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 >> CHAIR: Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. Let's get started.

 Welcome to the final day of sessions for Committee 3. I have prepared an agenda which you will find in document ADM their 32. We have made extremely good progress in our earlier sessions and in factual find today's agenda appears quite short and I hope it is. While we have initially been allocated three sessions of meeting time for today, it is my hope with your cooperation that we might conclude in the best case before lunch.

 I have indicated to the Chairman of 2 that we are fairly certain we could release the fourth period of today for the necessary session that may be necessary for the budget control committee.

 So I ask for your indulgence if we need to come back briefly after lunch to resolve final points, we will, but if we can complete the remaining work before lunch, that would I'm sure free many of you to examine other items.

 So can I have your agreement to use this as the agenda for today? I see no requests for the floor. The report of our Monday sessions can be found in document DT82 and we met for three sessions yesterday and completed a great deal of work.

 You will find in DT82 first a review of the results of Working Group 3-D A where they brought us an update to recommendation A.1. We made a small modification in clause 3.3.3 and agreed and sent that forward via the Editorial Committee to the plenary.

 Our next Item of business was for Working Group 3B. 3B has completed its work while 3A is still active and we examined the report of Working Group 3B and further examined the proposed updates of Resolution 67 and have forwarded that both to the Editorial Committee and to the budget Review Committee for the implications of the additional translation called for in this Resolution.

 We moved next to the consideration of Resolution 45. A great deal of the work here was in updating the exemplary list of priority items for coordination. We reached agreement to the text provided by the Drafting Group and then forward that to the plenary via the Editorial Committee.

 Next in clause 2.4, we considered Resolution 70 and here we had DT57 which resulted in introduction of about six editorial improvements which were introduced verbally. While the text we have forwarded to the Editorial Committee is contained in document contribution 100, we have also reproduced for you a revision DT57 R1 so that you can see the editorial improvements to the orange DT57 that were included in that agreement.

 Moving on, we had a Drafting Group clause 2.5 on academic -- chartered to look at academia resolutions but in fact they only looked at Resolution 71. They prepared an update for our consideration. We made a small amendment to change observer to a non-advisory capacity and with that change forwarded it to the Editorial Committee.

 Next in clause 2.6 we considered the output of the Drafting Group for A.7. We had reached consensus on this work which had been under way in TSAG for some time with compromised text on the financing and on that point during my introduction, let me ask a question. It occurred to me in our meeting of the budget control committee this morning that some of what we've done in A.7 in fact will have budgetary implications with respect to the accommodations for disabled participants and support for developing country participants and so with your permission I would like to ask your permission to send A.7 already agreed by us and sent to the Editorial Committee, if we could also send that to budget control for their meeting in the fourth session of today.

 I see no requests for the floor so it is agreed we'll send that to the Budget Control Committee.

 We had a discussion next in agenda point or in clause 3 of the report on the resolution on strengthening collaboration proposed by Canada. We chartered a Drafting Group which has completed work and we'll examine the output of that group today.

 We had further discussion of the proposed resolution from Brazil on stimulating further participation of academia and here we also chartered a Drafting Group and we will examine the output of that group here today.

 Moving on to clause 5 of the report we looked at A.2. Here we had only the proposal from TSAG which we agreed to accept and forwarded to the Editorial Committee. Same for A.4 and A.6 where we accepted the proposal of TSAG and forwarded these to the Editorial Committee.

 In clause 8, we examined a proposal from Canada for update of recommendation A.11. We accepted that proposal and forwarded this both to the Editorial Committee and to the budget committee. This one actually something that probably saves money. So calling this to their attention.

 Next we have A.5. This it's a conclusion we had a lengthy discussion and we've had some offline consultations and I hope were able to finalize what we will do on this Item today.

 Next we examined Resolution 11 left over from our first day. We had a way forward resulting from some consultations among the interested parties put forward in a DT and we agreed to that text and sent it to the Editorial Committee. Finally Resolution 55 on again gender issues we agreed to the text put forward by the Drafting Group and sent this forward to the budget control committee because this called for additional training for STSB staff. That was work completed yesterday. Questions or comments to this report?

 All right. Seeing no requests for the floor, our report of Monday is approved.

 Thank you. As I mentioned and listed here on the agenda under point 3 we have simply posted a revised DT57 to show the editorial updates that were introduced only verbally yesterday. Those are fully incorporated in C100 that we have sent to the Editorial Committee so that's just for your information.

