

RAW FILE
WTSA - PARALLEL SESSION
NOVEMBER 1, 2016
10:25 A.M. CEST

Services Provided By:

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

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

>> CHAIR: Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. Please take your seats. We will try to begin Committee 3 in about three minutes.

Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. Welcome to the last day. We have only five texts left on our work program and substantial work has been done on all of them. If it weren't for the fact that one of those texts is Resolution 1 and two of these texts is awaiting some work in Committee 4 -- I think the discussions will continue in to this afternoon. I don't anticipate any difficulty in finishing by our appointed time this afternoon, if not maybe a little bit early. So I would ask for your cooperation and attempts to quickly reach Consensus on our remaining matters at hand. The agenda that I have for today's session is published in ADM29 and you will notice a couple of things. Is one that we haven't put a projected timing on this and that's because due to some of the texts that depend on Committee 4 we may be jumping around in order of considering these documents in order to make our decisions with the time available and -- so we do as you will see listed the remaining texts for our consideration. So we have three modifications to

Resolutions, four modifications to Resolutions still to consider. Resolution 1 as I mentioned we still have to take decisions on Resolutions 11 and 45 coming from Working Group 3B. We have action to finish Resolution 22 and the new Resolution AFCP-1. Then we will consider the final proposals on A.12. There was one proposal awaiting some consultations and another proposal for update of some of the recommendation series titles that was awaiting final decisions on Study Group titles and mandates to confirm the scope of the work to be reflected in those titles. So any questions on the agenda? I see no requests for the floor. So we will take the agenda as approved. The next document I would call your attention to is DT89, which is the report of our fourth session or fourth meeting which was the Monday meetings of Committee 3 going through the various reports we received indicating 3A and 3B progress. The progress on Resolution 22 which we will finalize today. We finished yesterday Resolution 68, 55, 35, 70, 80, 71, 67, and then will go quickly through it but you will see a report of the discussions and finished Resolution 7, 58 and 57. Our discussions on A.12 we will still pick that up later today to finalize it A.13 we agreed no change but we will request some action of TSAG to work this in the new period and then we still have some discussion pending the finalization of Resolution 22 on proposed new Resolution AFCP-1. Any questions on this report? Rapture I see no requests for the floor. So the report of our first -- of our fourth meeting is approved. So then Ladies and Gentlemen, let me move in to our substance of our agenda. I will start with what I think the easiest one is -- Korea, please.

>> REPUBLIC OF KOREA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is just for clarification question with respect to suppression of Resolution 71, in the report previous reports. Before you concluded I pressed the button but apparently did not see the signal. Just for clarification question, the first line says the Chairman explained the pieces of the text from Resolution 71 incorporating in to Resolution 71. The second Resolution 71 could be other Resolution, for example, PP Resolution 169? Just for clarification question.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Korea. So Resolution 71 we had both proposals for modification and suppression. And perhaps not the only reason but at least one of the sets of modifications that had been proposed were tying it more in to the text of Resolution 80. We did finalize after some consultations Resolution 80 and then return to the matter of Resolution 71 and we asked the room whether bearing in mind the revisions that we had just agreed to Resolution 80 allowed it to stand on its own or whether we should reconsider the proposal for suppression of Resolution 71. We did note that PP169 covers the membership

category of academia and other factors have suppressed their corresponding Resolutions, the radio sector in particular, Radio Assembly in 2015. There were a couple of interventions supporting the suppression and I put the question to the room whether there would be any objection to the suppression of Resolution 71. We were later contacted by Delegations who were not in favor of that and were not in the room and we were advised that we shouldn't set the precedent in a WTSA Committee meeting that we could revisit decisions that had already been taken due to Delegations not being in the room. And I'm sure you can understand what difficulty that would present to all of the Committees for how to manage the flow of the work. So that -- that decision to Committee 3 stands for that reason and can be revisited, of course, in the Plenary if necessary. Thank you. I hope that clarifies for all. Korea, please.

>> REPUBLIC OF KOREA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think it is clear. But the first sentence if you see the pieces of the text from the Resolution 71 we are incorporating in to Resolution 71 I was talking about the second Resolution 71 could it be other Resolution or simply you meant Resolution 71 still.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I think we see now. So I think this is a typo in the report. The second Resolution 71 should indeed have been Resolution 80. So we had taken that business before. So we will amend that in our report. So the second Resolution 71 in that first sentence will be Resolution 80. Thank you, Korea. Any other comments to the report before we move on? I see no requests for the floor. So we'll amend the report accordingly. So the next document that I would like to pick up is perhaps not the shortest one but I think the most straightforward to Working Group 3B had concluded yesterday and not all of the texts were ready -- were posted and ready for our action. So Working Group 3B had done some edits to Resolution 45, modification that had been in DT94. So now we have available with those edits agreed by Working Group 3B DT94 revision 1. So this is sent to Committee 3 by Working Group 3B for our action. So can we agree to the text that's currently in DT94 revision 1 for modification to send forward to the editorial Committee and the Plenary? I see no requests for the floor. I'll give a few more moments as the document goes by in front of you. I don't propose to rereview the whole thing. Malaysia, please.

>> MALAYSIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have reviewed the text and we are happy with the current content of the text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Malaysia. Any other comments? I see no additional requests for the floor. So the modification of Resolution 45 is agreed. The other item of business we had left over from Working Group 3B was the modification to Resolution 11

and I believe the report we had was that Delegates seem satisfied but there was one point to that one Delegation requested some time to check and so I would like to inquire whether that's occurred and whether we are now ready to move forward with approval of the modification of Resolution 11. The text here is in DT87. So this was collaboration with postal council and the UPU. Any comments, Ladies and Gentlemen? I see no requests for the floor. So we can approve this modification to Resolution 11. We will send that forward to the editorial Committee and the Plenary. Pardon the interruption, Ladies and Gentlemen. I was reminded we haven't actually had presentation of the official reports of Working Groups 3A and 3B and with your permission I would like to defer that to a little later in the meeting so we have sufficient time available for the substantive discussion we have. I'll advise members that those reports are available in DT17 and 24. Oh, revision 1 of each of those. So those report on the deliberations in those two Committees and we will have a formal introduction of those as time permits while we have time available between the other texts. The next thing I would like to do is to return to Resolution 22, which I think we were approaching conclusion on. So we had some informal consultations. So we can hear about the results of that discussion. We also had another item to be taken onboard, perhaps as a side effect if you will of the proposal for new Resolution AFCP-1. So if we can -- if we can go through this. So I think the -- the one that's a side effect of AFCP-1 I think a relatively easy one. So I think Dr. Gracie had some text, that if we can agree to put it in I think it is down further in the operative part of the Resolution. So let me turn the floor over to Dr. Gracie and you can refer us to the additional clause and I think it is just a few additional words that I hope we can agree gracefully.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, everyone. The operative clause is resolves 2 of this document where we refer to the implementation of the operational plans. And pursuant to the discussion from yesterday we consider that we should also refer to the WTSA-16 action plan. So after the words operational plans we would add and in the WTSA-16 action plan which includes the WTSA Resolutions, we would continue with the text and then we would add the words possible strategies for implementing key elements, and then continue with the rest of the sentence. I don't believe that would cause any difficulties but it would pick up the point where TSAG is responsible for the consideration of the WTSA action plans at its meetings as a regular course of business. So this just highlights that fact and I don't -- again I don't believe it will cause any difficulties adding those words. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Dr. Gracie. If you can check the words on the screen, because everything might not be at dictation speed. Make sure we have it all on the screen. I agree with you, I don't believe this will cause any difficulties. If you can clarify if we are missing any words. Rapture.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Yes, after the words WTSA-16 action plan it would begin "and in the WTSA-16 action plan", and after plan, not plans, "which includes the WTSA Resolutions". Delete possible strategies for the moment. So you continue -- okay for the purpose of identifying possible difficulties, possible strategies for implementing key elements, and then the rest of it is unchanged. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Dr. Gracie. Any comment concerning this proposed addition to the responsibilities for TSAG in this Resolution? The monitor says Delegate 117. I guess it is Orange, please.

>> ORANGE TELECOM: Thank you, Chair. Just one detail. How are we going to make sure that this is translated in to the other languages, in other words, correctly since we have it only in English here?

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Orange. Of course, we would hope to trust the editorial Committee before this comes to the Plenary. I think frequently we do some final amendments on the text that comes to us for approval before we send those forward. We are not always able to approve them exactly as is. So I think unless there is a formal request, I think we will trust the editorial Committee to come up with suitable alignment of text expressing these ideas and then we have a chance to check prior to the Plenary whether the other languages reflect the ideas agreed here. Any other comments regarding this text? So the -- the next item to be resolved, there were some brackets towards the bottom of the Resolution concerning instructs the director. Let's take first the square bracketed text which is what resulted in the informal consultation and this is in instructs the director for. So just up a bit from where we are looking on the screen. So this was a proposal from Saudi Arabia and there were several expressions of interventions in our meetings yesterday expresses opposition to the TSB taking on an editorial role in these texts, rather than leaving that to the responsibility of the membership and I wanted to check whether the consultations had resulted in any more Consensus on that issue. Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Chair. And good morning, to one and all. Let me clarify that this proposal was made by the Arab States group. Let me also specify that we are very pleased as a group with the cooperation and understanding shown

by different Delegations. Proof of this is the number of DRs that we reached agreement on during the past week and we, of course, would hope that we will be able to reach a Consensus on this particular proposal. Now the Arab States proposal on Resolution 22 which talks about opposition, well, in its subject matter met with some opposition from some groups and we were not able to reach a Consensus on this, despite the fact that we were able to provide all necessary clarifications on this proposal. And despite the fact that there is no indication in the regulations of the ITU it would be in contradiction with this function of the TSB. Now our idea here is not to make a work for this Assembly for difficult. And we won't insist on maintaining this proposal. But we would like to have the terminology for the use of authors here be discussed by committee 3 and its -- put it in its report that will then be forwarded to the Plenary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Other comments? So if I -- if I understood correctly, Saudi Arabia, you are willing to withdraw the proposal if this is mentioned in the report or should we try to see what other elements here we should try to keep in the Resolution?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Chair. Let me specify here why we are not opposed to its elimination, including to provide editors in English. And the part that begins with noting further. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. So to summarize the discussion that just occurred here the -- there are two elements. So with respect to the proposal in instructs the director for, if we could return to that text. Towards the bottom. So there were two elements in this text and if I was recalling correctly the discussion yesterday, there is no disagreement with the first part of that and that would be to report and perhaps it would be useful to add to TSAG experience and implementation and in fact, the director has done this and it has provided useful input for our discussions. But then perhaps drop the rest of the sentence because the place where there seem to be disagreement was in whether the director provides the editors. So I'm seeing nodding from Saudi Arabia Delegation. Okay. They abandon the request for the floor. Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, to everyone. Well, we appreciate the willingness of our colleagues from Saudi Arabia, not to insist on the issue on the editors. And we also willing to accept that to report to TSAG. But as we have this already under invites the director, actually the same text, yeah. We should have it there, that means under invites one to report to TSAG, yeah. And that we kind of cause cover

would be all right in our point of view.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So thank you Germany. That's a useful suggestion. So we have it only one place and -- so -- yes. I'm wondering whether we need separate invites. I'm happy with it under invites. So we can delete it here if we have got the correct text in the other section. And then there was one final text which I think under invites the director, No. 2. So is this -- is there anything removed, anything still remaining here? So to suggest appropriate enhancement of ITU-T A series recommendations for consideration by the membership. So this was still in square brackets. So can I have your views on this? Germany.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, from our point of view the director should not make these suggestions. It should come, of course, from the membership. And therefore we would like to see the text fully deleted. Thank you.

