proposing a definition for the consensus. Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We propose to have no change in this text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Also, we have an African common proposal in this item to consider no change.

Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair. We support the remarks made by the Egyptian representative and recommend that there be no change made to the text.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Bahrain.

>> BAHRAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think no text would be acceptable for Bahrain, I'm afraid, so we'd like to keep the -- keep it as no change. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Bahrain. United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman. I am talking on behalf of the Arab States Administrations. The proposal of the Arab States is to keep the original text as it is without adopting any consensus-based definition. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Arab Emirates. Any other views? Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. After consultations, we are also ready to add our voice to the opinion just

stated in favor of leaving the text unchanged. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation, for that. Can we agree on the African proposal for no change -- African proposal for no change, original text? So we will not consider the CITELE, and we have also another proposal from RCC, so we propose no change. Thank you. Agreed.

Okay. We can go to the next item. Now we can go to Item Number 7.1.11. All those changes are just revised and new, 7.1.11. APT proposal. Just remove the first paragraph of this item. Can we agree on that? China, please.

>> CHINA: I would like to clarify that some editorial mistake at the meeting. This duplication of this paragraph. We just simply find this text here -- simplify this text here.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China. 7.1.11, can we agree on that? Okay. Agreed. RCC proposal, just editorial one, to change the reference for the resolution.

Now we can go to 7.2.2. Those changes are just new and revised. New and revised, 7.2.2. I would like you to clarify if we'd like to add a sector member for that, the same discussion we had in new Section 2? I propose to add Sector Member also among the Member States and Sector Member present at the Study Group meeting. Can we agree on that? Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. We have no objection against adding Sector Members; however, we do have a question which concerns many different parts of the text.

What would be done if consensus is not achieved? In that case, would the general rules of the conference or the Assembly and so forth be applied. For example, 113 of the resolution or alternatively, would there simply not be any decision taken, and then we would achieve deadlock, and the deadlock would perhaps go on indefinitely. Thank you.

In the radio sector we have considered such options, and there may be a possibility to forward this to the Assembly in such cases or perhaps hold a vote, or alternatively, if, for example, during two conferences no decision is taken, the issue could be forwarded on to TSAG. I have no specific proposal, but I would invite all participants to think on this, and perhaps we could find a common approach so that we don't end up in this situation when all of our efforts are simply suspended and nothing further can be done. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation. Any other views about that? China, please.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm speaking on behalf of China. We hope that Sector Members' mandate will be reflected in the new questions. You can see that in addition, some Member States and the Sector Members normally have to commit themselves, so ITU-T and ITU-R in their work scope and the mandates, they're very different. ITU-T needs to resolve many technical issues.

We hope that our Sector Members, in developing new questions, they can have more voice and contributions. If in developing new

questions, if we only limit it to members, members, it will limit our work in ITU-T. We hope to reflect power of Sector Members more in developing new questions. Thank you. (Members, then)

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China. I would like to have your approval for this text. Can we agree on that? Okay. Agreed.

Next item, 7.2.3, proposal by United States. Can we agree on that? Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Here the same question arises. If we have decided to use the "among Member States and Sector Members" phrase, then we need to substitute the words "of the study group" with those words. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia, for that. I believe instead of and any occasion that we have seeking consensus to specify sector member or Member States, I think that general rules will be applied in those position, so to clarify, if just Member States should apply or Member States And Sector Member, to simplify the text somehow. I know we would like to have it clear without any -- without any ambiguity about how we would proceed, but sometimes keep it to another reference, general rules, could simplify the text somehow. Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. We fully support your proposal. Perhaps such a provision should be included in Article 1, an additional point which would state that in those cases where it is not clear what is happening or achievement cannot be -- an agreement cannot be achieved, general rules apply. This would cover all imaginable cases. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. So we can agree on this proposal? We will -- thank you.

Orange, please.

>> Yes, thank you, Chair. It's a little bit difficult to follow exactly where we are and what decision we are taking, but if I understand correctly, we are currently on Section 7.2.3, where the text talks of the Study Group's consensus, and I think we can ask for an opinion from the legal advisor. I'm not quite sure what text we should use, but we need to be consistent and make a modification in the text of 7.2.2 or 8.2.2, as it may now be called, on the modification by the RCC.

I think that we need to say "the consensus of the Study Group" rather than "of the Sector Members or Member States" because they participated in in the **meeing**, and the general rules of the conference, just like the Constitution and the Convention, are texts which prevail over all the others, and they apply whatever happens in the meeting, and I don't think we have to spell those out additionally, and so perhaps I would propose that we should use "consensus of the Study Group" as a phrase in order to be consistent, and if there is no consensus, then one of the Member States can ask for a formal vote in line with the General Rules of Conferences, and I hope that would apply then. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Orange for that. Regarding 7.2.2, we -- exactly at 7.2.3, and we just accepted the proposal for USA, and we

had a discussion about shall we need to add among Member States and Sector Member? In every position we have a consensus question between Member States or between the Sector Members. My proposal was to just mention that we would apply the General Rules as a global -- global change for the whole Resolution 1, so we can have a clear reference about the -- when we consider the consensus itself -- consensus itself in the provision, that it should be between Member States or Member States and Sector Members only, so I believe that we don't need this change and we can consider 8 -- or sorry, 7.2.2 unchanged or with no change. Can we agree on that to simplify the text? Okay. Agreed.

So now we can move to the next point, 7.2.5. United Arab Emirates, please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Mr. Chairman, sorry to take you back to 7.2.3, I know we have limited time. Sorry. In that text proposed by United States, we are saying that the Study Group may continue to consider the matter? We would like to see -- terminate the matter to be deleted because when the Study Group considers the matter, so they consider it, and then accordingly decide, so we say, "consider the matter, or request approval by the consultation of Member States," so we delete "terminate the matter." Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Arab Emirates. Can we agree for that change? Okay. Agreed.

Now we can go for the next point, 7.2.5, and we have only 12 minutes and about 14 pages, so please, ladies and gentlemen, be very brief as much as we can so we can conclude the Res. 1.

Any views for RCC proposal, take back the text of the question to the Study Group?

