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>> CHAIR: Good morning, everybody. Let's resume.

On our Agenda we had skipped over Resolutions 55 and 68. We are still waiting on documents but hopefully we come back to those this afternoon.

The next Item we have to visit is listed as Drafting Group on Academic Resolutions, but in fact the Drafting Group decided the new resolution was not of the same topic as Resolution 71 so we have a document DT60 which is the result of the Drafting Group on updates to Resolution 71.

Mr. Abdullah, Chair of the Drafting Group, could you introduce this for us, please?

>> MUSAB ABDULLAH: As you noted, we kept the two resolutions separate. This was based on the request from the Brazilian delegate and supported by Canada. What I'll do is go through DT60 but only through the broad strokes and general intent of the changes.

We had four proposals, one from the TSB, one from Canada, one the Arab states and one from the African nations.

The four proposals were actually quite similar. It was just mostly an issue of what text to adopt.

Broadly speaking the considering section refers to various resolutions that support academia and dealt with academia. There was one consideration regarding level of financial contribution relative to the parties as important contributions of academia and also another point that stresses that academia shall not have a role in decision-making of any sort.

Moving on to the "recognizing," most of the paragraphs here deal with Kaleidoscope and recognizing its positive contributions. And then we have a section that states: "...bearing in mind acceptance of applications for participation of I2T shall be conditional on the support of the Member State to which it belongs but this will not conflict with academia currently listed as sector members or associates."

Then the meat of the Article under Resolves essentially begins with resolves to assess the participation of academia since the approval of resolution 169 of Guadalajara, and then we go on to various points that talk about allowing academia to participate in the various I2T activities so what we have listed is TSAG, the GSS, WTSA, WTSA side events and exhibitions.

We also make mention of academia having access to ITU-T documents and a representative from them may serve as Rapporteur. The resolution also talks about assigning to TSAG study of the need for any additional measures and/or arrangements to participate and benefit from their expertise.

There is also under "resolves" that the amount of the financial -- annual financial contribution shall be a reduced amount, particularly for academia in developing countries. As requested in the Com 3 meeting we have removed specific financial amounts.

We then have a section that instructs the Director of the TSB to continue his efforts to explore and recommend. Various mechanisms to facilitate increased participation and also geographical regions and point 2 is to continue to organise Kaleidoscope annually and point three is to cooperate with ITU Telecom to spread awareness of the value of academia.

Then we have two invites section. One invites the council to consider in submitting its report to the next plenipotentiary the positive contribution to the various activities made by academia and recommend that academia continue to be admit today participate in the work of the three sectors of ITU on a permanent basis.

Finally we invite to inform of this resolution and support them to join ITU-T and participate in its activities.

This resolution was reached by consensus by the various parties during the Working Groups and I hand it back to you, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Abdullah.

Before I open the floor, just one small point from my side in Resolves 5. The word "observer" has a very special meaning in our text and I think the language we normally use and I trust this is what you mean is that the participation shall be not in an observer capacity but in a non-advisory capacity.

So if I can take that, that small amendment, with that, I'll put the text for comment.

Any comments or suggestions concerning the text brought to us by the Drafting Group? Okay. I see no requests for the floor. So can I take the text as you find in DT60 with that amendment just mentioned a non-advisory capacity in Resolves 5? Can I take that as agreed? And we will forward this to the Plenary via the Editorial Committee.

Okay. Thank you, that's agreed.

This brings us next to the Drafting Group on A.7 so we entrusted this to Mr. Gracie, assisted by Mr. Dubuisson. You'll find the revised text in DT62 and I think we have had remarkable progress after I think almost three years of this in TSAG

So Mr. Gracie, DT62, please.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Yes, thank you very much, Chairman.

Chairman, DT62 outlines the major amendments to recommendation I2T A7 concerning focus groups. Chairman, perhaps I should go through this rather quickly given the fact that it has been under review for quite some time.

Before I begin, with the consideration of this document, I would like to express my particular thanks and appreciation to Mr. Dubuisson for all of his work in ensuring that both the text from TSAG and the proposals that were submitted to this Assembly were reflected in the document that we could review last -- on Saturday when the ad hoc group met.

It was of great assistance in going through the document and I certainly appreciate the fact that a lot of work has gone into this to ensure that we could reach consensus in our ad hoc group.