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

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Yes, thank you, Chair. And let me also thank the Distinguished Representative of Germany. Let me just reiterate that if the Arab States group to like to keep the text beginning with instructs the director.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Saudi Arabia. To be clear this is that you would prefer to see what's invites the director one, under instructs the director rather than invites the director. Would there be any difficult to moving this point where we had two occurrences and now we only have one where it is instructs the director. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. And good morning, distinguished colleagues. It is not very clear to us whether we should have instructs the director and at the same time invites the director. Perhaps it is enough to have instructs the director and put all of these different sections under that heading. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. So I believe this is the direction we were going. So I think if the first point was to move this particular item to instructs the director and then the next question, so we heard a proposal from Germany to delete invites the director to which would then say we don't have invites the director section remaining. So that's the next question. The first question was to move this particular point and then we try to reach conclusion on the other point. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Just before I spoke there was a comment that the director cannot offer editorial modifications to A series recommendations. However at this very Assembly document 34 was identified and I can read the text in English. These proposals on editorial updates towards 12

Resolutions and if we have a suggestion from the director for a Resolution, then it will be wholly logical to have similar proposals for A series recommendations. All the more so because in our sectors such proposals are submitted in the director's reports on the difficulty of applying one or other Resolution, parts of the rules, regulations and so forth. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Russia but I think if you look in to the content of document 34, in fact, it was the conclusion of the director under the responsibilities mentioned in Resolution 1, that the five Resolutions which received no proposals in this Assembly required no update. There is no proposal there. I also assume that the director as all of us are is can be clever in his use of language in reporting the experience and implementation of the A series and if there is some shortcoming in this document that would be evident from his report of experience, I think we have all experienced in this room and elsewhere the fact that many people here are very skilled in asking the question to make a point rather than to obtain information. So it is usual strategy here. Orange, please.

>> ORANGE TELECOM: Thank you, Chair. You've just said what I wanted to say. Point 2 under invites is covered by point 1 here. Because when we ask the director to provide his implementation experience on recommendations in his report he can suggest improvements to be made to the implementation. So No. 2 is really included under No. 1 already and it is not necessary. Now since I haven't used up my two minutes speaking time let me also take advantage to say or to ask what we exactly mean under the point 1 that was moved, providing assistance in the development process. Provide assistance to the membership in the development process. I'm not really sure what this means. Is this under No. 1, under invites the director of TSB. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And apparently we have inherited a bit of an error here, we had two copies of the text. The first copy we had under instructs the director, we had amended to report to TSAG the experience in the implementation of the A series recommendations and full stop. And then we have in the second occurrence some material which wasn't in the first that I don't believe was agreed. So at least my understanding we've pulled back some text that I think we were -- we had agreed to delete. So Ladies and Gentlemen, so I think from the at least from my understanding of the discussion that's what we were to consider. I mean whether we say for consideration by the membership, I think we could include or not but I think the remainder was related to the portion of the Arab states' proposal that they were willing to withdraw. United States please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That was my point, too. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So I think we have agreement on these items under instructs the director. So let me just return to the final point. So we have had some discussion about suggested enhancement bullet item under invites the director and I have heard proposals to delete it and discussion also that this in fact, is something that the director has a vehicle to provide suitable hints through his report in the implementation experience of the A series of recommendations. So with that understanding could I have your agreement that we delete that particular item and we can eliminate the section from invites the director to the end of the Resolution? Okay. I'm seeing nodding around the room and no requests for the floor. So we will agree that. So from invites to the end is removed. And then what I think our final set of square brackets are in noting further was related to the removed content. So -- so this noting further section was related to the other proposal. And this is in square brackets and I think given removal of the other proposal we can delete this text resulting in what I think at this point is now a consistent document. And I see one request for the floor. Is this -- this TSAG Chairman or -- it says ITU. Oh, Mr. (Inaudible).

>> Yes, Mr. Chairman. Back to instructs, where we were a few minutes ago, the last point starting from based on information generated by TSB prior to each TSAG meeting, though currently item 4, shows the same notion as the item, saying to provide information about any work which is item 3. So I'm just wondering whether we need to retain the item current item No. 4. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So pointing out possible redundancy in the fact that one may be included under the other. As we have noted in some of our other discussions this is not the only occurrence of redundancy in the documents. So we could leave it as it is or we could try to make sure that there is particular emphasis on the A series. Oh, let's see. Okay. So we are having a bit of issue. Maybe if we could do a view final here and make sure that we understand what's deleted text and what's added text.

>> Okay. Thank you. Yes, just to clarify. These two paragraphs just indicate about the still items, under item No. 4 was the initial proposal and then the modification was proposed as to say to provide information about any work item that has not given rise to any contribution which is item 3. So I think we have both all text and new text. This is my point. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I'm looking at a copy on the screen in front of

me where instructs 3 and 5 seem to be the same point. So I will pause a moment while we try to clarify this. I think there was some old in instructs 3 which read to provide any information about any work item which has not given rise to any contribution in the time interval of the previous two Study Group activities and we have new text in instructs 5, saying based on information generated by TSB prior to each TSAG meeting identify work items that have achieved no progress. So I think the intention of the latter wording was to leave the criteria rather than specifying a particular time interval. One possibility is to try to craft a merger of those two points and another possibility is to delete instructs 3 leaving it to newer crafted text of instructs 5. So let's see, Russia and then Saudi Arabia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. I would simply like to recall how the document was edited and explain our understanding of the situation. We conclude text in 4 is superfluous. Language that was agreed in the language in Italics initially, the text in 4 was in the resolves section and as a compromise we discussed how to reflect it. The decision was to move in that in to the section that say instructs the TSB. And so in our understanding the text in 4 based on information and so forth was just left over from our previous discussions and it can be deleted. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So to be clear, I think what I had counted as 4 was the text we had just agreed on to report to TSAG the experience in the implementation of A series recommendations and what I had as 5 is the text-based on information generated by TSB identified at each TSAG work items that had achieved no progress. In that set it would seem that 3 and 5 are expressing the same idea in slightly different words. Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In my opinion there is reoccurrence or adoption, I think there is a repetition. However I think that this amendment was a result of informal discussions between Member States, the objective of which was to replace item No. 5. It seems like item 5 was the original old text within the resolution and I think this was with relation to Resolution No. 22. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I have Russia and then Germany.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Please could you show me the item IBIS from the resolves section on the screen, and then you will see that this part repeats the text which we can now see in the part instructs the director. This is text that was deleted. It was a proposal of the European countries. We can't see the changes. It is not under track changes. And when deleting it, we agreed that instead of the deleted text we would have the text which we can now see in

