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>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Ladies and Gentlemen, good afternoon. Welcome to this, the first meeting of working group 3 A. As you know, we will dealing be three texts. Resolution 1, Resolution 32 and Recommendation A.1. I'm Olivier Dubuisson. I work for FELIX Informatique of France. I thank you for the trust you have demonstrated with me by allowing me to Chair this working group. The agenda of this first meeting is to be found in Document ADM/6. This is how I suggest that we proceed.

Today I will look at Document 32, which I think is relatively easy to work on and achieve an agreement. And then we'll begin with Recommendation 8.1. And as for Resolution 1, that we will defer to the next meeting on Friday at 9:00 a.m. if I'm not mistaken. For Resolution 1, it seems various ‑‑ are necessary. So I would encourage participants who have difficulties with this resolution to be sure to come and see me to discuss it. Please don't hesitate to come and see me. We can discuss it and try to find a way forward without using up too much of the meeting time of Working Group 3A.

I would like to ask you now, do you have any comments on document that you find ADM/6, or can we proceed in the manner I have outlined? First Resolution 32 and then Recommendation 8.1? Thank you. I see no requests for the floor so I am assuming there are no problems with proceeding with the agenda as we see it in Document ADM/6.

So let's just now take up Agenda Item 2, Resolution 32, Electronic Working Methods. Here we have four proposals in addition to modifications proposed by TSB. I would like to ask the representatives of the various regions which have submitted proposals to give us a very quick presentation of their contributions. I don't think there are any stumbling blocks here on these proposals. I don't think there are any contentious issues, so you just go right to the substance of your proposal. Please don't go into editorial comments. We can come back to editorial comments later.

You'll see that I've prepared a working paper to take up all the modifications, so once you presented your contributions, we'll move on to the working paper which I've prepared to see whether we can obtain the agreement of this group on it.

Could I ask ‑‑ just a moment, please.

[Silence.]

Could we ask somebody to give us a presentation of the first proposal, ACP/35A1.

Mongolia, you have the floor.

>> MONGOLIA: Thank you, Chairman. On behalf of APT, I would like to represent the first revision Resolution 32, Strengthening Electronic Method for Work of ITU‑T. It's developed by respondent's group for issues for developing countries under several APT preparatory meeting. APT members ‑‑ the consideration of with WTA 8 number 32 is an important for WTA 6 for 2012 for developing countries.

So basic note in this proposal is due to lack of proper industrial development, the local standardization body of many of the developing countries don't have enough expertise. And this has resulted in ineffective and low participation of many developing countries in the International Standardization Forum, including ITU‑T Study Groups and TSAG.

To address this discussion during Council 2011 and TSAG 12 on remote participation were quite encouraging; however, their training programmes on standardization should also be available to online broadcasting. This will help the developing countries to co‑op with the recent changes in the standardization field and we would encourage them to actively participate in the ITU‑T forums.

Further, there are problems with developing countries with little experience in understanding of the ITU website to find the source and location of the required information. For example, it is not always easy or convenient to find the Study Groups from ITU website. It can be difficult to locate previous conference reports and information from ITU website, summary of reps for proposal are information on the ITU‑T website to strengthen and recognize broadcasting of ITU training programmes. It's proposed that Resolution 32 be revised. Thank you, Chairman.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you. I now will ask the representative of CTEL to give us a presentation of Document 32, Addendum 2. Brazil, you have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And good afternoon to all colleagues. On behalf of CTEL, Brazil would like to point out that this is an important resolution. And we would like also to say that this proposal is ‑‑ we have two objectives with it. The first one is to emphasize the importance of electronic working methods as a mean of participation with Member States especially with developing countries. And we would wish also to with this proposition to update the Resolution 32 adding reference in this resolution to the Resolution 167 of the plenipotentiary in Guadalajara adding just this Resolution 167. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you. Now we will give the floor ‑‑ we will move on to Document 56, Addendum 1. Is there a representative of the ATU in the room, please? I see no request for the floor. But it seems to me that in practice, it is the same modification as that proposed in the preceding document, so we can deal with that at the same time as the document from CTEL.

And the last proposal on the agenda comes from the Arab states, Document 64, Addendum 5. Who would like to present this? No requests for the floor. But again it's the same modification ‑‑ no, I am sorry. There is an additional modification. So is there nobody to give us a presentation of Document 64, Addendum 5 from the Arab states?