So Chairman, we have slightly amended the title to reflect exactly what this recommendation is dealing with and that is the establishment of working procedures. As you can see the scope has been somewhat broadened, not broadened but clarified, and the establishment of the focus groups has been clarified and you can see that in the Paragraph 2.1.

This was certainly a subject for discussion at the ad hoc group and as you can see in this text, particularly the final bullet, there should be normally at least four members from among Member States or sector members from different Member States who commit to actively support the new focus group before it is established.

This was one of the key areas that was discussed during the course of the ad hoc group. Some of the other amendments are reflected here, some of them were discussed as I mentioned in the course of the discussion in TSAG and in the correspondence group which was established.

Now, with respect to some of the other areas, as you can see, there are a number of amendments to the general area of the establishment of focus groups. Many of them are just to clarify text and procedures. The leadership is addressed in section 2.3. In section 3, we have the focus group working procedures addressed.

Now, at section 4 where much of the discussion took place during the ad hoc group concerning the financing of focus groups and their meetings, and certain clarifications have been brought to the text so it's absolutely clear the role of the TSB and in addition, the various aspects associated with financing are clarified.

Now, section 4 now reads that: "The financing of meetings and their preparation is accomplished by volunteer hosting in a similar manner to Rapporteur groups or on the basis of financial arrangements determined by the focus group, provided there is no incremental increase in expenditures and no adverse impact on the normal work of the Study Groups and TSAG except for encouraging, participation of persons with disabilities, in accordance with the relevant Resolves of Resolution 175 of the plenipotentiary conference and for supporting the participation of representatives of developing countries in accordance with the relevant resolves of Resolution 123," again, "of the plenipotentiary conference.  
 Some of this is repeated in section 5 on administrative support. Again, there shall be no incremental increase in expenditures and no adverse impact. We use the word "shall" here, "shall be no inverse impact on the normal work of the Study Groups in TSAG, again with the exceptions that I have just outlined with respect to persons with disabilities and those who participate from developing countries.

As far as meeting logistics are concerned in number 6, we have added words to the effect that participation of persons with disabilities, including the provision of electronic documents in accessible formats, shall be encouraged in accordance with the plenipotentiary conference resolution 175.

As far as the working language focus groups are concerned, it is indicated that the language to be used mutually agreed by the focus group participants; however, any communication with a parent group shall preferably be in English or one of the other ITU official languages.

Now, the other sections deal with the such matters as intellectual property rights, the approval and distribution of the deliverables, and so on.

Finally, "the meeting and progress reports of the mechanics of those reports being submitted as well as meeting announcements are addressed in the rest of the recommendation."  
 So, Chairman, I don't believe I need to go into any more detail. I would again like to express my appreciation to Monsieur Dubuisson for his great assistance during the ad hoc group and of course to the participants themselves for their spirit of compromise and cooperation during the discussions.

I was very pleased we could complete this task in the allotted time and, again, it was through the good will of all those who participated in this difficult exercise.

Thank you very much, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Gracie and Mr. Dubuisson, for these efforts and I will join Mr. Gracie in thanking the participants. I think this is a great achievement after a lot of hard work and I am delighted to see the spirit of compromise that has brought what appears to be a complete and stable document to us for our consideration.

Are there any questions or comments to the substance of the text in DT62 that has been brought to us for revision of recommendation A.7? Any requests for the floor?

I see no requests for the floor so can I ask your agreement to this as text of revised recommendation A.7 for us to forward via the Editorial Committee to the Plenary for approval?

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

That brings us to Agenda point 5, the first of two proposed new resolutions. So we have the initial proposal in document 58 addendum 4, but pending our consideration, the Editorial Committee has made some suggestions for us. I think they are in fact editorial but we do have a document which you'll find in the Working Documents Area. I can't list that on the Agenda but Working Document 9 is in fact 58 addendum 4 with some editorial suggestions in a markup form.

If we can work from that, I think if we decide to adopt a new resolution, that will save us some time. So what you'll see on the screen is actually Working Document 9 and you will find that on the website in the Working Documents Area.

So Canada, please, can you introduce this?

>> CANADA: Thank you.