Italics. This is a decision which we reached jointly at the previous Committee meeting. So we are looking for the resolves part IBIS.

>> CHAIR: Yes. So IBIS is the item which was deleted from the resolves.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Right. So I fully see that. And the original wording of IBIS seems to appear at the end, but you are saying that we agreed in a subsequent meeting to replace it with a text that we see in Italics under instructs 3. So I'm seeing Mr. Gracie sort of nodding. Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My colleague from the Russian Federation has very detailed and exactly explained what has happened. So the text which starts based on information generated was the one proposed by CEPT Europe. In order to make your life easier we withdraw this text and then only three remains and then it should be okay. That means that the new text which is in Italics to provide any information about the work. That was the outcome of the discussion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And, of course, it isn't 3 but it is 4 with our agreement so far. So first instructs is taken in to consideration. Second is to provide to each TSAG meeting report on implementation of WTSA Resolutions. Third is this new text about providing information about any work item that is not given rise to any contribution in the time interval of the previous two Study Group meetings. And the fourth is to report to TSAG on the experience of the A series recommendations. So I think we are down to one expression of each idea which I think is starting to look like we are close. China, please.

>> CHINA: (Speaking in a non-English language). Thank you, Chairman. Going to 3 and 5, which you have discussed is there really any duplication? We need in Article 3 we speak of the review committee. During the two meetings if there were no contributions, but in Article 5 we talk about there not being contributions. There is not a great deal of difference. And so is there a significant progress and so this should be clarified keeping 3 and 5 because I believe they are talking about different situations. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you China. Yeah, I think one is something that can be measured. The other perhaps not. I think we come in to every meeting with proposals and sometimes those proposals reach fruitful outcomes and Consensus and completion of text. Other times we may have a lot of contributions that we discuss and we haven't reached a conclusion. So one might regard the latter scenario as being one where progress or sufficient progress isn't achieved but that's more difficult to measure. I think from the activity level I think you can say this is

something we are still working on. But it is certainly not something where TSAG can look at Study Group activity and determine whether things are converging. So I think we are very close to text that can be supported by all with just four items under the -- under the instructs the director. I think that at least in many regards the fifth was duplicate of the third and less well formed. So can we see if there would be any objection to proceeding forward with this text, with the four items under instructs the director? Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you. Mr. Chairman I would like to kindly ask you to lift the -- what we have on the screen. So that the captioning can cover the other part of instructs. So can you lift what we have on the screen a bit so that we can see what is underneath. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So I think you see this in front of you, a little hard to read with the revision marks but the first instructs is to take in to consideration the advice and guidance of TSAG and so forth. The next is to provide to TSAG, each TSAG meeting a report on the implementation of WTSA Resolutions. The third one is we hunt for it among the revision marks, the one we had just discussed to provide information about any work item that is not given rise to any contribution in the time interval of the previous two Study Group meetings and the final item to report to TSAG the experience and implementation of the A series recommendations for consideration by ITU membership. Okay. Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: I would like to clarify one thing. Are we keeping the four items that we see on the screen here? Only the four items.

>> CHAIR: I think that would be the intention in the proposal at this point. So we are checking to see if all in the room would be okay or reach Consensus on going forward with those four work items in particular. Okay. I'm seeing nodding heads. I am seeing no requests for the floor. So Ladies and Gentlemen, I think that means we can as we say at least in my language, declare victory. We have conquered this text and I believe at this point having deleted the noting further we have text with no square brackets. So the next item is to say as a whole can we agree to approve this as a modification to Resolution 22 and send forward to the editorial Committee? Okay. I see no requests for the floor. Thank you very much for your cooperation, Ladies and Gentlemen. I think this is a good result. We agree to this modification. So Ladies and Gentlemen, then I would like to return. So under agenda point 5 we also had -- we have the proposal for a draft new recommendation, AFCP-1, 42 Addendum 1. So understanding what that backdrop is I would like to resume our discussions of this proposal on a new

Resolution. So the input document is Africa 42 Addendum 1. So Cote D'Ivoire, please.

>> COTE D'IVOIRE: Thank you, Chairman. And good morning, to one and all and thank you for giving me the floor to present once again this document on behalf of the Africa group. As was mentioned yesterday there were informal discussions with the parties concerned and this will lead to modifications to 22 taking in to account the current Resolution text and modifications will concern a part of the Resolution in order for these discussions to be taken in to account. We have also considered the possibility which you envisaged to mention the series in the Resolution 22, given the specific circumstances in this situation it is important for this Resolution to be adopted as a whole. And so as a result of all of the discussions that we have had we have introduced two modifications in the part instructs. The first point of that will become compared to the former language instructs the director of the Telecommunications Standardization Bureau and in cooperation with the directors of other bureau to take the necessary measures to assess the implementation of the WTSA by all parties concerned. I can continue? And so the part instructs, 4.1, becomes instructs the TSB director in cooperation with the directors of the other bureau to take the necessary steps to assess the implementation of the WTSA Resolutions by all parties concerned. Under 2, the TSB director is instructed to take account of the implementation of the WTSA Resolutions and submit a report to TSAG. So these are the two changes which we have proposed to remain in line with modifications to Resolution 22 in order this Resolution can be adopted by your meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Cote D'Ivoire. So I think we need to try to capture these at dictation speed to make sure that we have the proper text. So I think if I understood correctly the instructs in this Resolution would be all for the director of the Telecommunication Standardization Bureau and this would effect what the director will provide as part of his WTSA-16 action plan submitted towards TSAG reporting the progress of those. So one other comment as we are dictating I think one thing we saw missing from here is any resolves, which we could fix easily by saying resolves to instruct the director of the TSB in cooperation with the directors of the other bureau. So that would just be instruct to the director of TSB in cooperation of the directors of the other bureau. And then the words I heard were to instructs 1 would be to take in to account the implementation of WTSA Resolutions by all parties. And then I think the second was to report to TSAG. But I didn't quite scribble down all the words on my paper here, nor was it typed. So if I can turn the floor back over to Cote D'Ivoire to take