 That allows us to move to the substance of today's agenda.

 The first point is the results of Working Group 3A so here we have two documents for your consideration. The first is the report of 3A which is now complete. You'll find that in DT63 Rev 1 and after introduction of the report we'll look at the proposed text for Resolution 1 in DT79.

 Mr. Dubuisson, you have the floor to introduce the report. Thank you.

 >> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I shall be brief.

 The report was reviewed by a group yesterday afternoon and there were a few editorial comments but nothing substantive. There are three sections. The first on Resolution 32 which Com 3 approved last week. In this section we inserted a table which sets forth in -- sets forth the way in which the various proposals were dealt with and in section 3 we come to recommendation ITU-T A1, once again with an explanatory table, and then in section 4 on page 3, Resolution 1 presented in the same manner, I don't think I need to go into greater detail; however, I will be delighted to answer any questions there may be. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Dubuisson.

 So the report contained in DT63 Revision 1, comments or questions of this report, final report of Working Group 3A? Brazil, please.

 >> BRAZIL: I don't know if we should make the comment on Resolution 1 at this point or on the presentation of DT79

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. If it is a comment on the substance of the report, then you can make it here. If it is a comment on the content of DT79 that would leave the text of this report unchanged, then we can deal with it later.

 If there's something that would be described differently, we can hold it in abeyance approving the report until we have looked at the resolution. Can you tell me whether the text would change based on your intervention on Resolution one?

 >> BRAZIL: The comment we have is on the considering part of the Resolution and the report says that IAP from CITEL which has several supports from the Americans region was not accepted; however, we would like to make another statement on that and perhaps we don't want to reopen a big discussion here but it is an important subject for us. So I will leave to it your decision. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you.

 Mr. Dubuisson, please.

 >> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Chairman.

 I should also like to thank the representative of CITEL for their observation. If we do work in the same manner as for other lines we should perhaps have said accepted. In fact, we partly accepted the CITEL proposal rather than rejected it en toto. And I would apologize to CITEL for that unintentional mistake.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Dubuisson. So is there a small amendment about partial acceptance that is true whatever we discussed in Resolution 1 or -- Mr. Dubuisson, please?

 >> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Chairman.

 No, it is simply the way in which we have presented the work or what we did for resolution one in the fourth column. If I have clearly understood what the representative of Brazil has said, we, we'll have to come back to that when I introduce Resolution 1.

 >> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. So let me hold in abeyance approval of the report and then we'll amend that as necessary.

 So then let me move to DT79 the text of resolution one for our consideration.

 Mr. Dubuisson again.

 >> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Chairman.

 The document is on the screen so I will speak to the principal modifications. I won't speak to editorial changes which made no substantive change to the resolution the first substantive change is in considering C, which is in fact the issue raised by Brazil. It was agreed that we should remove the reference to 18 -- 88 -- 1988 and use the term "in force" in English, you should take up Rev 1 of this document 79. The change was not made and Rev 1 was translated this morning in Geneva into all languages except Arabic. As you know it's only half past 8:00 in the morning in Geneva, so the -- in the revised versions and the -- the revised versions of the document DT79 do contain this change. We have changed the words Melbourne 1988 for the words "in force" and perhaps I should allow the delegate from Brazil to take the floor if he she wishes, Mr. Chairman, or otherwise I'll continue.

 >> CHAIR: Brazil, please.

 >> BRAZIL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

 We are okay with the proposed change. We actually proposed that the sentence between parentheses should be deleted but "in force" is a good suggestion. We are okay with that.

 What we would like to comment and discuss is the following sentence in considering C. It says that we should meet objectives set down in the preamble and Article 1 of those regulations and our proposal from CITEL is that we should -- shift read "Set down in those regulations."

 We are not really sure when considering C was created since this is a very old resolution. In the footnote you see it dates back from 1956 and we want to correct a historic error here. Even in the ITRs of 88, it was not only the preamble in Article 1 which was important for the ITU-T work. Several -- the following articles were important also, definitions, they are used in all SGs, in ITU-T. Article 3 which deals with networks probably also SGs deal with issues in Telecommunication networks. Article 4, ting services also. Article 5 on security, we have a discussion in Com 4 today on the title of SG 17. Article 6 on accounting And taxation. It is discussed heavily in SG3.