I think the TSAG sometimes could make some comments on the questions, but sometimes those comments could be editorial or may be very simple changes, so if we take back the question for the Study Group, maybe that will make the process a little bit long or give long time for discussion for such editorial changes back in the Study Group. Russian Federation, can you clarify?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. We fully agree with you; however, the text, as proposed, refers to the part that it be modified, so this is just an explanation that if TSAG considers that a question has to be changed, then, therefore, it has to be referred back to the Study Group. We're not talking about editorial changes. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation. Any comments for that? Any disagreement for the text? Okay. Agreed.

The next point, 7.3. Any comments? 7.3.2, the same new, revised, editorials.

7.3.3, also editorial.

Then we can go to 7.4.1.1. Can we agree to have no change, to simplify the text? Okay. Agreed.

Then 7.4.2, RCC proposal. Orange, please.

>> Yes. Thank you, Chairman. It appears to us that in order to be consistent with what you stated previously, we also need to

reject this addition of text because it seems to me that the deletion of a question can also be proposed by a Sector Member. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Orange. Can we have it no change? My proposal, no change. Can we agree on that? Thank you. Agreed.

Now we can go to Section 8, and we have proposal from RCC to change the title of Section 8. Orange, please.

>> Yes. Thank you. I was on 8.1 I wanted to mention that, so I can do that now or wait. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Orange. We would approve the title of Section 8. Okay. Agreed.

Now we can go to 8.1. Orange, if you have any points, you can raise it now.

>> Yes. Thank you, Chairman. Quite simply, I believe that at least in if the English version, the wrong term has been used. In the first part of A, a "formal agreement" is what I would called an oxymoron. I think we're talking about formal consultation. I would call that formal consultation of Member States, and equally, in if the second part of A, I -- in the second part of A, I would also talk about formal consultation of Member States and not agreement. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Orange.

>> (Off microphone)

>> CHAIR: Sorry, Orange, just for confirmation, you meant your proposal on the RCC proposal?

>> Thank you, Chairman. Replacing the word "agreement" with "consultation" in in the first and second parts of 8.1.A.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Orange. Actually, it's introductory part for Section 8, and we have two proposals from APT and RCC. They are very close, just that we have to approve a way at the APT and AEP. We can consider the text and also the proposal by Orange. Can we agree on that? Thank you. Now we can go to 8.1.1. Proposal by RCC and proposal by APT.

The first part, they are very identical almost. No changes? Orange, please.

>> Thank you, Chairman. On the second paragraph, on the term "consensus," I think we should not modify this but apply the previous rule consistently. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Orange. First, in the first part, I believe the AP.

It's a little -- APT is a little bit drafting the text. RCC is just a proposal. Can we agree on the RCC one, to simplify the text? RCC first part of item 7 -- Item -- sorry -- 8.1.1.

Okay. For the second part, if consensus, can we have no change? Okay. Agreed. We just reject among the Member States and just the RCC part.

Now we can go ...

For APT, sorry, the proposing new text, when determined whether a new or revised draft recommendation, this text, can we agree to have it?

This is a new add. It's just referring to Resolution 40, reference

to Resolution 40. Thank you. Agreed.

Now we can go to 8.1.2, just editorial. No major changes.

Now we can go to 8.3, proposal by the Arab States. If there is a requirement to change the selection criteria, they just would like for reasons for these reconsiderations. Can we agree on that? Okay. Agreed.

Now we can go to Section 9. We have some editorial changes about new and revised recommendation. I think it's an easy one

We can go to 9.4.1, APT proposal to clarify the text with linking to Section 9.5.2. Any objection for that? Can we agree on that? Okay. Agreed.

Now we can go to Item 9.8.2.1. And my proposal is no change. Can we have it no change? Keep the original text? Okay. Thank you.

The last thing in our resolution in Appendix 1, RCC proposal, relevant to standardization organizations. Can we agree on that, instead of bodies?

Thank you. We agreed on that.

Now we almost covered all Res. 1. The document is a working document and is available in the Working Document 2 in our section. Russian Federation. We need to give the floor to conferee, please, so --

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. We have agreed with many of the modifications on the condition that we, together with you, will prepare the text that will be general in character with the references and in compliance with the General Rules for the Assembly and for conferences, and so there is that condition, and on that condition, we have accepted many different modifications. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. And exactly as I mentioned, we will deliver our report to conferee to give us a way forward. We will finalize the fine-tunings because we have a lot of fine-tunings and maybe we have until now only three square brackets on principle. I would like to thank you all. I would like to thank all our interpreters to give us better communication for all of us, and by this meeting, I consider that Working Group 3A is concluded and wish you -- all of you good luck in conferee to conclude Res. 1. Thank you a lot.

(Applause)

(Session concluded at 1100 a.m.)

>> CHAIR: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I'll allow a few minutes for stretching. We'll start Com3 at 10 minutes past 11:00. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the continuation of the deliberations for Committee 3. You may have noticed that we are reaching the point in the meeting where time becomes of the essence and that for many of the committees, things like coffee breaks have disappeared. Well, we'll try to give you enough time for stretching, but we'll also try to have enough time in session that we can complete our work.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you could please take your seats and cease other conversations or take them outside. That would be helpful.

The agenda for today's session is in Document 80M -- ADM 22, so I would like to tell you what my goal would be for today. There are a number of resolutions where we have text available that is at least close to being able to finish up.

I would be cautiously optimistic that we would be able, during today's meetings, to take at least Resolutions 22, 35, 55, 67, 68, and 80, and have text ready today to send forward to the Editorial Committee.

I would like to decide on a way forward on the -- some of the proposals we haven't heard yet on A.12 and A.13 and proposed resolution AFCP 1, time permitting.

Resolution 70, while the drafting group completed this morning, I'm not sure we'll have that output cleaned up and translated in time to consider today, so that may fall into tomorrow.

And then we will need time to go through the results of the work in Working Groups 3A and 3B, and as many of you were involved in the Working Group 3A session this morning on Resolution 1, I think even though we've been through this text that some time may be required for finalizing that discussion in Committee 3.