So, Ladies and Gentlemen, if there are no requests for the floor on issues of clarification on these contributions, are there any requests from the floor for clarification? No, I see none. In that case, I suggest we take up the document, which is the working document which I prepared which is a synthesis of all of these contributions and then we can see whether we can accept them one by one. It's a compilation of all the contributions. It's a document which you will find in a special area of the.

Website of the WTSA. You have to link at the bottom of the agenda. It's document ADM6. That is the agenda. You take the first document, 3A/1. Could I ask, please, the technicians to put ‑‑ to display my screen? Thank you. I hope we'll have less problems with displaying on the screens than this morning and that you'll be able to read what I have displayed on the screen. I tried to use the largest possible format.

I just recall the list of modifications which we have to use. And then we'll come back to this note so that we can remember that there's also a proposal from CTEL to modify Resolution 44 or with problems with remote participation, and so we might need to see if there is any reason to align the text of modified resolution and 44 if necessary, perhaps transferring something to the Editorial Committee to.

Do this. The first modifications I think are self‑evident and I don't think anyone will object to. They have the usual update of the venue and date.

The next modification is an addition of H into the considering. This proposal, as I said, was requested by at least three regions. Does anyone object to this addition in H? Thank you very much. So this addition is approved by this group.

The next modification was an addition to the noting, addition of Subparagraph F proposed by APT. This is Proposal 35A1/1. Are there any objections to adding this F? I see none, thank you.

The next point was adding ‑‑ and this was from the APT. Proposal from APT to make an addition ‑‑ or, rather, to make a modification to a subparagraph of the resolveds. I haven't exactly repeated the texts by APT. There are various acronyms. As you know, we don't like to have acronyms in official ITU texts, so what I did repeat is exactly the same text as in Resolution of the Plenipotentiary Conference on Developing Countries, et cetera.

Then there was a proposal from the Arab states. That is the second subparagraph on the screen in red on your screen. What I tried to do was merge the two proposals, which are similar but not identical, these proposals which come from APT and from the Arab states.

And what I am proposing to you is this third text, which you will see in, well, orange or brown, whichever you can see, at the bottom of the screen. So I'll just stop there for a moment and ask you: Have you any comments on this proposal for the merging of the text of the Arab states and the APT? Thank you. So, it seems to me that your eyes have left the screen and yet I see no requests for the floor. So it seems you have had time to compare the text. Would anybody like any more time? Or may I take it that my proposal for merging the text of the Arab states and the APT is acceptable? And that we will thus modify this part of Resolution 32. Thank you very much. I think we've made considerable progress on this resolution.

Now, we had a proposal from APT35A1/1. That was their proposal and it was to add this subparagraph at the bottom of resolveds 1. Here I just had a comment. Maybe the representative of APT could explain this. I wonder whether this term "processes" is clear to everybody. Could I please ask the representative of APT to explain what was meant here in this subparagraph?

Well, if nobody minds, if nobody objects to the use of the term "processes" in this addition into this resolveds 1, then we can just leave it in. And I take it that we agree to add ‑‑ oh, Germany. Oh, Australia? Australia asked first, I'm sorry. Australia first.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. With the agreement of Mongolia and the APT, I think what was intended there was a description of ITU‑T procedures, perhaps, instead of processes. So the more appropriate word would probably be "procedures" if you maybe could consider that change. Thank you, Chair.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Romania, please?

>> ROMANIA: I was asking for some clarification which we now got from the Australian representative. I would also prefer to have some clarification on what is meant by "processes" in the way it was just described. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Germany. If we replace "processes" with "procedures," then would Germany still need a clarification? No? Thank you, Australia, for your proposal.

So with that modification, are there any further requests for clarification or objections concerning the addition of this new subparagraph? I see none, thank you.

So after that we have ‑‑ there is a request from APT in Document 35A1 again to clarify which meetings could be ‑‑ could use electronic remote participation or webcast. Are there any comments on this?

By the way, I forgot to say that sometimes you will notice slight purely editorial modifications to your proposals. Sometimes I just changed small lowercase letters into capitals and vice versa. This is just the sort of thing that the Editorial Committee would have done at the end of the process. No request for clarifications? No comments on this point? In that case, I take it we agree.

And now we have still from the APT a clarification about the ITU website. No problem, I think, with that, either? Thank you.

And that brings us to the end. So if there are no further requests for the floor from any of you, and now is the time to ask for the floor, then we will transfer Resolution 32 as modified to Committee 3 for approval by Committee 3. Thank you. So that fitted to the 30 minutes which I had hoped to allocate to this Resolution 32.