the words. We were able to capture and finish with the words we are missing.

>> COTE D'IVOIRE: Thank you, Chairman. I will try to voice this out as slowly as possible so that the Secretariat can note the modifications made to the instructions section. As I was saying 1, under instructs, instructs the director of the Telecommunication Standardization Bureau in collaboration with the other directors or with the directors rather of the other bureau with the directors of the other bureau to take the steps necessary or to take the necessary steps, the necessary steps to assess the implementation, to assess the implementation of the Resolutions of WTSA by all parties concerned. By all parties concerned. And so we mean the Member States and sector members and then under 2, we still instruct the director of the TSB to take account of the implementation of the Resolutions of WTSA and submit, to take account of the implementation of the Resolutions of WTSA and submit an assessment report. And to submit an assessment report to TSAG. To TSAG. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Cote D'Ivoire. So I think that's clear. The elements of what TSAG has been requested to do are taken on board in the update to Resolution 22 and so this is providing further clarification for the duties of the director with respect to the information to be provided towards TSAG. So one more sort of editorial thing. So we saw missing resolves and put it in front of instructs the director of TSB but I am noting one other operative part which is above which is invites Member States and sectors. We move resolves, resolves to invite the Member States and sector members, 1 and 2. And then to instruct the director. Again point 1 and point 2. So then I think we have captured the two points. So it is not TSAG that's being asked to do something in this Resolution. It is the director and the Member States and sector members. So hopefully the proposal is clear. The floor is open Ladies and Gentlemen for discussion of this proposal. Senegal, please.

>> SENEGAL: When I wrote a little bit the text, I would like to propose to replace necessary steps by necessary actions. Because in French we say it (speaking in a non-English language).

>> CHAIR: Thank you Senegal. A further comments or discussion? UK please.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: We thank the African region for proposing this Resolution. It is very well intentioned. I'm just a bit concerned about the practicality of it in that there are 189 roughly Member States. There are a large number of sector members and there is a large number of Resolutions. This is a substantial amount of work. We have the TSAG Chair here. Perhaps knowing how busy TSAG is how this could work. Perhaps I

could ask the TSAG Chair to or even the African region how this is going to be put in to practice. But certainly the sentiments are good. But it causes me just -- I need to think about it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UK. TSAG Chairman, please.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Yes, thank you, Chairman. Chairman, at our TSAG meeting we have a report from the director on the implementation of the WTSA action plan which includes all of the Resolutions. Now the expectation would be for any specific action to be highlighted and this -- these actions would be conveyed to the membership. It would be up to the Member States and sector members present that TSAG determine options for any actions that could be undertaken. And advice provided in turn to the director. The director particularly if there are financial implications would include these in the consideration of his report to the council. So I think this is how the process would work. I agree that it would be difficult for TSAG itself to do anything with regard to the actions that are envisaged for this Resolution or any other Resolution. But the prime responsibility of TSAG is advisory in nature and we can certainly provide the director with some direction as to priorities, particularly in the context of the action plan and in the consideration of the operational plan. As you know Chairman, we regularly seem to ignore any review of the operational plan. Perhaps these sorts of issues highlight the importance and need at our future meetings for reviewing the operational plan so that the director can have a clear idea of the priority of certain activities that can be reflected not only in the operational plan but also eventually in the Strategic Plan, which as you know will be revised in two years' time at the Plenipotentiary Conference. All this information is quite important but our particular role is advisory in nature and on that basis I am sure we can provide some very good advice to the director. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Dr. Gracie. I would also note that TSAG as many groups do receives a great deal of information and many, many reports. And generally what requires discussion are not the routine items but the exception items. So items where there is difficulty in understanding or implementation of a particular Resolution where the expected actions are occurring, and there are no difficulties encountered I wouldn't expect TSAG or any other body takes meeting time to do anything other than note a report. I wouldn't expect all 193 Member States to give a report of each individual WTSA Resolution. I would expect them to contribute where they find difficulty of any understanding of Resolutions. Most meetings will work on identifying those exception areas and I certainly wouldn't expect TSAG to be going through Member State by Member State Resolution by Resolution

where things are going as expected. Cote D'Ivoire, please.

>> COTE D'IVOIRE: Thank you, Chair. Let me also express my thanks to the head of TSAG who has clarified things. For us we believe that there is a provision of this Resolution which is proposing something which we think could work along the lines of what we are asking for in the Resolution. For example, to utilize the PrepComs for the World Assemblies to look at the Resolutions as a whole and see where we stand with them and that is for the different regions that all make up ITU. We could say ask that these regions propose improvements and help implement Resolutions. We believe that the assessment of the implementation of Resolutions by Member States is an important thing. It allows us to see what problems arise in implementation and see how improvements can be made to different Resolutions, adopted by WTSA. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Cote D'Ivoire. Simply observe that it doesn't appear that regions need any special invitation for this. We have proposals from every region in to this Assembly for modifications of existing Resolutions and new Resolutions. I think that every regional WTSA preparatory meeting has taken in to account the Resolutions and evaluated the places where that region sees any difficulty or any change required. So I think that everyone understands when we come to a WTSA that we do have available for us to modify any of the Resolutions under our purview. So I think that's understood. And we -- we don't need additional text telling people to do that. But for the text we have here, so I would like to try to focus the discussion towards making sure that we have text in front of us, that we would be able to try to agree as a proposed new Resolution. So I would like to return to that discussion. So we have the text as proposed. Are there any other comments on this proposed new Resolution? Orange, please.