You've seen throughout Working Group 3A and other places that in many cases where we have proposed additions or changes to existing resolutions, where we don't reach consensus on those changes, our default has been to stay with the original text. There are a few places where we still have retention of square brackets, but I would certainly ask everyone, as far as possible, if we can't reach consensus, if we can reach agreement to stay with original text and only retain square brackets in the cases where there are informal

consultations ongoing where there is some promise of being able to reach agreement on a way forward.

So I'm sure Mr. Manacrede doesn't want us to repeat the same arguments we've heard here in his plenary meeting, and so unless we have promise of a way forward, I would like to ask that we try, as possible, to close on some of those issues and remove the square brackets.

So the first thing I have on our agenda as far as documentation is review of the report of the third meeting of Committee 3.

Now, this has been posted, earned and I would propose that I don't -- and I would propose that I don't walk through it, just in the interest of time, but if I can have your agreement, we'll know to approve that report and move right into the business at hand.

So I think many of us, because it's mostly the same people in the room, are aware of the status of Working Group 3A, but Ahmed, if you could give us a few words about the status of 3A, please.

>> AHMED: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We just concluded our work in Conferee A just before your meetings, and we completed our work on Res. 1. We went through the whole document. We have some items that need just a fine-tuning and some form of consultation between the Member States, and I believe there will be no difficulties to conclude those meetings before your next meeting, and we only have three items that there is disagreement on the principle, that we have square brackets on those items. We -- I would like to invite all members or regions that have difficulties in those three square brackets, exactly, that we can continue our informal consultation. We may have agreement how we can resolve those issues so we can come back with a clean text for Res. 1 for your committee, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So we will -- we'll definitely look for something that is cleaned up from what we saw this morning to be posted as a TD and available and translated for our discussions, likely in the sessions tomorrow.

As far as Working Group 3B, let me mention some -- before I turn the floor to Dr. Gracie, some conversations. I believe all but one of the resolutions that is not yet complete under 3B discussions have concluded with some informal consultations, and there's an intention to try to put some of those things forward into TDs as soon as possible before the meeting of 3B that afternoon.

I think there's more work needed, as I understand, on Resolution 45, but Dr. Gracie has informed me that he doesn't believe he needs the entire time of the 3B session that afternoon, so the intention would be that after 3B concludes that afternoon, we will resume our deliberations in Committee 3 and take advantage of the interpretation time available and go until 1730 or 1740 with the interpreter's indulgence to try to get through more of the work that afternoon and leave us in good shape for tomorrow and with sufficient time to consider the important matters like Resolution 1.

So Dr. Gracie, if you could give us a short edition to what I just said -- addition to what I just said about Working Group 3B.

>> DR. GRACIE: Yes. Thank you very much, chairman. As you can see from your agenda, the report from Committee 3 is in DT 24. I don't plan to go into any detail on those reports. If anybody has any comments, certainly I would entertain any changes that may be necessary.

Chairman, the outstanding matters from our first meeting include Resolution 7, and I do believe we've reached consensus on that resolution. Resolution 11, that too has reached consensus. Resolution 18, which is linked to Resolution 57 -- and I'm confident that we have reached agreement on those resolutions, so I would anticipate that we would include all of this information in a TD -- in TDs, which can be quickly approved that afternoon at the 3B meeting.

The only outstanding issue is Resolution 45, as you mentioned, and colleagues are continuing to discuss and fine-tuning the wording of Resolution 45.

What I can mention at this point is a decision was taken in principle to maintain and keep Resolution 45, but it's simply a matter of fine-tuning the wording, and hopefully, by the time the meeting is convened that afternoon, colleagues will have reached consensus on the text, so I see some colleagues are nodding in that direction, so -- so that is the only outstanding activity associated with 3B, and I'm confident that perhaps in a period of even 20 minutes we could conclude 3B and you could resume the meeting of Committee 3. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Dr. Gracie, and as you can see, we try to be as efficient as possible and to allow sufficient time for the discussions that we require.

So the next item I have of business -- and actually, as we bring these up, I'll try to see if we can pull up the documents in order and see to what extent we're prepared to take decisions, and then we can mark them off our list and move on -- is the ad hoc on Resolution 22, which has had two sessions and produced a TD -- DT 65 is the document for Resolution 22, so Dr. Gracie, if you could indicate what the status and issues are here. Thanks.

>> DR. GRACIE: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. We had our final meeting on Saturday for almost two hours, and we did reach consensus on most points. There is one outstanding issue that we need to still resolve, but if you wish, I can go over the various points in Resolution 22 section by section and see if there's any outstanding issues.

If you allow me, I'll begin with the -- of course, there's editorial changes in the title and so on. But in the -- considering B, the reference to 197-C was agreed, so I don't believe there is any further need for comment there.

The proposal with respect to -- the reference to Resolution 68 was moved to a noting, so that was agreed.

The proposal for -- as you can see, Number G, BIS was not accepted, so that was deleted.

The proposal with respect to considering M was agreed. We

agreed to maintain the text as close as possible to existing text, so I do believe that that was a general principle that was agreed throughout the discussions.

The reference to the Review Committee was agreed, so it is now included. We, of course, will need to renumber the various paragraphs, but that's just an editorial matter.

And as you can see in if the noting, E-BIS, that was moved originally from the considering, so that was agreed, the text.

The further noting with reference to the A series recommendations, we agreed that that would be considered in relation to the final instructs of this document, so that has not yet been agreed, but we can return to that later.

Recognizing there was some text that was merged into considering B, so that was agreed.

The inter-American proposal from CITELE, we rearranged some text and we added a reference to Resolution 35, and I do believe that was agreed, and so we can accept that change in this particular section, which is resolves 1.C.

The next for Resolves 1 E-BIS was agreed, and this wording is, again, consistent, as close as possible, to existing text, so that was agreed.

The text for G-BIS, from CPT was also agreed, and, again, we tried to use the existing formulation of text as closely as possible, so that was agreed.

We have, again, from CEPT a paragraph on I-BIS, and once again, this was agreed. Now, Chairman, the reference in this paragraph to stale work items, we haven't yet made a specific change there, but after -- after the meeting we had a number of discussions taking place because the word "stale" did not perhaps convey the right meaning understanding in other languages. In fact, in English it is a little strange, but in any case, it was agreed that we should use the words -- and this, again, is reverting back to existing text -- where progress has -- where no progress has been achieved, we would use these words rather than "stale," and I do believe that that would be a very good substitution.