And now we can move on to Agenda Item 3, which is Recommendations 8.1. As before, I will ask all the various representatives to give us a presentation of their contributions, and we will give the floor on questions and clarifications after the presentation of these various documents.

First we have Document 44, Addendum 2 from the regional common law in the field of communications. Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair, from the RFC, from the Federation, it would be nice to agree to deadlines of WTSA 12 working party meetings of ITU‑T. Therefore, we propose a deadline for submission of contributions from ITU members in a single language without request for translation of 12 calendar days before the meeting. And the document should be placed upon the website no later than three working days from the day of receipt by the secretariat.

The deadline for availability on site of all the documents we propose seven calendar days before the meeting. And this deadline does not report on events that have taken place less than 21 days near the start of the meeting nor from proposals from Chairman or convenors of ad hoc groups, compilations of proposals prepared by the Chairman or secretariat or contributions specifically requested by the meeting.

The deadline for availability on site of reports that have taken place less than 21 days before the meeting and are due to be considered at that meeting should be two calendar days before the beginning of the discussion of the item in question at the meeting unless otherwise agreed by the meeting.

And the deadline for submission of contributions to WTSA should be 14 calendar days in accordance with Resolution 165 of the Plenipotentiary Conference Guadalajara 201. Otherwise it's ‑‑ to submit ahead no more than one month prior to the opening of the assembly in order to allow more time for translation of document into all the languages of the Union and for preparing for the WTSA so that administrations can prepare for the WTSA.

Therefore, we propose changes to Resolution 1 of WTSA and Recommendation 8.1 of ITU‑T. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you. Next I have Contribution 61 from China Unicomm. Do we have a representative here in the room?

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Distinguished guests. I'm a representative from China Unicomm. I'd like to give a contribution. The reason we developed such a proposal is that we have considered that many of the rapporteur meetings and intermediary meetings are held outside of Geneva. And in certain countries these are required for those foreigners to enter into those countries. And in certain countries, it takes a lot of time to apply for the Visa. As a result, some of the delegates cannot get their Visa to attend the meetings in time. Therefore, we have proposed such a contribution.

I think that our common sense proposals have been reflected in the TSAG 24/1. And regarding this TSAG 24/1, we'd like to add on something more; that is, about 2.3.2.10. And we thank you that we have some different opinions regarding the TSAG's document according to our proposal, considering the improvement of the efficiency, we'd like to improve the efficiency by proposing that in terms of the circular letter, it should be given by the rapporteurs. And regarding the circular letter, there should be two requirements and the format of the circular letter should be the TSAG‑defined template. In addition, the circular letter should be posted on the TSAG website or the Study Group web page. That's my presentation. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you. Now, it seems that we have looked at the two main contributions. Of course we have Document 24, TSAG 24. And this has been subject to a certain form of consensus within TSAG, and I suggest we use it as a base document in order to see which modifications we can agree on.

So before I ask you for any comments, so comments just for clarification, I would like to first of all ask if there is support for China Unicomm's proposal. Are there members who support Document 61 from China Unicomm, which as was said in the presentation is similar but not identical to the proposed modification from TSAG? I see a request from Mongolia and from Indonesia. I imagine there's a request to support. So I don't need to give you the floor. Mongolia?

>> MONGOLIA: Thank you, Chairman. Mongolia would like to support Chinese proposal, thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you. And Iran has requested the floor.

>> IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is simply to support proposal by China. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Excellent, thank you. Microphone, please, for the Chairman. Microphone. It would work better. Are there any requests for clarification on these two proposals? Really, we're looking for clarifications, any requests for clarifications?

Then I will explain how we're going to move on this Recommendation 8.1. I see no requests for the floor, so this is how I wish to proceed. I have also prepared a document, a working document, which is on the same website. It's Document 3.1/2 which brings together all the proposals for modification. We're going do as we did for Resolution 32, we'll take them one by one and see if you support them or not while still remaining very aware of the fact that we have deadlines. And so there will be discussion. And if we come to the end of this meeting today, this will allow us to have some informal discussions up until our next session on Friday with a proposal so we can move forward on this.

So I look at the Working Document 3.1‑2. And we're going to go through this and see what modifications appear.

So the first modification is in Clause 1.4.7. And it's a proposal directly from TSAG. It was a correspondence group which was led by Mr.‑‑ at the time. Do we have any opposition to what we would be adding in the text under 1.47 in Recommendation 8.1? I don't see any, so thank you. Exactly the same text as in Document 24, TSAG 24. T.