Document 58, Addendum 4 from Canada addresses the issue of strengthening collaboration in the work of the ITU-T. Historically it has recognized the need to cooperate with other existing standards bodies. ITU-T's external cooperation is guided by three recommendations: A4, A5, and A6. Additionally, Resolution 1 Rules of Procedures of the ITU Telecommunications Standardization Sector makes it very clear that cooperation with other relevant standards bodies is desirable. For example, 4.2 notes a principle duty is is to foster cooperation and coordination with other relevant bodies. In clause 5.16 it is noted that a Director shall seek to foster cooperation and coordination with the other standardization organisations for the benefit of all members. And in Claus 7.3.1 it is noted TSAG shall ensure the questions respond to the overall needs and priorities of the work programme and are duly harmonized to facilitate cooperative efforts with other standardization organisations.

Mr. Chairman, over the last few years in view of the rapid development of technology and new applications and services, standardization activity in the areas of telecom services, networks and products has increased and this activity continues to be carried out in ITU-T national, regional and other standards development organisations.

Further, a number of Memorandum of Understandings have been established between ITU-T and relevant SDOs with an objective being to improve collaboration. In the communique from the Chief Technology Officer annual meeting in 2012, just took place two weekends ago it was noted that a new approach to international standardization is needed, one based on improved collaboration, cooperation and coordination with other organisations.

Further, ITU-T is asked to continue to promote an industry-led, consensus-based approach to standardization and encouraged propose joint development through mutual agreement or to utilize standards produced by other organisations via normative reference as appropriate.

Further, to this the global standards symposium of 2012 recognized that cooperation with other standards organisations was an essential component that has fueled innovation and success of the internet and identified a series of important questions to explore the strengths and weaknesses of current collaborative arrangements.

Given all these provision in place, one would expect that efficient collaboration should already exist between the ITU-T and other relevant bodies; however, it would appear from recent experiences that there is a need and an opportunity for further improvements.

In this regard, there have been discussions at recent TSAG meetings to re-advise A4 and A6 to reflect this desire for improved collaboration. A TSAG correspondence group was established to consider improvements to these recommendations as developed some proposed revisions. While this activity is helpful, it is Canada's considered opinion that this will not in itself address the current issues associated with collaboration.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this contribution is to recognize that there is a need for concrete action to be taken so collaboration between the ITU-T and relevant SDOs could be improved.

To address this, Canada proposes that WTSA officially recognized need for improved collaboration by creating a new resolution entitled Strength Collaboration. It is expected in response to this resolution action will be taken that will; A, identify areas where improvement is required; B, allow for development of a mechanism within ITU-T to achieve this objective; C, develop and define specific steps on how to coordinate activities with other relevant organisations regarding development of new questions that are intended to address new domains and work items under such questions. I think I'm at E; report for implementation of the new steps; F, work cooperatively with the relevant SDOs to improve cooperation; and finally, to provide a report to WTSA 16 providing outcomes of the actions taken.

The text for the proposed new resolution on strengthening collaboration is provided in the attachment to this document and this concludes my presentation.

Merci, Mr. President. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. Any questions for clarification on this proposal?

Mr. Gracie, please.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Yes. Thank you, Chairman.

Just to point out during the course of the discussions this weekend with respect to the establishment of the new Strategic Review Committee, a question was raised with respect to the relationship between this proposal and the activities that would be carried out by this review committee vis-a-vis a collaboration and cooperation. Now, as a result of the discussion that took place yesterday, the terms of reference of the review committee were amended by removing a reference to recommendations A4, A5, and A6 as well as recommendation A23 and Supplement 3, all of which relate to collaboration and cooperation between ITU-T and various organisations.

So Chairman, it would seem that because of that there is a relationship between the new review Committee and TSAG. TSAG would carry out activities associated with the various A series recommendations at a minimum and that the TSAG would simply be invited to establish and maintain a close and complementary relationship with this new Review Committee in order to develop certain synergies no recommend for recommend recommendations addressed to the objective of strengthen things the collaboration. As such, Chairman, to reflect the discussion in the ad hoc group on the Review Committee, again, the activities would be complementary and would not overlap. It would seem that that was the view, the general view of the participants at the meeting that took place on the Review Committee yesterday. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Gracie.

So it would be my understanding that it is the view that the Review Committee is something outside of TSAG and the subject of this resolution would be something inside of TSAG.

So to move on to the substance of the resolution, just before I give the floor to the United States who I see is asking for the floor, simply noticing and perhaps it's -- okay, not quite taken care of and what's come from the Editorial Committee -- the resolves 1 seems to ask for a mechanism and resolves 2 talks about a body. So it's almost assuming creation of the group rather than mechanism, so perhaps we can figure out a way to resolve that difference. Simply something that I'm noticing at my reading.