And, again, I emphasize, these words already exist in text, so colleagues got together and agreed that this formulation would best convey the meaning of this particular paragraph.

So perhaps I could pause, Chairman, and see if there's any comments on that proposal.

So, again, it would read, "where no progress has been achieved" in place the "stale."

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And I'm seeing the words are in a sight slightly different order, work items that have achieved no progress. These who work in TSAG are familiar with the report that identifies what was called in that report "stale work items," but the effort after the last session of the drafting group was to come up with some words that the -- that EDCOMM would have a fighting chance to express in six languages, and this was existing text that conveyed the meaning, so could I have your agreement for this text? Any requests

from the floor? Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you very much, Chairman. We also had informal consultations with representatives from Germany and the Arab States. There was a proposal to delete the I-BIS, and instead of it to include in the instruct section, instructs the director of TSB and to include the following text, and I will state this in English: To provide information about any work item that has not given rise to any contribution in the time interval of the previous two stud you why groups meeting through his report about study groups' activity.

So this was an informal arrangement which we reached. I would simply like to ask whether -- given that -- whether there were any other informal arrangements or agreements that led to a solution on I-BIS, given the proposal of Ms. Van Brusen, that is the Chair of the ad hoc. So would it be possible to get any information on that? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Dr. Gracie, please.

>> DR. GRACIE: Yes. thank you, Chairman. I'm certainly happy with moving this to the instructs at the end of this document if that's the agreement that's been reached. Either place is acceptable to me, so perhaps those who participated in the informal discussions, if they would like to indicate their agreement, that would -- I think would resolve the issue. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Dr. Gracie. Observe that we already have text in A.1 that instructs study groups to consider work items for deletion that have not given rise to contributions in that period of time, and text in Resolution 1 that instructs study groups to consider deletion of questions that haven't given rise to contributions, so I think we also see this text in existing documentation, so can I put it to the room, is there any objection if we take that as a replacement for the text that came out of the ad hoc group? There have been consultations here. I see ITU sector member Orange, please.

>> Thank you. We, unfortunately, cannot read the text at all, so we don't know where we are. Is it possible to improve the text on the screen?

>> CHAIR: Yeah. I think we have some technical limitations, but I think if I can read out, I think TSB is trying to make this a bit bigger. And if we can slide it over a little bit so we don't lose the left edge of the letters, hopefully that could be readable. Is this better? So "To provide information about any work item that has not given rise to any contribution in the time interval of the previous two study group meetings through his report about study group activity."

Any further comment or any any objection to this text in place of the other item? I see no requests for the floor, so that's agreed, so if I can return to Dr. Gracie to talk us through the rest of the document, please.

>> DR. GRACIE: Yes. Thank you very much. So I'm now on the text for Resolve 2. We agreed that the reference should be to the annual operational plans. This was a proposal from CITELE, and that

text was agreed.

Now, in Resolves 4, we wanted to make a reference to one of the major recommendations from REVCOMM, and we reviewed Document Number 23 very carefully, which is the REVCOM report to this Assembly.

We discussed this in detail, and you can see the text for Resolves 4 and a slight amendment to Resolves 5 was made and agreed, so I do believe now that we have agreement on this text to capture the notion of standardization strategies, and, of course, as you know, TSAG has established a rapporteur group on standardization strategies, and we will be dealing with that at the next meeting of TSAG next year.

So that -- on that section, I think it's all agreed, and we agreed to take out some text that was proposed.

So we're reaching towards the end of the document. We have an instructs to the Director to -- and this is consistent with the Convention -- to take into consideration the advice and guidance of TSAG, and again, we have to remind ourselves that TSAG is an advisory body, in order to approve the effectiveness and efficiency of the sector, that is his responsibility, and to provide each TSAG meeting with a report on the implementation of resolutions and actions undertaken in their various resolves and instructs and invites, so that text too was agreed.

And finally, Chairman, we have -- we had a proposal from the Arab Group inviting the Director of the TSB to report on the experience of the implementation of the A Series recommendations, and that particular aspect was agreed.

Now, the -- the problematic area that was not agreed concerns the text regarding the appointment of editors.

Now, that was to be discussed further outside of the ad hoc group, and if I understand correctly, we are still in the process of trying to find acceptable text, so unfortunately, that is the only area that still remains to be finalized, but, again, I remind you that there is text earlier in the document which is linked to the notion of A Series' recommendations that needs also to be considered.

So I think, Chairman, that for the most part, we did reach consensus on most of the changes to Resolution 22, and I'd like to take the opportunity to express my particular appreciation to colleagues for their spirit of cooperation in the discussion that took place in the two meetings of the ad hoc group and particularly to Mr. Oda of the TSB for his great assistance in ensuring that we reflected the agreed text as clearly and accurately as possible, so with that, Chairman, I present the revision to Resolution 22 for your further consideration. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Dr. Gracie. So we have to close on some of these square bracketed items and decide a way forward, so I have several requests for the floor. Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the information he gave us. We're looking to the resolution that we have in front of us. There are some missing items and square brackets from our last meeting, and we've sent you, Mr. Chair, an email with our

solution to this issue, so as Mr. Gracie said, we look forward to the discussion in order to solve the square bracket issues, and if you kindly, Mr. Chairman, would include our proposal in this version. It's a new item and instruct the TSB. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, and reminding all Delegates that we are trying to reach an agreement here, so we don't have lots of sessions to consider this, so we should try to close on what we can agree to include, or if we can't agree on text to include, we leave it out.

So Emirates, please.

>> EMIRATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and good morning to all colleagues. Mr. Chairman, to many drafting groups or formal groups who will not be able to participate in this discussion, I have one modification in Resolves 1.C, if you can kindly take us to that part of the document. There's a proposal to restructure and establish ITU-T Study Groups in accordance with the needs of Member States and in response to the changes in the communications marketplace. I would propose the following, Mr. Chairman.