 So it is not only the preamble in Article 1 which are important for the ITU-T; we just want to correct this and make this considering C true to the reality.

 Whatever we will discuss in the following next two weeks, it doesn't matter if it's very high level or very detailed, doesn't matter. What matters is all articles will be important to the following work of the ITU-T so that's our suggestion, that we read "set down in those regulations" in considering C. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil.

 And so can I ask whether there is agreement to accept the proposed deletion in the preamble and Article 1 slightly more than Mr. Jones has highlighted on the screen.

 Mr. Dubuisson, please, and then the United States.

 >> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Chairman.

 I have to tell you very honestly that the Working Group first agreed to suppress this reference and this was discussed again in a second session and then the suppression was canceled and if I'm not mistaken the representative of CITEL was not then in the room so I wanted to say it is that we discussed this again today if someone has a problem with it. Thank you.

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

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

 Yes, this was discussed. I think we could find acceptable language. The U.S. objected to this change because we think it is still relevant here and we did not sign up to the CITEL proposal so if we could work offline with CITEL colleagues that would be helpful, thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. I was sort of optimistic we could finish before lunch but perhaps there will be one or two issues we have to come back to just after and hopefully resolve things quickly.

 So I'll leave this point as something we come back to and let's review the rest of the changes to resolution 1 and confirm that we are with the exception of considering C, satisfied with the rest of the changes from Working Group 3A.

 Mr. Dubuisson, if you could continue, please.

 >> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In considering F, there is a reference to Resolution 165 of the plenipotentiary conference on deadlines. I don't think that there is any problem with that. Then in section 1 we have added a new clause 1.2 bis on the fact that sometimes there is a tendency to recycle or reuse in between Assemblies and plenipotentiary conferences some resolutions to copy them again. Once they have been accepted by one entity in particular, the plenipotentiary conference, then this automatically applies to the Assembly.

 This text has been added to try to avoid the somewhat automatic production of resolutions. Then I will jump to 1.9.4. 1.9.4. Here we have added three new definitions, definition of the term "Question, recommendation, and the term resolution."

Here we have to realize these three definitions can apply only to the standardization sector. These terms already appear in the constitution and convention but with their own meaning. Here the definition applies only to ITU-T. I would recall the term "Question" is referenced in Recommendation A.1 which we recently approved. So Recommendation A.1 uses the exact same definition for the term "question" as that which we now see on the screen referring to Resolution 1.

 Now we move to clause 3.5. That was a proposal to add a small portion of text on criteria for selecting the management team of a Study Group rather than adding text and running the risk it is not aligned with resolution 35. We chose, rather, actually to refer to Resolution 35 which by the way has been modified by this simply and then there is a new clause 5.2 bis which has been added which exactly reflects the practice which unfolded for this Assembly, that is TSB via the Director submitted a document with the proposed editorial modification to resolutions so this sentence merely reflects the practice.

 In Section 6, a new clause 6.0, 6.0 on deadlines for submission of proposals to the Assembly so that in order to allow for their timely translation into the six languages before the Assembly so that participants can analyze them.

And this is exactly the same text as that of resolves of Resolution 165 of the plenipotentiary conference.

 Then we have to take a long leap because many paragraphs have not been changed and we leap to clause 9.3.8 which was slightly amended, not the substance, but the form was amended. So as to clearly recall, ITU recommendations were elaborated with a view to being used as widely as possible and we also recall that it's not only the common pattern policy which is applicable but also there are two other documents on Intellectual Property rights which are applicable. These documents are produced by the ad hoc group of the TSB Director on Intellectual Property rights.

 So, Chairman, that is the end of the presentation because the rest of Resolution 1 has not been modified. I should like to take this opportunity, as I did for recommendation A.1, to thank participants in Working Group 3A because everybody was prepared to make compromises where necessary. We made very rapid progress and we can now submit to you for your approval this resolution, recommendation 8.1, is an important text for the standardization sector because it makes it possible to manage the work of all our Delegates on a day-to-day basis. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Dubuisson.

 No requests for the floor came during that intervention beyond considering C but let me ask if there are any other issues beyond considering C for possible adjustment in this text.

 I see Cameroon, please.

 >> CAMEROON: Thank you, Chairman, and good morning.

 I think in section 6 in the French version there is a misprint in 6.0. 6.0 has been omitted. I think this is just an editorial misprint. There is no 6.0 in the French version.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. I'll let Mr. Dubuisson respond and then United States.