>> ORANGE TELECOM: Thank you, Chair. What I would like to understand in the first instructs, when we say by all parties concerned, now the representative of Cote D'Ivoire said that sector members are a part of this, but I'm afraid that a certain number of enterprises, perhaps even the great majority, if you asked them for their opinions on the implementation of Resolutions of WTSA, most of them wouldn't even answer because these Resolutions are more texts for the Member States than sector members. And so if private firms don't respond, what conclusion do we draw? And perhaps through you I can ask Cote D'Ivoire to answer that question. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Orange. And I certainly tend to agree. I think many sector members involved in the technical work of the Study Group never read the WTSA proceedings. They are aware of the responsibility and mandate of the Study Group

they attend and the text of the question or two that they are active and contributing to. And they are aware of which work items are under development in those questions. But I think more many of those companies I think they are involved in a particular slice of the work and find the Resolutions aren't immediately relevant to their day-to-day work. Of course, it does apply to the A series recommendations that govern how that work is carried out. Resolution 1 the fundamental rules of procedure, how we approve those documents but beyond that many of the other Resolutions don't have a great deal of meaning in the day-to-day work of many of the Delegates and many of the questions. So I would tend to agree that only in cases where there are difficulties would I expect to hear input from a Member State or a sector member. We do have many Resolutions that invite Member States and sector members to do things. And it is not a Treaty conference as we are sometimes reminded by the legal advisor. So we are not taking any decisions that are binding on any Member State or sector member. But we are trying to gather certain input so that TSAG can carry out its work. So Cote D'Ivoire, any response to the issues raised by Orange?

>> COTE D'IVOIRE: Yes. Thank you, Chair. And thank you for your explanation. I would like to thank the representative of Orange for his question. I think that sector members are part of ITU. They are members of the ITU just like Member States. And when we attend the WTSA and we adopt Resolutions some of these invite private enterprises as much as the public sector. So what we are saying here is that in Resolutions that have to be implemented by all parties concerned and this would involve enterprises. When we invite sector members and when we say sector members and others are invited to implement Resolutions that's what we mean. Also during the PrepComs and the PrepCom for WTSA bring together people from all parts of the ITU, and they are the ones who are charged or have to look in to implementation of Resolutions. I say this just by way of providing more elements to this discussion. In other words, we think there are things that can be done by members like enterprises as well as Member States. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Cote D'Ivoire. Other comments on this proposed text of a new Resolution? So let me ask, would Committee 3 be prepared to adopt based on the text we see in front of us proposed new Resolution for us to send forward to the Plenary? So after some consultation we will approve to send this new Resolution forward to Ed Comm in the Plenary. It has been advised that pulling together this information might have financial implications. The Committee 2 Chair has authorization to take on board additional inputs in preparation of the final report, financial impact for the conference. So the remaining

items of business for Committee 3 are to review Resolution 1 and A.12 and as I said A.12 is awaiting some information from Working Group 4B -- I'm sorry. The regional group aspect of Resolution 1 is information from Working Group 4B and I don't know the schedule for the mandate of Study Group 3 and Study Group 11 to consider the A.12 modifications. Presumably we will do that later in the day when we have more information available. A.1 the last we checked was available in DT98 in all languages except Arabic. Is that still the situation? So we would have the option to move forward based on discussion of Resolution 1 with the text and languages available or we could defer until our afternoon session if we want to have text available in all six languages. Cote D'Ivoire then Australia.

>> COTE D'IVOIRE: Thank you, Chair. Sorry to take you back but I'm not quite sure that I understood what we are going to do with our draft Resolution as we proposed it.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I think we had just taken a decision to send this forward to Ed Comm. So we asked the room, we did not hear any opposition. And took a decision. So I think this item for us is complete and Ed Comm and Comm 2 will take the next steps. Australia, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Yes, thank you very much, Chair. Sorry, I wanted to take the floor on behalf of Argentina and not Australia. I think the microphones got mixed up. In any case we were just reviewing DT98. There is only one version in Spanish and we -- should we be working with rev 1 or are there changes that have -- that would affect our studying this in Spanish?

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Argentina. I hadn't even noticed revision 1. So the first document was not available yet in Arabic but indeed the revision 1 is not available in Spanish or Arabic but in the other four languages. Let me propose that while we wait for that to occur there were two other small matters of business we could dispense with on our agenda. So that would be to go back and take the formal reports of Working Groups 3A and 3B. So we can take that and then there is a small piece of A.12 which is not related to Committee 4 work that there were some consultations on. So perhaps we can close on that. And by the time we have done that work either we will have Resolution 1 available in the other languages but certainly no later than our afternoon session. So yes, given the information that there is a revision 1 and perhaps people haven't had a chance to check we'll wait for that text to be available. So if I can then ask for reports of the final reports of the Committees. So Working Group of the -- of the Working Groups rather, Working Group 3A report is in DT17 Revision 1. Mr. Raghy, please.