United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chairman.

Just to note that U.S. supports this proposal and that we will look forward to working with Canada. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Finland, please.

>> FINLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We also like to support this proposal and the proposal made by Bruce Gracie that is linked with this question about the Strategic Review Committee.

But I think that the one of the basic problems in this matter is that these are meeting only once a year. At the group which meets once a year, it cannot be very effective. So that hopefully that group which is preparing the mandate for this group that they also concede the possibilities to work effectively and achieve results so that -- and the financial implications this may cause. So that is what is needed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Other requests for the floor or comments to this proposal? Emirates, please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

I just want to ask: Will you be adopting this resolution or will you be looking at the results from the specialized group that was proposed by Canada and then coming back to this resolution? Just a question of clarity.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. That's of course up to the meeting. I think the clarification of Mr. Gracie was that he felt that these were distinct groups with different responsibilities. If that is agreed, it is something we might take action on independent of the other resolution. If that's not a shared view, then we could take it on board when we take a decision. Other comments to this proposed new resolution? I did hear several expressions of support for a new resolution and a clarification about why it was felt this was distinct from the Review Committee.

Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman.

Chairman, we have very clear instructions as to what should be done by TSAG. We have that in Resolution 22, we have it in the convention also so we have no objection to adopting this resolution. In fact, this is along the same lines as already determined by the convention and Resolution 22.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Emirates, please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson.

I would like to bring about a very simple modification and take into consideration D. One of the consequences of the WTSA-12 was the bringing about improvements on the new standardization so that organisations would not compete between themselves. I just want to change to "cooperate," so they can cooperate between themselves rather than to compete.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So the proposed amendment -- and let me see if there would be agreement to replace the word in -- I believe it's considering D to replace the word "Complement" with "Cooperate."

Is that an acceptable modification? That's the proposal? We'll see if there are some small things we can do here and if we have too many, we'll charter a Drafting Group. So is that a modification that would have support? I'm seeing some heads nodding.

Any opposition to replacing the word "complement" with "cooperate"? Okay. I see no requests for the floor so let's take that as a proposed amendment.

And Another issue that -- I see Mr. Dubuisson asking for the floor. Mr. Dubuisson, please.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Yes, thank you, Chairman. I'm speaking on behalf of France Telecom (indiscernible) and I have no objection in principle to this resolution although generally speaking we are not in favor of having a multiplication of resolutions within the T sector. We think we already have quite a lot of resolutions.

We also see here some potential overlap between the role of this possible Review Committee to be set up on the one hand and existing structures on the other. After all, we must not forget the role of TSAG and that's the point Russia was making in referring to 22, so I think if we are going to go on with this, at the very least we have to add somewhere, perhaps a noting section or another considering that refers to the fact that we already have things that already exist.

We have, for instance, the SCV; we have other kinds of across-the-board issues and we have a Memorandum of Understanding on e-business, we have a number of bodies in which the ITU is already involved. So we have to remember what we already have.

Somewhere in here we must recognize the fact we already have all these coordination groups so we haven't got coordination going out in every possible direction. We should also recall the recommendations and supplements we have on cooperation as well. I think somewhere we have to put all this in here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Before I had given the floor to Mr. Dubuisson, another thing that I had mentioned was what appeared to be a bit of an inconsistency between the third and -- sorry -- second and third bullets of Resolves 1 and Resolves 2, because in the former case we're talking about a mechanism and in the latter case talking about a body. So rather than trying to draft that on the floor, I think that it has been suggested that we find a way to recognize in the considering some of the other coordination activities that we already have that are going on, so that's a suggestion that we have for drafting and then the other thing is I would ask to find some reconciliation between mechanism and body because it is not fully clear to me from reading this. I think the idea is creation of a group but I think that is not entirely consistent within the body of the text.

Could I have a volunteer to undertake drafting? I think I hear general support so I don't see this as a matter of controversy; I see this as a matter of editorial and making sure that we have sufficient recognition of what already exists and perhaps in addition, if it is not too early to take onboard where Com 4 stands with respect to the new resolution on the Review Committee, that perhaps is worth also mentioning in the considering.

So can I have a volunteer to lead a small Drafting Group and then we'll ask to find a time when that can meet?