 >> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Cameroon. I did check the French version this morning when I came in but I did not notice this detail so I shall have it corrected and it will be put before Committee 5 but thank you very much, Cameroon.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you.

 United States.

 >> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

 In section 9.3.8 of the document, the reference to ITU-T recommendation sought to be elaborated with a view to being applied as freely and openly. We would request a clarification on what "openly" refers to, please. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. I don't see Mr. Dubuisson taking the microphone but my understanding of what the author of these words had in mind was something consistent with existing policy where anything required for implementation of an ITU recommendation would be available under 2.1 or 2.2 of the policy and that is 2.1 being royalty-free and 2.2 being reasonable and non-discriminatory. So there is not anything you need to implement a recommendation that is not available.

 I think that was -- I hope that was the intent, and perhaps the words sound a little stronger than the intent. But the actual policy is pointed to here.

 Let me ask Mr. Dubuisson if this could be -- if this meets -- is the same as your understanding, please.

 >> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Yes, thank you, Chairman. I do think indeed this echoes the term in the English version's widespread use which appears at the end of this sentence. If necessary, we could request the representative of RCC who made this proposal to give us an explanation.

 I should like to explain that this text was reviewed word-by-word with the legal advisor who sees no problems with it. It was also reviewed word-by-word with the Rapporteur of the Director's ad hoc group on Intellectual Property Rights who also does not see any problems with it. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: United States, please.

 >> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you for that explanation and we appreciate that clarity, Mr. President.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. I'm guessing some of the misunderstanding comes from the fact that the word or the adverb "freely" sort of sounds like the word "free" but doesn't have quite the same meaning. So I think that the text as it is, I can see where that misunderstanding may be coming from. But in fact the adverb has a slightly different meaning.

 Mr. Dubuisson, please.

 >> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Chairman. As you have drawn attention to this, I quickly checked the French version and in French we do not have this problem of understanding the word "free." In French we don't use the word which means free of charge, but the word which means that you can do something with liberty.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. So I think what I would suggest here that rather than trying to wordsmith that you allow us freedom when we send this to Ed Com to call this word to their attention and leave it to our English language experts to find the correct word to imply that sentiment and come up with the best equivalent to the French word which is the official. Okay?

 So with that, can I ask if there are, other than considering C, which we'll look for text from Brazil and U.S. just after lunch, are we happy with this? Of course since the point is not closed things can be raised but I'd like to close as much as we can. Anything other than considering C still open on this document? Okay.

 I will look for those words and come back to this just after lunch and then we'll finalize whether there is any revision that needs to be made in the report to reflect the decision.

 With that, I would like to move to our next Agenda point. We had a Drafting Group on the proposed new resolution based on the proposal of Canada on strengthening collaboration. Here we had a Drafting Group chaired by Mr. Gracie and we had DT78 as the result of that drafting.

 Mr. Gracie, please.

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

 DT78, Chairman, outlines the agreed text that we had discussed in the ad hoc group concerning a draft new resolution on strengthening collaboration.

 Chairman, as a result of the discussion that took place on this proposal that was put forward, two new considerings were added referring to the relevant provision of the convention concerning the duties of TSAG as well as of course Resolution 22 which concerns the authorization of TSAG to act between WTSAs. And Chairman, since the meeting yesterday, which as you can appreciate, there were many meetings occurring at the same time, and not everyone had an opportunity to input into the discussion and as a result I did receive some further comments which I'd like to also reflect in this resolution if there is no objection. That would be simply a reference to the World Standards cooperation; this is a organisation between or collaborative arrangement between ITU and the ISO and IEC, also the Global Standards Collaboration which is again a collaborative arrangement between participating standards organisations which would include ITU.

And finally, a reference to the collaborative activities involving ITU associated with the development of global harmonized set of intelligent transportation system communication standards.

 All of this was discussed in the course of the Global Standards Symposium with reference to the various collaborative relationships which exist between ITU and other standards bodies. So if there's no objection, Chairman, we can add that reference or these references editorially.

 Chairman, I would like to point out an error in considering C, and as you can see for recommendation IT2 A5 and A6 we have reproduced the same title, of course, A5 as we discussed yesterday concerns the generic procedures for including references to documents of other organisations in IT2T recommendations so again, Chairman, if you would allow to us make that correction editorially it does not detract from the resolution itself since it's just simply a considering.