>> AHMED RAGHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good morning,

for all colleagues. Our Working Group report is available in document DT17 and the report simply briefed the results on the discussions for our meetings. Mainly for the main three documents that we discussed during our fifth -- five meetings. I would like to go through the substance of the report Mr. Chairman. Mainly we approved Resolution 32 and we also approved to maintain A.1 with no change beyond the TSAG changes. And we will review TSAG to consider the update of A.1 as a priority and regarding Resolution 1 situation that we have -- we went through the whole text of proposals for amendment of Resolution 1 and we have some square brackets and we now inform our consultation to conclude the final text for Resolution 1. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Mr. Raghy. Are there any questions or comments to this report? I see no requests for the floor. So we accept and approve that report. The next report is from Working Group 3B in DT24 rev 1. 3B Chairman, please.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you, Chairman. I simply like to briefly describe the outcome of the meeting, the two meetings of Working Group 3B. And I'm pleased to announce that all of our work items have now been completed and approved by the your Committee. So I don't believe we need to go in to any detail. I simply like to thank all of those colleagues who have participated in the work of 3B and particularly the Secretariat who provided as usual their tremendous support for the work. So I don't believe that there are any remaining questions. So I present this document for your noting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Dr. Gracie, for this report. Any questions or comments to this report of Working Group 3B? I see no requests for the floor. So that's approved. So then the other item of business and unfortunately we don't seem to be spending very much time on these but we can at least get them on our list, so there were in proposals for recommendation A.12 there was one of these proposals that is independent of the results of Committee 4 and that was the CEPT proposal 45 Addendum 5. And I understood that there were to be some informal consultations on that proposal and I was wondering if we had any progress or a way forward concerning this proposal. This was -- Russia please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. I apologize but I do need to go back to the previous document. In section 110 on Resolution 57, in the second paragraph it says and so the matter related to matters addressed by Resolution 18 and both topics will be reconsidered at the next Working Group 3B meeting. I'm afraid that this text is regarding the previous report because at the last meeting of 3B the Working Group proposed deleting Resolution 57 for the reason that its content

was already reflected in Resolution 18. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. I think the answer and I'll turn it to the 3B Chair for confirmation is that these are cumulative reports of discussions of the Committees and that was the situation as of the first of two sessions of 3B and hopefully would find later on in the report the final Resolution which is as you just described it. But let me ask Dr. Gracie for clarification.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Yes, thank you, Chairman. Yes, indeed. The final report with regard to the disposition of Resolution 57 is found on the second but last page. So the information at the first part of the report is the result of first meeting but the results of the second meeting are included in the remainder of the report. The remainder of the report is quite accurate as to the status of Resolution 57. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So hopefully that's clear and doesn't require -- we make any amendment to the report. These as usual are a chronological sequence of discussions. So as I said the next thing I wanted to return to was the discussion about identification of the approval process and I wish to inquire whether there was any outcome of the informal consultations about a possible way forward on that proposal. Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, we had a brief discussion yesterday afternoon and my colleagues from the African Group and from the Arab group promised me to provide me with information whether they would be able to accept the small addition we would like to see under clause 2.5. So I haven't received anything yet from them. So I don't know whether yes or no. Sorry for that. But it is going around now three days. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So let me inquire briefly. Of course, we are not going to finish A.12 until we have the information from Committee 4 on the other items. But whether the African and Arab regions were able to consider this further. And I see from another region Russia please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. We have a proposal to jump forward. As far as I was informed by my colleagues who are currently working on Comm 4 the issue on the terms of reference of Comm 3 was reviewed there. The working document which already exists at Comm 4 was approved with no modifications, including the name or rather the Study Group as was already noted. In some administrations there have been concerns raised about the possible influence of results of discussing terms of reference on the names of the Study Group. This -- but because no such modifications have taken place and because the text with the name of the Study Groups is already in existence before us, I would like to propose considering those

names possible changes in the recommendations also, in order that we already have a compiled complete text and we could then formally approve it once we formally get confirmation from Comm 4. Perhaps this is a way to save time. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. I would like to close though on the first point and at least understand whether there are still consultations required or if we are able to agree on the CEPT proposal. I would remind that I think there is also a proposal including as far as proposed update to the Q series which would depend on the terms of reference for study group 11. And so I think we would want confirmation that both of those were available and finalized before moving forward on those. So you mentioned Study Group 3 which was one regarding the title of the D series but I think there was also a proposal concerning Q series just to remind Delegates. So I did want to get an answer concerning the status of the first point, whether more time is required. So I did want to check whether all parties were now okay with that proposal or would accept that proposal or whether there is still consultation required before people are ready to accept that proposal. So let me ask the question a slightly different way. Would there be any opposition to accepting the CEPT proposal and I'll add the word now, just to say well, please take the floor if you require until later this afternoon to provide an answer. Okay. I did want to allow sufficient time but I would interpret that I'm not seeing any objection to accepting the CEPT proposal concerning recommendation A.12. So we can return to the other proposals. We had two updating series of recommendations and I am informed that the proposal on the Q series should be easy and -- okay. So if we could look at that part of the proposal, 47 Addendum 24 concerning the title of the Q series. Okay. So the proposal for the Q series which currently has the title switching and signalling would be to add and associated measurements and tests. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much. Chairman, colleagues, because this proposal came from the RCC administrations in support of this proposal, I would like to make a comment. This language was considered at the TSAG meeting. It is a compromise between the positions of the Comm 11 and 12 Study Groups. I'd also like to note that during consultations between those Study Groups 11 and 12 which already took place at this Assembly, this language preserves the balance that was achieved in those discussions. Therefore, we would like to request reviewing whether it is possible to adopt it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Any comments on this proposal? Okay. I see no requests for the floor. So I think that proposal is agreed. And then we return to the title of the