Mr. Gracie, you care to take this on, please? Okay. So Mr. Gracie, Vice-Chairman, will take this on. I think Working Group 3A meets this afternoon toward the end of lunchtime maybe. Or this evening. 1:30? So the suggestion is we look for a room at 1:30 for this drafting activity on the proposed new resolution from Canada. Look on the monitors for the room so it will be 1:30 today. Thank you.

We'll move on, then, to the new proposed resolution from Brazil. When we visited Resolution 71, the Drafting Group had decided this was distinct from the proposal from the other resolution on academia and so we already had had an introduction and discussion of this, so I won't ask for it to be presented again. We do have, and I'll call your attention to it, a markup from the Editorial Committee that should we agree to this in its current form has some suggested editorial revisions to that, that is in Working Document 10 under the Com 3 Working Documents area on the website.

So let me move us back to the discussion we were having when this was originally introduced. Any comments or questions on what you will find in Working Document 10 or if you want to look at the original proposal from document 57 Addendum 11.

Any comments to that proposal for a new resolution? The essence here was to give some recognition to key contributors and editors in the published recommendations. Any comments to that proposal?

Emirates, please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman.

With reference to this proposal from Brazil, we would like to make the following comment: We support the idea of this, and we support the principle, but we think it would be very difficult to put into practice and we think any application mechanism would be extremely difficult to establish. Could the Delegation of Brazil explain how they see this resolution implemented? After all we are asking ITU-T to do a number of things here and we are seeing that in the reports of all groups involved in discussion, certain things should be included but this is just not possible for all sector members and Member States.

So what exactly are we going to do? Are we going to be giving universities and academic bodies the opportunity of including the name of the person or department involved in their work in reports to ITU-T? I would really like clarification of how this is actually supposed to work in practice. In principle we have no objection but we do have some questions as to how it would work.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. In fact, Brazil has next asked for the floor so if I can ask that you try to respond to that as well as the point you had in mind when you originally asked for the floor. Thank you.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thanks for the delegate of the United Emirates for the question which could help me bringing to the Plenary the best orientation on what we are proposing.

The first thing is we have two objectives in this proposal resolution and the first of course is to put an name of the main contributors to new recommendations being published by ITU in the ITU-T and the second one is to request the TSB to work with the ministries in order to make this recommendation accomplished.

It is very important that the ministries recognize the ministries of science and technology, for instance, recognize the work being done by professors in ITU-T but also in other sectors of ITU.

Regarding the specific question of my distinguished colleague from the UAE, I have put in the screen and the first presentation some examples of how IETF and other SDOs make in these terms and they put the names of all the Chair, all the authors and all the main contributors as an annex to the recommendation.

Of course this is just an example. We don't need exactly to follow the examples or recommendations in these SDOs, but they are very important for us in order to give us an orientation.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, since I have the floor right now, after legal advice that came to us, Brazil would like to make more contributions to the text, including a recall to Resolution 66 of plenipotentiary and new resolves 4 which deals with Intellectual Property considering that none of the above is intended to breach the copyright held by the UN. We think that with this introduction, questions regarding Intellectual Property would be properly dealt and no confusion would be conceived to this proposal resolution.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, and if I may, perhaps a small drafting group could treat these issue and come back to this Plenary with a final text for this Committee's consideration. Thank you, and we are open to respond to other questions if it appears. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In principle, the concept of support for academia and the work and its impact on the work of ITU-T as well as other organisations is something that we definitely support.

This question raised by the Distinguished Delegate of Brazil was also an important issue on the Agenda of the last plenipotentiary conference.

So I think the proposal by Brazil to form a small Drafting Committee to put all the elements involved in these areas that have been considered in this issue would be useful and we are ready to get involved in this Drafting Group if it is so required. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Uruguay, please.

>> URUGUAY: Thank you, Chairman. Uruguay supports Brazil's proposal as well as the proposal to set up a group discussing their best way to have this recognition as a public type of recognition to build in the work of research institutions while maintaining the neutrality of ITU recommendations. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

China, please.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We support Brazil's proposal to set up a small Drafting Group to actually explore the involvement of academia in ITU-T's work. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Paraguay, please.

>> PARAGUAY: Thank you, Chairman.

We believe that appropriate recognition of academic researchers concerning contribution to standardization work would be important if we wished to encourage such participation. It would also allow a Resolution 71 to be more effective.