 We have also added references to Recommendation A, series recommendation I2T A.23 concerning collaboration with the ISO and IEC on information technology as well as supplement 3 to the A series recommendations concerning the collaborative or collaboration guidelines between I2T and ITF.

 Now, as we discussed yesterday, and there was no objection, references have been made to the outcome of the or the relevant outcomes of the chief technology officers meeting which occurred just prior to the GSS and the WTSA and that is reflected in considering F and likewise to the global standard symposium itself which took place just prior to the WTSA.

 Now, in the resolves part, as you can see, the actions that would be undertaken as part of this process, in TSAG, and in resolves 2, you note that the mechanism which could take the form of a working party or a Working Group of TSAG and may work additionally between TSAG meetings in order to ensure continuity of the discussions on this topic, should report to TSAG for implementation on the outcomes of actions undertaken, work as required including the socialization of I2Ts desire to work cooperatively with the relevant standards bodies to improve cooperation and provide a report to TSAG and that this report will subsequently be submitted to the WTSA.

 As you see in the invites this remains in square brackets pending outcome of discussion in Committee 4 concerning the Strategic Review Committee so that text will remain in square brackets until the outcome of that discussion has been completed.

 So, Chairman, essentially what this text indicates is that there would be a close, complementary relationship established between the Strategic Review Committee and TSAG in order to develop synergies for the development of recommendations which are addressed to the objective of strengthening collaboration between ITU-T and other standards bodies.

 So as you can see as you can appreciate, Chairman, there is no overlap of functions here. What is foreseen to be undertaken in the Strategic Review Committee is substantively different from what is being proposed here with respect to the work of TSAG.

 With that, Chairman, I present this draft resolution, draft new resolution on strengthening collaboration for your further consideration. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Gracie.

 Just so I don't forget, I did notice a request for the floor briefly from China after Mr. Gracie had started the presentation. I assume it was on the previous topic and we'll come back to it after we complete this, so are there any questions or comments to the proposal with the editorial additions of the references to GSC and to the World Standards Collaboration? The correction of the titles of the A series recommendations and furthermore to the bracketed text, in this case not due to any controversy but due to the need to align with the results of Committee 4.

 I see a couple requests for the floor. First, the Russian Federation.

 >> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

 At the very top of the -- could we scroll up to the list of references and recommendations. A bit lower. Supplements to A -- supplementary to ITU 2 A series recommendations and I'd like to point out when discussing our contribution for resolution 50, the Delegation of the United States was categorically opposed to including the titles of supplements in this resolution. They said it was not admissible to use in the resolution a title of a document not normative but only informative, so we think we should adhere to this in all resolutions to make them consistent with each other.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. I would personally note that this is in a "considering" and not in a "resolves." I don't know if that was the case in supplement 50 but if I can ask if Mr. Gracie would care to respond and then take the intervention of Germany.

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

 Of course I think you have partially answered the question. This was -- this is in a considering. It is simply a reference to the fact that of an existing supplement that refers to the collaborative relationship between two entities, including I2T concerning guidelines for their work. It simply is a reference and that's all. It is not to discuss that particular relationship but just to ensure that the references are complete. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you.

 Russia, please.

 >> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman.

 I understand your arguments and agree with them; however, in Resolution 50 we have the exact same point in the resolution sections taking note of and recognizing we were forbidden categorically to refer to the supplement adopted by Study Group 17 and prepared by the Russian Federation and it was said that we could refer to the recommendations but to specifically refer to a supplement, to a given recommendation, and specifically give its title, this, there was no consensus to do this. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Would there be any objection -- while I certainly understand this is an important relationship, it's one of many -- would there be any objection to removing that specific reference from the resolution?

 Canada, please.

 >> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps some clarification to this statement made by the Distinguished Delegate from Russia. With regards to resolution 50, the issue was not that we were dealing with a supplement; the issue was that we were dealing with a particular supplement. The issue was the document itself, not the fact that there was a supplement. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Certainly supplements are many and varied and done for a variety of purposes. They are non-normative texts within ITU and perhaps different documents would have different reasons for existence.

 So I would prefer if we reach agreement to either leave this one in or take it out. So I know this was agreed at a different level. It was an agreement of TSAG, in fact, in completing this work. So let me ask for some opinions on keeping this in or taking it out.

 So Russia, please.

 >> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman.