D series. I hesitate to make a final decision based on a working document of another Committee, but we had two formulations for expressing the title of the D series. So we have the one proposed here and we had another proposal in 43 Addendum 13. Okay. Somewhat longer formulation here. So the floor is open for discussion of this versus the alignment with the scope of work for Study Group 13. United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, everyone. Just a general comment, have we completed work on Res 2? I'm concerned that we are making a decision to change the recommendations titles here and we haven't fully completed the work in the other committee on the mandate of the Study Groups and I -- from my perspective there is a correlation here and we would not feel comfortable making that decision now. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, we have the same concern as the United States and in our preference in any case we just to take the title of the Study Group as it will be adopted hopefully during the day and then it would be no problem. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So your proposal then Germany would be to use whatever would be a title of Study Group 3 and D series of recommendations? I am seeing nodding from Germany that that's their proposal. Russia please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much Chairman. On behalf of the RCC countries we would like to inform this meeting that we agree with the name of the V series which coincides fully with the name of Study Group 3. And I will read this in English to avoid any confusion. Accounting principles and international communication/SCT economics and policy issues, so this was what was coordinated and agreed within the Ad Hoc Group. It was presented today at Comm 4. And in our opinion there is just one formal step remaining to get the -- to receive the document officially from Comm 4. So I would like to draw your attention to the fact that in our approval notably on regulation I know that can be a problem for the administrations. In our opinion at the current time there are no such contradictions or problems. The countries of the RCC therefore propose naming the series after the title of the Study Group 3. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Cote D'Ivoire, please.

>> COTE D'IVOIRE: Thank you, Chairman. I would like to second the previous speakers representing Russia and also I think it was United States, I don't remember. Anyway, there was a lot of discussion at the Ad Hoc Group about the title of Study Group 3 and about its terms of reference. The Ad Hoc Group ultimately reached agreement on the title and terms of reference

of SG3. This would then be adopted at Comm 4. I have not participated this morning in Comm 4's work. And so I second the position of Russia. And I would like to say that the recommendations for this series should carry the same name as the title of the Study Group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Cote D'Ivoire. So I have heard proposals from several that we should simply mimic the title of the Study Group and the name of the series and what remains is to verify with Committee 4 the status of the agreement to that before we take a final decision in Committee 3. The United States raised a concern about Resolution 2 but if the title is agreed with some of the points of guidance still to be discussed under it as long as the points of guidance don't come up in to the title, perhaps that doesn't need to delay our work. So we will check that. But I think the -- at least from the proposals I have heard we don't need to look directly at the original RCC or Arab States proposals because these were views before the discussion was opened in the Assembly for the mandate of Study Group 3. So provisionally we will look to do that and I will confirm over lunch with the Committee 4 Chairman the status of those agreements. Okay. Regarding Resolution 1, so Ladies and Gentlemen we do have ten more minutes until lunch. We -- the situation is that the revision 1 text is available in four languages only at this point. So let me ask your preference, whether we proceed to start with review based on the English language version, if that's okay with participants, we can try to do the beginning of our review. If people would prefer to wait until 1430 when I think I would have more confidence we would have all six languages available, we can also take that as well. So I suspect we have time if we wait until 1430 but I'm in your hands, Ladies and Gentlemen. If you would like to use the ten minutes we can. Otherwise we will come back at 1430 and start Resolution 1 beginning to end. Any comment? So the two languages that we are missing at this point would be Arabic and Spanish. So I'll look to the two main regions involved and say would you like to proceed now or would you rather wait until those translations are available. Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you very much, Chair. Well, I think that we can take advantage of these ten minutes to begin considering. We can go slowly and we'll be able to follow the English version until the Spanish version arrives. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: (Speaking in a non-English language). Thank you, Chairman. We are happy to continue working with the English text as we wait for the Arab and Spanish text when they come this afternoon. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So you have the text of the beginning

of Resolution 1 on the screen in front of you. So there is some editorial sorts of things that are at the beginning. So the first square bracketed text coming from Working Group 3A is concerning the ITRs. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. I really do apologize most sincerely but I would like to draw your attention to the title of the Russian language version. Of course, this only concerns one of the six languages but it is very important for us and we would not like to raise this issue at the Plenary. The thing is in the existing version if I am to translate this myself in to English the Resolution is called internal regulations of ITU-T says the Russian Delegation's translation and we would like to bring this in line with the English version and change the Russian text to rules of procedure for the standardization sector. I think the Secretariat can pass that on to the drafting Committee. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. We will inform the editorial Committee to ensure that the title of the Resolution is aligned. Back to the point at hand, we have this sentence in square brackets relating to the ITRs. Comments on this text. United States please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you. Yes, the UAE and the U.S. were to get together and have a consultation on this text. There was no -- we were still discussing and however there was no agreement. The issue and I guess this is a question for the legal advisor, if the general reference to both sets of ITRs because my understanding is that administrations are party to different versions of the ITRs and here it would be inappropriate to have just Articles relating to 2012. However the U.S. could compromise with a general reference to both the -- to the 1988 and the 2012. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you United States. So the proposal would be that at least one administration would be able to agree to this text if we were to delete Dubai 2012. Switzerland, please.

>> SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chairman. Through you could we get a clarification about which Article is referred to at the very beginning of letter C. Is this the Articles of the constitution or the Convention or some other Articles? Next if this concerns the Articles of the Convention, I'm not completely sure that the ITU-R of 2012 and 1998 are mentioned in the minutes of the meeting. And so we would need a clear clarification as to which Articles are referred to. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So to be clear, Switzerland you are referring to the first considering which cites a number of constitution Articles and Convention Articles? So the very first considering which hasn't been modified is editorial. Next is United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. It is not just

deleting Dubai 2012. We have concerns with the Articles relating to, we are not sure which Articles we are talking about here. So we really need to have a question from the legal advisor on how we are to articulate these in the Resolutions. So thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Apparently the legal advisor is not in the room and we are just about at the point of closing for lunch. So we can ensure that he is here afterwards. I have Saudi Arabia in the queue.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. We agree with the United States as regards the first comment as regards the ITU-R. Given that the legal advisor is absent we will await consultations with that advisor and we will try to work over that language again to meet the expectations of each party. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. So that has brought us essentially to the point of 12:30 when it is time to break for lunch. So will wish you all a bon appetite. But besides eating I hope you take the opportunity for some consultations and we will ensure that the legal advisor is available for some of these questions when we resume at 1430. Thank you very much.

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

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