In accordance with the needs of ITU-T Membership. Should not limit it to only Member States, we should consider also all -- all ITU-T membership, not limited to only Member States. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, and as you can see, many of those words were just rearranged in the sentence that were there before. Let me give the floor, first, to Dr. Gracie before I move down the queue.

>> DR. GRACIE: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. We thank the UAE for that helpful suggestion. I would include not only membership but also participants, given the fact that associates are participants, not members, and we also have academia, and the possibility of other participant categories, as would be decided by the Plenipotentiary Conference or Council, so I would suggest membership -- membership and participants or words to that effect, so thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Maybe if the legal advise advisor's in the room, I can consult, but my understanding is while associates and academia are not members, they are part of what we refer to with a broader term "membership," and if that's accurate, then it's already included. If we need to extend it, then we want to be clear, but my understanding was that the broader term "membership" actually did include associates and academia, but I'll look for some clarification from that. And if we don't receive it right on the spot, we can check that offline, but at least my understanding was that that term was intended to include all of those categories. I think where we don't want go as far as participants, is invited experts, for example, are participants but not part of the membership.

Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you very much, Chairman. I have a comment on a different issue. The issue of Resolves 5 and editorial adjustment. At the very end, Resolves 5, we can see "and nominate the Chair and vice chairman," TSAG nominates. In the translation into Russian, the English word "nominates" has certain undesirable desirables.

We would like to say appoints the vice chairman and chairman instead of "nominates."

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia, for that helpful suggestion. In fact, once that's occurred, there's no further consideration, so that would seem to have the better sense. United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning. Mr. Chairman, have we moved on to the membership? Are we good with membership then? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I'd offered to check offline with the legal advisor whether "membership" was truly a word that was normally understood to include associates and academia. My personal belief is that term has been used in that sense, but we would verify and see if we need to add anything to ensure that associates and academia are included in whatever phrase we insert in this place in the document.

United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to note that Member States and Sector Members are part of the decision-making process; whereas, others are not, and so that's something that we need to take into consideration. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, that's -- that's absolutely correct, but I think the context in which the word appears is taking into account the needs, so you can take into account their needs without making them part of the decision-making process, and I think that would be well understood.

Additional comments on this point? Okay. Let's see. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. In accordance with this is best to be replaced, as you suggested, by taking into account. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And I hadn't intended to reword it, but -- (Laughter)

-- since the request came from a Member State, I assume we can accept that. Further comment on this point or can we return to discussion about the appointment of editorship? Cameroon, please.

>> CAMEROON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Can't we list the four in here, you know, Member States, Sector Members, academia, and associate? I didn't want it to be so heavy. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I think if we have a short-term available, we'd like to use it. I think the advantage of "membership" is that if new membership categories are created -- I understand there may be one under discussion on financial and human resources and even some proposals to come fore, you wouldn't want those new categories to be excluded from the term, so if we have a -- an umbrella term, it would seem like that's safer so we don't exclude any new categories of membership that may emerge in the next cycle. I'm seeing Dr. Gracie nodding there, trying to capture that.

As far as appointment of editors, I would remind all that we do have a procedure that's described in Recommendation A.1, in particular, Clause 2.3.3.3, and the "where the work requires, the Rapporteur may include a role of editors, and it should be endorsed

by a working party or study group, and the final sentence of that clause lists the responsibility of the ed to, which is to assist the reporter in the draft recommendations or other publications, so that is the current text of the current procedure for the appointment of editors to be considered in -- in evaluating deviation from that, if that's to be made for the A Series recommendations.

So any further comment or discussion on this point? Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. As it was said on the -- on behalf of the Arab group, I mean, we came out with a kind of compromised text to capture the issue under the instruct, so if you would kindly put our text on the screen under instruct (Off microphone) and we can take it after, in the discussion here, or we can go back to Mr. Gracie's ad hoc to continue the discussion. I don't think it will take such a long time to finalize this issue. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes. Thank you. I'm not sure TSB has it. In fact, I didn't actually receive the original email but received a forwarded copy from someone else on the CC, so I still have not personally received the original email, but I did have a forwarded copy.

Yeah, I think let's not hold up the meeting to try to find that but come back to this matter when we have that text available, so if I can ask one other clarification. So -- now I do see that the legal advisor is in the room, so what we wanted to confirm is what had been my understanding that "the membership" is a broad term that includes Sector Members, Member States, associates, and academia, and any other membership category that might be created, so I know that academia and associates are not members, but I thought they were included in the broader term "the membership," so I wanted to verify my understanding there.

>> LEGAL COUNSEL: Thank you very much. You are absolutely correct, Sector Members and Member States are members of the Union, whereas, academia and associates are not; however, the term "membership" is not defined anywhere. It's used very loosely in the ITU.

I think that your understanding is correct. When the membership talks about "the membership," it includes academia and associate; however, I would point out once again that it's not been defined anywhere in the text of the ITU.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So could I -- on the basis of that clarification or maybe it makes it less clear, but the fact that "the membership" seems to be a more sweeping term, can I have your agreement that we use that in the previous item where we were taking into account the needs of the membership in making these structural changes? Any objection to that proposal? I see no requests for the floor, so that's agreed.

So with the exclusion of these two points, which are indicated as "to be discussed," so we have the issue, invites the Director of the TSB with some alternative formulation for how we appoint editors for the A Series of recommendations, and then, depending on what is

-- what is agreed on that point, there presumably would be no conservative how we adjust the text above or whether we require the text above in the "noting further." Okay. I'm seeing a nodding of the convener of the ad hoc group, so let's try to have that text available perhaps directly after lunch. We can pick that up and have it on the screen, and we can have a discussion of whether that's appropriate.

Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. Unfortunately, the screen is flashing up and down again so fast that we don't actually understand which editorial version we're looking at, "membership" or "Member States." Could we just have that on the screen and see what exactly we have adopted. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So the -- so this is based on a number of interventions, restructure and establish ITU-T study groups taking into accounts ITU-T membership and responses to changes in the telecommunications marketplace, full stop. So I'm seeing nodding heads, so hopefully everybody is happy with that.