 We propose two options. First option, either to proceed as we did in Resolution 50, indicating that recommendations of the A series and their annexes, no more, no less, without giving any title or specific number. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Would there be agreement to that approach? We do have in fact four recommendations of the A series and a supplement that are applicable. The A series is a sort of manageable number of documents. You see them listed all on one screen. Would that be an acceptable approach for the Committee to simply refer in general to the ITU's external cooperation is guided by several recommendations in the A series and their supplements. Perhaps not as much help as giving a list but it's easy to see, I think, which ones are applicable.

 United States.

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

 This discussion took place in another room, so what I would like to do if we could is take this offline and speak with Russia and make come up with an acceptable solution. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you.

 Okay. I will add this to the list of things where I look forward to an agreed solution just after lunch. Hopefully we come in with some things we can check off quickly.

 So with the exception of that particular list and of course the Item in square brackets which is not one of controversy but one of alignment with Com 4, are there any other points that people would like to raise on this? I know Germany had a request for the floor. Same point as Russia or another point? Germany, please.

 >> GERMANY: Thank you, Chairman. This was only because of the title, question for clarification on consideration C because it says moment number of A series and I think there is a small problem if you list under this title supplement because when the supplement gives status as a recommendation.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. We will solve that issue with the same discussion which we'll look forward to hearing the resolution of just after lunch.

 Any other issues with respect to this proposed new resolution which I hope we can deal with quickly when we return? I see no additional requests for the floor. We can move on.

 I have been asked to make a short announcement. The Head of Delegations meeting that had originally been scheduled for today has been postponed. That will now be held tomorrow at the same time, 12:45, so please take note of that.

 That brings us next in our Agenda the new resolution drafting based on the proposal of Brazil. We have the results of the Drafting Group in DT83. I think this was chaired by the Emirates so can I ask for an introduction of DT83, please.

 >> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

 I will speak in English because I have the document in English only and so I will speak in English.

 Yesterday we had the Drafting Group on the new proposed resolution from Brazil. The meeting went successfully and we concluded the resolution without any square brackets. So the title was modified to read "Promoting the active operation of academia, universities, and their associated establishments in ITU-T activities, " and then there was two additions in the recognizing part. It was a recognizing part was added. We had Resolution 66. And in particular it is all five to reflect that: "It is not intended to breach the copyright held by the union so that any person or entity wishing to produce or duplicate all or parts of the ITU publications for resale must opt in a specific agreement for such purpose."

Resolution 71 was added. Here in both resolutions I would recommend that we mention the Assembly or the conference which they come from and I leave it to the Editorial Committee to do that.

 In the considering part we had some slight modifications. Then we moved -- in the resolves part we moved some parts of the "instructs the Director of the Telecommunication Standardization Bureau to instruct TSAG." So under instruct TSAG, "Instruct TSAG to study options of how to clearly acknowledge the significant contribution to the development of such publications, example, editorship and authorship of significant contributions," and then finally the last addition was to invite Member States to report their consideration -- sorry -- to request their consideration for the inclusion of participation into the contributive process and their list of activities for research and development for productivity analysis. This is in general the conclusions received in the Drafting Group.

 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much. We have this proposed new resolution from the Drafting Group, a little less prescriptive than the original proposal but leaving it in the hands of TSAG to prepare the appropriate mechanism.

 Any comments or questions on the results of this Drafting Group? France, please.

 >> FRANCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is France Telecom Orange. As you will recall, Mr. Chairman, when this contribution was introduced the first time we made a number of observations. In the Drafting Group, at its meeting yesterday Brazil had proposed the new title, resolution, in order to cover our concerns and observations we had made. Their proposal has simply been swept under the carpet and not taken into consideration at all by the Drafting Group. I fail to understand why. But I would like to submit once again the compromise title proposed by Brazil and I would point out that the title does eliminate any concerns or the appearance of favoring one category of member rather than other. "Participation of membership in the work of ITU-T." "Acknowledging participation of membership in the work of ITU-T." And with this title one could in fact leave the resolution unmodified because it would be quite coherent, perhaps minor modification under "Instructs the Director of the Bureau, promoting active participation of members, more particularly universities" and so on, academia. Those are really minor modifications. But if we come back to recognizing subparagraph A as it is currently drafted, this does not take into consideration yesterday's debate and may give the impression that it copies on prohibited, nor does it resolve but at the same time it does not resolve the copyright issue we raised yesterday and "The right held by the union."