In terms of how to carry this forward, it would be a separate issue in ITU-T documents so this could be analyzed by the Drafting Group which was recently proposed.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, and I apparently don't have a way to keep my Vice-Chairman in the queue or the people on the podium in the queue but Mr. Dubuisson has asked for the floor before I give the floor to Russia. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Chairman. Yet again I'm speaking as a sector member. I'm surprised how things are going. I think we're talking about the substantive issue. Are we talking about simply recognizing academic contributions while completely overlooking sector member contributions or would sector member participants also be mentioned?

The title only mentions universities and on top of that I'd like it to be explained or I'd like to have what "significant contribution" in English means. I would like to have that explained. And I'm saying this as a sector member, I'm very concerned by what has already been said about this category of member.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Dubuisson. In fact that was something that at some point I was going to notice from my reading as well, that while academia seems to be a motivation for doing this, in fact the practice being discussed in Resolves 2, for example, or Instructs 2 would seem to apply to any significant contributor, so the actual action while it may be motivated by academic space would seem to apply more broadly.

Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman.

Chairman, we are grateful to Brazil for this contribution. We share the view being put forward but we do have a question. Would it not be appropriate to consider whether to marry this with Resolution 71 and in this case all of these issues that have just been raised by Mr. Dubuisson could have been dealt with in one forum. If we tied everything together we would have everything dealt with.

Here we are singling out academia but seems to me it might have been a better way of proceeding, not insisting on this, just a question to Brazil: Did you consider the appropriateness of doing what I have suggested? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I believe we did have some discussion about that when we chartered the Drafting Group on academia resolutions and when the report of that group came back I think that in the conclusions of the Drafting Group it had been that these were in fact separate because the subject of Resolution 71 was simply the academia class of participation in ITU whereas this was a motivation for identifying editorship, authorship and significant contributors in the layout of ITU-T recommendations which may be motivated by the academic participation but to my reading would not be restricted in its application.

So one is on the subject of the class of participation and the other is on the subject of identification of significant contributors and recommendations.

So perhaps the Drafting Group could take onboard that in the title of the resolution because that really is what would seem to be the bottom line that might be helpful in understanding the purpose of it because the title, as you say, appears more related to Resolution 71 than perhaps the content.

Next request for the floor is from Cuba, please.

>> CUBA: Thank you, Chair.

I have taken the floor to support the idea behind this document. We think we should encourage academic participation. Like any new idea, question marks have arisen. Any new resolution should include the possibility that we introduce this working method into the ITU's working methods. We believe that in the academic sector, participations will stimulate participation from other areas and so these things are complementary, bit-by-bit, we can start allowing ITU to encourage this type of work. We believe that will only be beneficial for the ITU's work. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So it seems likely we'll create a Drafting Group here shortly so one more point for my reading, just to raise, is in Instructs 3, we seem to be leaving it on the Director's shoulders to identify objective criteria for identifying the significant contributions. So I would invite the Drafting Group to consider whether, for example, TSAG might have a role in identifying those criteria as a final point to be taken on board.

So may I ask for a volunteer to lead a Drafting Group to try to prepare an update of this text and if in doing that work they could begin from Working Document 10 which has the editorials already applied then that would save us work at the end. May I ask for a volunteer to lead that drafting activity. I see another request for the floor. Legal advice, please.

>> Thank you, Chairman. I'm not taking the floor to volunteer to lead this Drafting Group, rest assured of that.

But I just wanted to go back to something that was said by Brazil. Yes, I did contact that delegate to draw his attention to the fact that regardless of the outcome of this Drafting Group, it's crucial that the principle according to which the ITU should have exclusivity of copyright on these recommendations should not be called into question. So I would like to draw your attention to Resolution 66 of the plenipotentiary. That's very clear in that regard.

In other words, should there be any contributors and should they be identified in the relevant documents, it should be very clear they cannot be tantamount to co-authors and they can't claim any kind of Intellectual Property rights or copyrights over the recommendations and publications in question.

Simply I wanted to stress that which seems pivotal to me so that the Drafting Group can move forward in full respect for plenipotentiary decisions.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Perhaps that's an important point to ask the Drafting Group to include in some of the front matter of this resolution just to clarify that point.

So with that can I move on to requesting a volunteer to lead this drafting activity. Emirates, please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman.

I would like to volunteer to lead the work of this drafting group. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much, and let's see, as to a time, so I think we would have a choice to run in parallel with the Drafting Group on the Canada resolution so toward the end of lunch, or we could do it just after the close of Com 3 at 17:30 so as to your preference there might be some common interest but not complete. 17:30 maybe is -- is that okay for a time for the Drafting Group? Okay. I'm trying to give the floor to emirates and then we'll go to Iran who I see has asked for the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman. 17:30 or 5:30 P.M. That will be perfect to start this group's work.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, we'll find a room.