TSAG also proposed adding a new section on correspondence activities. It's exactly the same as the text which appears in Document 24. So unless there is anyone who opposes it, I suggest that we accept it. Thank you.

The next modification on 1.61 is also from TSAG, Document 24. And I don't think there will be any problems in this. Thank you.

Now, we come to some modifications that may lead to some discussion among us. This is Clause 1.71 on definitions. And I should bring you up‑to‑date on some matters and some comments. Firstly, there is a proposal to define the term "question" this is a proposal from TSAG 24. But we also, in parallel, have a proposal to define this term" question" in Resolution 1. So it doesn't seem to me that it's a very good idea to define the term "question" in two different places because obviously if we modify one and not the other, we could end up with definitions that are potentially different. So we need to choose where we are going to define it.

Also, we need to be aware that this term "question" is used in the basic text of the Union Constitution. It appears with a capital letter. And if we define the word "question" here at this Assembly, this definition shall only apply to the standardization sector and shall not apply to the other sectors. And in particular, it cannot have impact on the use of the term as it is used in the Constitution.

So I would like to ask if you have comments on that. And if we should continue, really, with the definition of the term "question," the same applies to recommendation resolution later on. And if we're going to go down this path, we need to all be fully aware that this definition will only apply to the T sector, ITU‑T sector, and others may use different definitions. Are there any other comments?

I see no requests for the floor. So I conclude that everyone at this stage is agreed with continuing to the definition of the term "question".

The other point I mentioned, which it doesn't seem to me a good idea to define it twice, the same case. So my proposal here is that in Clause 1.7.1, that we use the usual annotations that we see in recommendations. So I will ask the drafting committee to show me how we do this precisely. But we will look at the ‑‑ and base ourselves on the definition that we'll put on the Resolution 1 so that if there are changes within Resolution 1, we will then bring it into here. So do we have agreement on that? So the definition of the term "question" will in fact be that which we bring into Resolution 1. Very well. I hope that is clear to everyone. Now of course we can come back to it when we discuss Resolution 1. There's no doubt about that. So I think we continue in this manner.

Then we have definitions proposed for terms which are used in Recommendation 1.1 but which weren't defined yet. Firstly, we have the term "amendment". Do we have any comments or opposition to the term "amendment"? I don't see any, thank you.

The next modification comes from TSAG and Document 24. I think it's purely editorial. And it's based on the rules of the Standardization Committee for Vocabulary, which recommends that we have definitions which are as short as possible. So all the explanatory text would appear in footnotes or in notes just below. So if there is no opposition, then I suggest we continue.

Then we have the same from TSAG to apply to the term "appendix." And also I note that I've made a small error on the term "requested amendment." The modification has not been changed. It's just been moved. I apologize.

Then we have the introduction of the definition of the term "clause." I don't think this will cause any problems.

For the term "supplement," the definition has been moved just so that it can be in alphabetical order.

The term "question" that we just agreed will be in the definition in Resolution 1.

And then we have definitions for terms text work I took and work programme. I don't think that will be problematic. And that also comes from TSAG in Document 24. So, thank you. So that's an important item on which we've been able to agree. So we shall continue and find the other modifications.

The next is the clause on the roles of rapporteurs. This is Clause 2.3.3.6 with a proposal which also comes from TSAG in Document 24. I don't think there are any problems with this modification, which was already discussed within TSAG.

So now we come to the subject of deadlines. So I suggest that kept comments for later, so I would say now is the time for comments. Any opposition? Or requests for amendment on this proposal from China Unicomm? Document 61, which as I said earlier is similar, not identical to the modifications proposed by TSAG in their Document 24.

So just one comment. I've tried to fuse together the proposals from China Unicomm and those from TSAG in Document 24. So my proposal here is that these texting shouldn't be picked up more. So it seemed to me they were already there, so we are sort of doubling up. But this is more of an editorial point.

So I open the floor. Are there any comments? Is there any opposition to this text? Or can we agree on this? The United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. If I could have a definition of "circular convening letters." What is the normal practice in the T sector? Do we mean by posting a circular letter on the website, or do we actually mean sending out letters to the members of the T sector? Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you. That's a good question. Indeed, could we ask the representative from China Unicomm to clarify this point? China, you have the floor.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the circular letter being posted on the website, we'd like to make the following clarification. We think releasing this circular on the website is a very efficient way of publishing it. The current working method is the convener of the meetings to send the circulars to all the participants and Member States. You know, there are so many Member States and participants, it's easy to omit and neglect someone. So if we publish or release this circular on the website, it's a very open and efficient option.