 I think we should delete the second part of this subparagraph A after the words "copyright held by the union."

On subparagraph 2, I would remind you that the role of an editor is simply to modify a document as determined after discussion, so I think rather this is the job of a Rapporteur than an editor.

 So I would propose therefore a new title and a correction or modification in recognizing, A, the remainder would be editorial changes, and I think we should check once again that there are no legal implications beyond those which we desire.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you, France Telecom.

 So I see the legal advisor has asked for the floor and perhaps it's the same point on recognizing A and so if we can clear that up and then we'll move back to the title.

 Legal advisor, please.

 >> Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 Far be it from me to wish to delay your work, particularly as in fact the representative of France Telecom has already said what I had to say myself. Reference to Resolution 66 has now been introduced in recognizing and it is extremely important but I would draw attention to the fact that it is not necessary to refer to resolves 5 of that particular resolution which deals with a particular issue that is the production or duplication for resale of ITU documents and in fact this is not its place here since, rather, what we want to stress is the importance of the copyright held by the ITU.

 I would propose, therefore, that recognizing A read as follows: "Recognizing Resolution 66 of the plenipotentiary which shall not in any way breach the copyright held by the union," and conclude the sentence after that word, and this would I think resolve some of the concerns raised at earlier meetings.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. I would suggest we don't edit it on the screen but I think we have the sense and I have some scribbled words and to the extent that my scribbles differ from the words just dictated by the legal advisor, I hope you'll let us take that editorially.

 We will make the editorial modification which I think addresses that particular concern of France Telecom orange and the legal advisor so we will make that modification. Before we return to the title I have another request for the floor from Iran.

 >> IRAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

 I would like at the beginning to appreciate also the work by the Chairman of the ad hoc group on this.

 My comment, Mr. Chairman, is with regard to the proposal of changes of the title. Mr. Chairman, since 2008 and also the plenipotentiary in Guadalajara, a new category of membership to the union called "Academia" was introduced. The concept was that WTSA and ITU-T in general would benefit from the expertise within the universities and research centers and it would be beneficial for both sides, for the universities and also for the ITU in general, and particularly for ITU-T.

 So I think if we broaden the title to cover all membership, we are losing the spirit of the contribution by academia. Mr. Chairman and all colleagues, the participation of sector members and the administrations has already been existing for so many years. Now here we are concentrating and encouraging participation of academia, universities and other associations so I think we should keep the title as it is and not broaden it to cover other types of memberships.

 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you.

 One clarification of course is that we don't use the word "Membership" with respect to academia or of associates. We call that a "category of participation." "Member" is something that is reserved for Member States and sector members.

 But I understand your point. I think the matter of this uses academia as justification for making a particular proposal. The proposal in fact would appear to be neutral to the category of participation so we would not only recognize an editor or a significant contributor because they come from academia; we would recognize that contribution level for anyone. I think the motivation to make a change came from academia but the actual change I understood was broader.

 So Emirates, please.

 >> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chairman.

 I would like to thank all those who worked on the Drafting Committee yesterday.

 As far as the title of the new resolution is concerned, Brazil came up with a proposal and that proposal did not meet with the required consensus; therefore, several administrations and participants saw fit to include a reference to the academia, universities and other associated research establishments and it was agreed we do not make reference to Member States or private sector.

 On the other hand, as far as mention of Resolution 66 is concerned, the legal advisor was with us at the meeting and it was his idea we include this reference in this paragraph. The view at that meeting was that this decision would be based on what went on in terms of the discussions in Committee 3 and the representative of France Telecom Orange was present and did not ask for the floor or make his feeling clear during that meeting and this is an issue that needs to be underlined. That's why I wanted to clarify to this meeting. Thank you, Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you.

 United States, please.

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

 The United States did not participate in this Drafting Group; however, we are supportive of the resolution but we would like to understand if there was a proposal made by Brazil on a different title and through you if we can ask that question, what the proposal was. And then also through you it appears this resolution is a resolution without a resolves. That seems quite -- that is odd from a process point. All resolutions should have a resolve, should resolve to do something. What are we resolving to do?

 Then it would also seem that while I -- the list is positive, I think we should probably not -- it seems it could be excluding some entities so I guess we should try to, for example, or such as, but those are my points. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you.

 Mr. Abdullah, please.