Iran, please.

>> IRAN: Thank you. Since we have 1:30 meeting with -- Committee we also support the 5:30 in the afternoon, thank you.

>> CHAIR: I think that is agreed. We will look forward in our meeting tomorrow to examine the output of that Drafting Group.

So then moving on in our Agenda that brings us -- we have listed point 7 and here I can report we have had some offline consultations and we have text agreeable to all parties but I think it's -- I was going to post that as a suggested way forward under my name. I don't believe that document is available yet so I would propose we come back to that in our afternoon session, assuming the document is available. So that would move us, then, to Agenda point 8 which is recommendation A.2. We have one small modification proposed from TSAG. I think Mr. Gracie is the TSAG Chairman and has offered to introduce that for us. Mr. Gracie, please.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Yes, thank you very much, Chairman.

The reference document is a document 24 which outlines a number of amendments to the A series recommendations and with respect to A.2 dealing with the presentation of contributions to ITU-T, there is a small amendment in number 2 which refers to contributions. It states specifically if contributions are submitted as paper documents, they shall be addressed to TSB and copied to the Study Group Chairman and vice-chairman, working party Chairman and concerned Rapporteurs. So basically Chairman that's the only amendment in this document. The rest are strictly editorial. again it's in section 2. Simply refers to contributions submitted as paper documents. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Gracie. So this is simply an update to reflect more modern working methods and so there is some text which implies that it is the responsibility of a contributor to send their documents to a number of the individuals and responsibility in the Study Groups and if they do it in paper form which nobody does but is allowed to, they would have to follow that but if they use the electronic mechanisms, everyone, participants included, has access to the documents that are submitted electronically so there's no need for any special action by the contributor to send the electronic documents to the Chairman, for example.

So I think we can be kind to the Chairman and not fill up their e-mail inboxes any more than necessary.

Is there any objection to approving this very small revision to ITU-T recommendation A.2 to reflect the updated working methods?

I see no requests for the floor. That's agreed.

That moves us to the next item for our consideration, also a small amendment of A.4.

Mr. Gracie, please.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Yes, thank you, Chairman.

Recommendation A.4 deals with communication process between ITU-T and forums and consortia. Now in section 2, and again this is in document 24, under section 2 on procedures, there is -- there is additional text as follows: "In establishing a communication process, this would provide a framework for ongoing communications to achieve the following, prevent inadvertent duplication of effort while allowing each organisation to pursue its own mandate, secondly, provide authoritative information to, of one organisation's dependencies on the other's work, and, finally, to exchange information on topics of mutual interest."

So those are the only changes and as you can see, for the purpose of clarifying the text, and now in section 2.2, once the communication process is established, we have a small change to -- to section 2.2.1 concerning documents sent to, we have inserted the words I I2T 8.4 qualified forums and consortia and in the first line of 2.2.1, after the words "a proposal to send" and we have added the words "a liaison statement" and we continue to add ITU-T before A.4 so, Chairman, that's the only -- those are the only changes to A series recommendation A.4 of an editorial nature that are presented to you for your consideration. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So we have from TSAG some small updates to recommendation A.4 so clarifying in the beginning some purposes of communication and then some cleanup of language in terms of the fact that we call everything we send to and from other organisations’ liaison statements.

Any comment to that proposal? Any objection to accepting this proposal from TSAG for a revision to recommendation A.4 via the Editorial Committee to the Plenary for approval?

Emirates, please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chair.

Concerning the amendments which have been proposed on procedural matters, when we are trying to avoid redundant activity we need to be very clear. My question, Chairman, is what mechanism will allow us to avoid inadvertent overlap or redundancy? Maybe we should clarify this. In the next Item, relevant information et cetera, what do we mean by provide authoritative information? That is just for clarification, Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. As leader of the correspondence activity within TSAG, I will give you my understanding. I think A.4 and A.6 which we'll come to shortly both describe the process whereby we establish a communication process with another SDO and once we have established that communication process, we communicate. So we send information back and forth. We advise each other when undertaking new work that we believe is related to the other group, and have an opportunity to exchange that information and so when we communicate, we inform each other of what we are doing and use that information so that with full awareness of the work that's going on in the other body we take our own decisions about what work to undertake and whether we can make the judgment knowing what else is going on whether to proceed with work.