So we -- can we agree that by now we are complete with consideration of Resolution 22 with the exception of the proposal concerning appointment of editors for the A Series of recommendations, the one remaining issue that needs to be sorted? Okay. So we'll take agreement to the rest of the document, and hopefully by after lunch we can agree to the rest and have something ready to send to the Editorial Committee. Thank you for that.

So the next document we have, we have an ad hoc group on Resolution 68. So if I can -- so we have this text available in DT64, the output of the ad hoc group, so if I could have a short report from the convener of that group, and I believe from all in the room, there was an agreement to this text. So if you could walk us through this quickly, please. Kenya, please.

>> KENYA: Yeah. Thank you very much, Chair. The ad hoc group on Resolution 68 met on Saturday, between 1400 hours and about 1800 hours, and, Mr. Chair, the good news is that we were able to agree on most of the proposals. Essentially, the proposals that we were considering came from those two regions, namely Africa and Europe.

Mr. Chairman, fortunately enough, most of the proposals that we received were quite similar, so it was quite easy for us to consolidate the two proposals, and, Mr. Chairman, as I say this, one of the areas that we made amendments was in respect of the title of the resolution.

As you may note, that previously the title was "Implementation of Resolution 1.2.2 of the reports on the evolving role of the WTSA.

We did discuss this particular title and agreed that the essence of the resolution basically is about the role of the industry in ITU-T, so we were able to agree on that particular title.

And the rest of the agreed text relates to basically updating the resolution to reflect the recent -- the recent changes in status, namely, for example, that TSB Director has been organizing I-level meetings of the private-sector executives to discuss the landscape,

identifying and coordinating standards, and also the output of these particular meetings of -- over the period, being reflected in the ITU community as well as taken into account by TSAG.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, in terms of additional consideration was that ITU-T should encourage cooperation with other SDOs and also noting that the essential part of the work of -- in the development of technical standards is basically done by industry representatives.

I think in addition to that, Chair, we also recognize or rather noted that TSAG has recognized the need for the strategic function in the ITU-T and that the inputs of the industry into the strategy is highly desired

Mr. Chairman, and I think an additional item was to recognize and also ask TSB to generally organize meetings of chief executive officers' meetings, basically trying to generalize that, rather than being specific, and also to encourage wide representation of industry from the Sector Members from all the regions.

Mr. Chairman, in concluding, Mr. Chairman, we agreed that Sector Members from developing countries should be encouraged to participate in these executive meetings in order to raise proposals that relate to the priorities in terms of standardization in these parts of the world.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman. So in conclusion, Chair, the entire text was agreed in the meeting that was add representation from virtually all the regions.

I submit, Mr. Chair, for your final consideration. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And I appreciate your help in leading this group. I recall there was very good agreement in the room. Can I have your agreement to the output from this ad hoc group as the text we put forward for the modification of Resolution 68 and sending this forward to the Editorial Committee? United Arab Emirates, please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We did participate in this group. We would like to thank the Chair of this group for the great outcome that came from this group.

We have only one comment, not on the text, but a general comment that the future CTOs, we believe it should be a high level and executives from the CTOs should participate in the meetings, because as you know, CTO comes out with a communication, and that communication will also be -- I mean the participation should be in the high level in order for that communicate to be agreeable by everyone, so we have this comment as we participate in the meeting and a consensus was reached on this resolution, we are happy to maintain the text as is with this general comment for the future. We would like this to be in the report, Mr. Chairman, that we wish in the future CTO meetings that this to be considered. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Emirates. Any other comments on this document? France, please.

>> FRANCE: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. Very briefly. On behalf of the -- I'm over here if you can find me. On behalf of CEPT, we also would, first of all, like to thank the Kenyan Chair of the

Drafting Group for all of his work. We're very happy to find this compromise, and now the text can be sent to the Drafting Group. Thank you, everyone.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. With that, I'll declare that we've reached agreement on this text, and we will forward this to the Editorial Committee for their work and presentation to the plenary.

And thank you, again, to the Chair and the -- all the participants in the Draft Group for giving us a result we could proceed forward with directly.

Returning to our agenda, the next item of business I had as far as a Drafting Group, we had the group on gender issues, and for this we have DT74, which is a proposed revision of Resolution 55, which came out of this group, so our vice chairman from Vietnam has chaired this group, if I can ask to -- for an introduction of DT74, please.

>> VIETNAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Following instructions from the Chairman ad hoc group on gender Resolution 55 met twice on Friday to discuss about the consolidated text document. This document is consolidated documents from proposal from APTs to modify Resolution 55 and proposal from CITELE to propose new resolutions on promoting gender equalities in ITU-T activities.

The group agrees Resolution 55 needed to be improved and new ideas from the resolutions who could be incorporated into the revised Resolution 55.

Since the consolidated document included too many deletions and additions as well as reorder some part of the document, the group reached consensus on starting to draft with clean *ve*, s on documents -- versions on documents and changes and additional in the consolidated document.

Mr. Chairman, the ad hoc group agrees on new revised Resolution 55, which includes the main changes, as following: The preamble parts were added to be as brief and concise as possible in order considering recalling recognizing.

The other applied discussions, we agree with that.

The operation path were to include instructs, TSBs advised study group and the Secretariats and Member States and Sector Members. This is to achieve standard balance and gender equivalence in all activities within ITUs, especially in current programs, womens in standardization expert groups. The ad hoc group meeting, there is one square bracket Number 7; however, this was concluded in applied discussions within group and remain in resolutions.

The groups suspend terms on discussions on using terms in understandings. To the end, the group is to agree to use the term "women" to meet the different in if different countries.

There is a supplement document, Mr. Chair, and taking the opportunities, I would like to extend my sincere thanks to all the ad hoc groups and support from others who provide productive ideas on modifications of Resolution 55. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any comments or questions on this proposed modification of Resolution 55? Okay. I see no requests for the

floor, so thank you very much. So we will take it, then, that this proposed modification 55 is agreed, and we will also forward this to the Editorial Committee for further action to send it toward the Plenary.