 >> MUSAB ABDULLAH: Without providing support or objective to the resolution under discussion, I would just like to highlight a point that may be of importance to some of the comments raised.

 Resolution 71 in the final text does instruct the Director of the TSB to continue efforts to explore and recommend various mechanisms to encourage cooperation with and facilitate increased participation of academia as well as various other articles within the resolution that discuss the encouraging and recommending that academia be permanent members. As such, based on some of the comments about increasing participation of academia, it may be that this is already covered in 71, and that perhaps the focus of the new resolution could be the recognition of contributions in a neutral manner and I raise this just for consideration.

 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Given the nature of the discussion and some of the points that have been raised, I think the most efficient way to address this would be if we could ask if the convener would be willing to reconvene the Drafting Group perhaps at 1:30 if that's possible and have a short discussion to work out these last issues and bring us something that we would be able to address quickly in the afternoon. Would that be possible?

 Emirates, please.

 >> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much, Chairman. I am fully prepared to hold this meeting and 1:30 I will call for that meeting and I hope that all the colleagues who participated in the previous meeting to help me in arriving at a solution to this issue. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. So I would, as we're approaching 12:30, ask the interpreters' indulgence for a few minutes. I hope it's not more than five, if that's okay.

 >> Yes, Chairman, you can have five minutes.

 >> Yes, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. We mention discussions that have been gone on with respect to the Russian proposal and the results of some consultations and I will attempt to bring in some exact words but the nature of the discussions that we have had have come to an understanding that perhaps it is overly restrictive to prohibit any references from certain kinds of documents and that in some cases it may be reasonable to request that an organisation give permission for inclusion of the text and the recommendation.

 It was further recognized that in some cases the organisation that produced a text may be unwilling to give that copyright authorization for inclusion of the text and then of course the Study Group has a decision to make.

 The issue is complex. It is something that may require consideration on a case-by-case basis, and it was also recognized that some of the problems may be procedural within A.5 and some may be as far as the application of A.5.

 So perhaps there are some references that have been incorporated casually without full consideration of the 10 criteria outlined in clause 2.2 of A.5 and the procedure in 2.3 to reach consensus to incorporate a reference.

 It was further noted that in the case where reference is made and a problem may be discovered and the organisation responsible for the document to which a reference is made is unwilling to consider a request for change, the Study Group may have to reevaluate in a revision whether to retain that reference. A Study Group is never compelled to keep a reference when it revises a document. So if a document no longer meets the need or if a different solution needs to be found, those are all possible ways forward whenever a recommendation is modified. Bearing that in mind, I think the understanding we have reached is that it may be premature to make a change recommendation A.5 from this meeting; nevertheless, we should include something in our report which asks TSAG to take further actions so the sorts of words I was considering were TSAG is invited to consider possible improvements to the mechanism and the practice of including references to document of other standards organisation as described in recommendation ITU-T A.5.

 In some cases we may have a situation where we find things that need to be improved in A.5 itself. In other cases we may need TSAG to provide reminders and encouragement to the Study Groups to rigorously apply the provisions that are already in the document.

 So these were some discussions that we had offline in consultation and so we'll try to confirm some words this afternoon.

 I see Russia has asked for the floor and can comment on my report of that discussion. Thank you.

 >> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman.

 We agree with what you have said except we would make a small proposal for an addition to 2.5 and we thought we had reached that agreement, so there are two things.

 We would like to propose in addition to 2.5 and 2 we fully agree with you that TSAG should continue looking at the practice and application and if necessary modification of recommendation A5 but we think there should be an addition to Paragraph 2.5. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you.

 Indeed we did have that discussion and I apologize for the misunderstanding on my part whether that addition was something we were going to leave in the remit of TSAG versus making now. The modification is small and let me ask -- we will prepare a small document indicating that text proposal plus the words that I would suggest we include in our report as far as requesting further action from TSAG and we'll call attention to that in the Plenary.

 With your indulgence I'd like to handle it in that way so we'll come back with a small document this afternoon to reflect our way forward with regard to the Russian proposal.

 So with that, I think we have used our five minutes and I would like to break for lunch. We will reconvene at 2:30 and, again, the small Drafting Group will meet at 1:30 and we have a few other offline consultations concerning the other texts and so I look forward to hopefully a short session this afternoon with those resolutions.

 Thank you very much.

(Session concluded at 12:37 PM)
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