So I think this is intended that once we open the communication channel we will actually communicate and since if that's used appropriately and we have advised each other of the work under way, that will serve to not have -- not have accidents where we simply start new work unaware of what's going on in the other body.

That was the idea that you don't simply qualify an organisation as an A.4. Once you have that channel open, you use it.

The reason for the word "authoritative" is that there is a certain amount of communication that goes on amongst standards bodies by way of common participants so we have a lot of industry participants in particular who will attend more than one standards body and they may take the floor in one group and describe what their perception is of what is going on in the other group. That's an opinion of that individual and sometimes accurate, sometimes their opinion, and I, so the reason for the word "authoritative" is that if we want a message to be received by another organisation, in the words of the -- to convey the consensus opinion of ITU-T we should do that via a liaison statement.

Certainly the informal exchange of information that happens via joint or via common participants is valuable, but the authoritative information about consensus view of one organisation represented to the other normally we try to capture that in a liaison statement and use the mechanism of A.4

or A.6 for that purpose.

That was the intent of the words if that's helpful. So if that's a satisfactory explanation of the intent of the words, I will move back to asking if we can accept the proposal of TSAG for update of recommendation A.4 as agreed to send via the Editorial Committee to the Plenary for approval.

Can I have your agreement, please?

I see no requests for the floor so that is agreed. Oh, Emirates. I'm sorry. Moved too fast.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman. I simply wanted to express my agreement with that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, that makes it simpler for me not to have moved too fast.

I think bearing in mind the time, I sense that the proposal on A.5 may require a little discussion where perhaps A.6 is something we can do more quickly because it is nearly the same proposal as we had for A.4 so if I can simply propose we take A.5 just after lunch and move ahead in our Agenda to some that are a little bit simpler.

So A.6, anything more beyond what I have just said, Mr. Gracie, to say about this proposal from TSAG?

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Yes, thank you, Chairman. I believe you have summarized that very well. Changes are almost identical to those of A.4. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So again, sort of identifying the purpose of communication and using the appropriate wording nearly the same, so we don't care whether it's a international organisation or a forum or consortia, we communicate in the same way so the same modifications to recommendation A.6.

So can I have your agreement to that text as a revision to recommendation A.6 to send via editor to Plenary for approval? I see no requests for the floor so that's agreed.

And one more that at least to me read to be simple if we could because I think this was simply a recognition concerning electronic working but if it takes too much time we'll continue after lunch but maybe we can finish it before.

Canada, 58 Addendum 1, we have the proposal for update of A.11. Canada, please?

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This addresses the issue of maintaining and distributing paper copies of ITU-T recommendations. Historically the ITU publishes and distributes paper copies of its recommendations. Recommendation ITU-T A.11 provides information on the procedures to be followed for publication by the (indiscernible) recommendations and the results of the WTSAs. (Indiscernible) has now changed and the ITU-T has taken the position it will make available its recommendations and allow for downloads to occur via electronic methods.

Mr. Chairman, electronic downloading is the most effective process for distribution. Canada believes it is time to consider whether ITU should continue to oblige to have the ongoing responsibility to make available paper copies of ITU-T recommendation for purchase.

It's our understanding that with the ability to have access for free electronic downloading of recommendations, the need for the distribution of paper copies by the ITU no longer exists. This contribution recognized where solution 66 -- to the Secretary-General in 2 to ensure publications in paper format are to make available as quickly as possible so as not to deprive Member States, sector members and associates not possessing electronic facilities or access of publications of the union. This proposes that recommendations of the UTA 11 be modified to reflect this change in the normal distribution of recommendations and thereby free the ITU-T from the obligation of providing paper copies of recommendations.

So, Mr. Chairman, we, Canada, recommend that the attached modification in this document be adopted.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

So we have about one minute and let me ask quickly if there would be -- first of all, this is from one country. Is there support for that proposal? Maybe we need -- we're too short of time. We have a few too many questions to ask here. So let me suggest we come right back to this after lunch and hopefully this is something quick.

So I will propose that we -- I'm sorry -- "after lunch" for us means after afternoon coffee because I think we're scheduled in the fourth period if I understand correctly. So let's pick up where we left off in our Agenda at the beginning of the fourth period after afternoon coffee. Thank you very much.

(Session concluded at 12:30 PM)
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