One other thing that was noted in analysis of this by TSB, it was considered that in the -- some of the statistics that were to be generated and published that this may require some additional resources to provide that information, so there was a suggestion we also send this text forward to Committee 2 so they can look and evaluate that. I think it could be that these sorts of statistics are generated anyway, so it probably isn't a big deal, but anything with potential financial impact we need to send toward Committee 2. Any comment to that proposal? Okay. So we will take care of that.

Okay. We were just checking on the availability of documents, so Resolution 80, there were some results of some informal consultations and a proposed way forward. There's a document available at this point in English only, so we'll look to take that up a bit later when it's available in the other languages.

So that takes us back to the next point on the agenda, Resolution 35. We were discussing in our previous session of Com3, we did not conclude discussion on this document, so we have posted the text as of the conclusion of our previous session. That's in DT49.

So I wanted to take a few points. Unfortunately, I'll jump you around the document a little bit. So the point that we were discussing before we recessed in the previous session was in Resolves 1, which was the issue of "should" vs. "shall" in this resolves 1, and you may recall that I asked you to undertake informal consultations to see if an agreement could be reached, and so I'd like to check whether there was, in fact, in if I agreement reached about which way we should direct this. We did not have any proposals on this, so I'll allow only a short time for discussion. If we don't have a consensus here for a specific -- or a specific direction toward the Editorial Team, we will simply ask the Editorial Committee to align this text and leave it to them to do that, so is there any -- has there been any result from the informal consultation? As I said, I don't want to spend a lot of time on this because it seemed like this might be difficult to resolve unless the informal consultations have reached a good result. Any comments on this point? Brazil, please.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair. After some informal consultations, our view on that is the issue should not -- we did not have -- actually, it's not appropriate to have so much time being discussed here since this editorial issue, maybe we should just put this in consideration for Committee 5 to solve the editorial issue. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Okay. We will instruct the Editorial Committee accordingly. Thank you for that.

Then to return to the text, let me actually take the various proposals we hadn't reached slightly out of order.

So if we can move to the proposals at the end of the document

from APT, there were a couple of small points in -- yes, right here. So on this page, this was the essence of the APT proposal, so the first proposal is relevant -- adding the words "relevant," professional, knowledge, and experience. Any comment to this proposal? Okay. I see no requests for the floor, so we can agree on that addition.

Then there is another proposal to add another bullet, strategic knowledge for standardization-related activities. Any comment to the addition of this text? -- this text? Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. We still have a question about "strategic knowledge." What I mean is we don't really understand what this means as applied to these guidelines. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Can we have some clarification from APT what was intended with -- with this phrase? China, please.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Chairman. With this document, the suggested-the strategic activity plan. Can we modify the "knowledge" to the "strategic czar ization plan" for -- to replace the knowledge? (Standardization) it's the original text from APT common proposal.

>> CHAIR: I think this agrees with --

>> CHINA: Maybe replace "knowledge" to "strategic plan" or suggestions.

>> CHAIR: Okay. I'm not entirely sure I understand. This is a list of qualifications for a Chair or vice chair candidate, and I'm not sure how the existence of a strategic plan bears on the qualifications of the candidate, so I think we're struggling for some phrase to indicate what you believe needs to be included in the qualifications. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you. We could just delete the word "strategic," and then perhaps the sentence would be acceptable to all. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. We also agree with the Russian proposal. We think we could solve this just by striking out "strategic."

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Is that acceptable to participants? I see no requests for the floor, so that's agreed. So let's scroll up to the operative part of the resolution, and here I think we had sorted the intentions, so I think we have the right text on the screen, so we did some editing here to clarify that the intention was that for TSAG we have at least one but no more than two vice chairs per region, and for study groups, we had at least one, no more than three. And then we have the inviting Member States, Sector Members to promote the promotion -- the nomination of women candidates for these posts, so we've done some work on this. Can I have your agreement to this part of the text? Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. I would simply like to clarify when we say, at least one but no more," does this mean that each region or organization is obliged to give at least one, or is this up to the discretion of the regional organization? It's clear that we

should say no more than, but if we say at least one, it means that we are all obliged to offer one but not all organizations will always be able to do that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So I know this has been the practice in TSAG via an unwritten rule that we -- actually in the previous two cycles -- elected exactly one, so a region that didn't have a candidate, we solicited to try to fill that in, but I take your point on the study groups. Russia, please, and then Argentina.

>> RUSSIA: My apologies. With respect to the TSAG, I don't think there'll be a problem, but in study groups, well, there are 11 of those, and it's not always possible to do this in all of them. We don't want it to be mandatory to do this, but it's clear that this would not be an issue for TSAG. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. So your proposal, then, if I understood it, was that -- okay. -- is that we simply strike out "at least one," but every region is not represented by more than three qualified candidates? Okay. Would that change be acceptable to all. Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: thank you. Well, I took the floor to say that the text that we're reviewing resolves heretalks solely about SGs ings, we're not talking about TSAG because here we'll dealing solely with SGs, just so it's clear in everybody's mind.

Concerning the Russian proposal that was just made, we think that the spirit of what we wanted to express here remains, and we could accept that proposal.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So thank you very much for that. So this is the operative part. We had done some work on Friday and then the additional amendment today, so I believe this text we see on the screen reflects something we can agree to. Switzerland, please.

>> SWITZERLAND: Thank you very much, Chair. Just one question concerning the decides, in addition, Number 2, it says that the -- well, the words here saying that they're represented by candidates, I'm afraid there might be some confusion here if we, indeed, were inviting members of the sector states, and it says the candidates should be taken from them.

To my knowledge, candidates are usually appointed by the regions, and they represent those regions only once they have been accepted. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And this text, as we see it, prescribes how many there should be, it doesn't describe the process by which you arrive at that number, and so when we look at the preamble, perhaps we can see whether there's any clarification needed on whether it's the regions that are expected to make the determination which candidates will represent them or whether it's the heads of Delegation who will select no more than a certain number of candidates from each region, so I wanted to make sure we had a common understanding on that, because I think current practice is that the Member States normally make their nominations directly to the Assembly, and then the heads of Delegation make the choice, and there is some consultation that occurs in the case of TSAG where we're

trying to reach an agreement, at least in the previous two cycles, on one candidate, but in terms of study groups, that has not occurred in that way.

So if we can accept that this expresses how many we want without perhaps saying how we get there or who does what in the process, we can look at some of the text above because it seems like one of the proposed considering did indicate that there was the intention that regions would select their candidates for TSAG, so if we can agree that -- well, maybe I can't leave the screen yet, so let's leave it where it is and take the next two interventions, so Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you. Just not to complicate things further, let me just point out that the text that you are referring to was taken from Resolution 166 of the PP. The specific text there is the same. The only thing we're doing here is saying "not more than three," but it would seem that if we could see it on the screen, please, you can see that this is taken directly from Resolution 166 from the Plenipotentiary Conference.

Let's see here. I don't -- not there. I don't see it. But anyway, if you have any doubts, you can just look up 166.

What I would like to say here is that there is a difference between the English and Spanish versions because we're agreeing that there's not more than three, and in Spanish it says, not less than three, so we will turn to the Drafting Committee to make sure that the texts are aligned to the English.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I do see at least one participant in the Editorial Committee in the room, so I think that will be taken into account.

Spain, please.

>> SPAIN: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to remark on what Argentina said. Indeed, we have to harmonize the text between English and Spanish, and -- just so that the Editorial Committee takes note of that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. That will be taken onboard so that it's clear in all languages the intention is not more than three, and so just to remind that the text we have in front of us simply says how many, it doesn't say who decides, so there is some text we will look at in the preamble that is proposed that does indicate that it is the responsibility of the regions to select or to consider nominees for TSAG, so if we could scroll up to that part.

So -- down further. There's a proposed -- okay. So on these points, which I think were where we hadn't quite finished, so I think we -- we actually, on the final point, the value of prior experience of the nominee as a rapporteur, associate rapporteur, or editor in the respective study group was agreed, so we do have this text. The convenient of nominating by consensus up to two candidates per region for the vice chairs of the Advisory Group, and perhaps we could use TSAG just to be consistent with the other text because we are in the T sector here, so if we could replace Advisory Group by TSAG, then it's the same as the previous three bullets.

So comments on this text, which I think is clarifying that it's

the intention to -- to have the regions make the selection?
Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. And thank you for that last comment you just made, but we were trying to maintain the text as it stood. We wanted to maintain a very general nature here; in other words, what's been done in other conferences, not just in this one. That's why we put this under "taking into account." Hence, we would prefer that the text specify the Advisory Group without making any reference to our own. But since this is taking into account, we just want to reflect what's being done in other conferences and maintain it as I stated. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So if this is referring to something in -- that's been a practice elsewhere but not in the T sector, would it be appropriate to say the advisory groups of other sectors? Would that capture the thought more clearly? I'll ask that question to Argentina and then give the floor to Mexico.

>> Ar general continue

>> MEXICO: Yes, Chair. Mexico just wanted to express our support for the proposal from Argentina and maintain the Advisory Group.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. China, please.

>> CHINA: I speak on behalf of APT members. We need further clarification. If there's no problems for taking into account the item for the TSAG's vice chairman, so we would like to further clarify is there any related resource in the resource part for the TSAG vice chairman because in the current resource part, there's only the vice chairman for study groups. There's no clear specification for the vice chairman for TSAG. We need further clarification. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And if I could ask the interpreters if we could have ten more minutes, please.

>> Granted, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So I would observe that we have two texts in the proposed Resolves. One is on TSAG. We indicated we would select at least one, not more than two per region, and we had the study groups where we indicated we would select not more than three per region, and then in this "taking into account," we have an observation that the other sectors have apparently -- and I don't participate in the other sectors, so I can't confirm this, but have apparently had the practice of the regions selecting the regional -- their own representatives to the Advisory Group, and the suggestion we follow that process.

So what we're leaving open, as I understand it, is the question for Study Groups whether the regions are also expected to filter those nominees or whether it's up to the heads of Delegation to trim a list to the -- for the nomination of Study Group vice chairs. Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. It seems to me that the remarks made by China go in a completely different way than what I was trying to explain. In any case, correct me if I'm wrong, but she was saying that this text that we're talking about now was referring elsewhere

about candidates who are going to a part of the TSAG, and my answer was yes, because all of the competencies that we mention here are mentioned for the TSAG candidates as well as SG members. The only requirement that's different that we're adding here under Resolves further -- and I want this to be clear because I think we're going around the bush here -- we're going to put "limited to not more than three candidates per region as vice chairman of SGs," only SGs. We haven't made any other modifications under Resolves that limits the number of candidates in any way, but I want to make it clear that all of the competencies, all of the mandates here that are established for people who are qualified to be chosen as such Chairs and vice chairs cover both the TSAG and the SGs; hence, the resolution deals with both of those. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And certainly, that was my understanding from Resolves 1, is referring to the qualifications for Chairs and vice chairs, and certainly that needs to be applied in selecting those candidates for both groups.

So as you pointed out -- and I think it's clear to me, I hope it's clear to everyone else -- that the Resolves further to items we've agreed have indicated the count and then the taking into account C that is proposed to indicate or is intended, if I understand correctly, the -- that the T sector should follow a practice that has been followed in other sectors that they have found convenient and we would attempt to replicate that practice, okay, so if we can say the Advisory Groups of the other ITU Sectors, I think that clarifies we're saying we're going to pattern what's in the operative part after the other sectors.

Now, we've left open, I think -- and we can see if there's any difficulty -- what happens if there are four or five candidates for regions for vice chair of a study group, whether that gets -- whether the regions are expected to reconcile that or if that's up to the heads of Delegation, but maybe we can wait and see if they have any problems or proposals for how to solve that, but we can perhaps see, with experience, if that's a difficulty or if, in practice, we tend to get three or fewer candidates from a region.

Are there anymore comments on the text we see in front of in the "taking into account" part? If we agreed on this text, I think that would bring us to the end of considering the modification to Resolution 35.

Any other comments on Resolution 35, on this or any other part of the text?

So I think we've reached agreement here. We will send the text of modified Resolution 35 forward to the Editorial Team.

With that, I think we shouldn't attempt to pick up another item before lunch break, but we will reconvene here at 1430 for our afternoon deliberations. Thank you very much.

(Session concluded at 1235 p.m.)

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