That's why we suggest the rapporteurs meeting and interim meeting circulars being released on the website in order to enable all the Member States of ITU to get related information through accessing the website, yet we agree with the Chairman that we allow some editorial merger of these two proposals. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: I beg your pardon, China. Could I please ask you to repeat just the last sentence there?

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We agree with your proposal through some editorial measures. Because as you said, there are many similarities between these two proposals. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, China. I was consulting my counselor and I just missed the final part of your intervention.

Now to come back to the United States' question. Would it be preferable to use the term "invitation letter" rather than convening letters? United States, I'm wondering if there was confusion there with the term "circular letters"? United States?

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, thank you for the clarification. I guess the confusion for us is we're not sure what "convening letter" means. We're not sure which process we're implementing. This is for rapporteur group meeting. And I'm not sure. What is the normal practice for Study Groups? In announcing a Study Group meeting or announcing a ‑‑ meeting. So are we creating another layer? Another process for the T sector Secretariat? Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you. Now re‑reading this sentence, I wonder if we couldn't make it into two because it's true that this sentence deals, if I've understood it properly, with plenaries of Study Groups. And I imagine that includes plenaries of working parties and also rapporteurs meetings, which I would call ‑‑ is what we call a rapporteur's meeting at the ITU. And that's a meeting on questions which are held outside the plenary of a Study Group. The Study Group plenary, or working group plenary, may take decisions, while that is not the case for rapporteurs meetings.

Now I'm hoping my counsel is listening to this, but I think plenaries have a circular letter, if I'm not mistaken in the term I'm using, while rapporteurs meeting are subject of what we could simply say an invitation but not a circular letter in the official sense of the ITU terminology.

So if we make this into two sentences, one which covers plenaries, which are thus meetings which can take decisions, and a sentence for rapporteurs meetings, because China Unicomm would agree on that and the United States, as well. No one is requesting the floor. So should ‑‑ United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. We're not opposing this text; it's just that I'm just confused as to what we're trying to do here. This whole section is discussing rapporteur and arranging meetings for rapporteur. So if we were to add the sentence as you suggested, we would be inserting a process on plenaries that I don't think belongs here. Could perhaps maybe we could speak with China offline and see what really we're trying to achieve here? And perhaps find a way forward. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, United States, and thanks very much for having picked up on this clause and seeing that it applies to meetings. So if we use this specific and precise terms of ITU‑T, there are rapporteurs meetings and question meetings. Now rapporteur meetings take place outside of a Study Group plenary, and question meetings take place during. So I'd like to thank you for this proposal. We're going to keep this text whilst waiting for our next meeting, and then that will allow time for informal consultations and allow us to come up with a text that is acceptable to all. I have some ideas, but we're in the going to draft the text now in the meeting.

I have a request for the floor from ‑‑ Comoros, please? Did you request the floor? Please request the floor by pressing your microphone button.

>> KOREA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is Korea, neighbor to Comoros. I agree on the Chairman's issue and based on the ITU‑T terminology, rapporteur meeting is informal group meetings which do not issues any corrective letters. Also this is not ‑‑ method of changes. It is issue for substantial changes. So we think separate this in term of rapporteur meeting and also regular Study Group meetings. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Korea, for your support. And I imagine you will take part in the informal discussions that we will be holding up until our next session on Friday morning.

So, Ladies and Gentlemen, I suggest we move on to the next clause, 2.3.10 which has modification ‑‑ I have moment of doubt here. This is the Chair. No, I beg your pardon. I'm finding my notes. The text from China Unicomm, which I copied before so we can compare it. So I apologies for that. So 2.3.3.11. And modification from TSAG in Document 24. Are there any comments, or does anyone oppose this? Very well, thank you.

In 3.1.7, we had a modification ‑‑ one modification from the RCC. I note that TSAG in Document 24 had asked for a similar type of modification elsewhere but not in clause 3.1.7. So perhaps Mr.‑‑ is following. Maybe he can confirm that this modification should probably have been applied, as well, by TSAG and it's merely been forgotten. Thank you. That confirms that. So you can see the same modification has been put forward by TSAG elsewhere just as was requested by the RCC, so I suggest we move on to the next area.

So that in 3.2.3 we have the modification which was also forgotten by TSAG. So that's two places.

And then we have the deletion of text at the end which is requested by RCC in Document 44, addendum 2, proposal 10. Are there any comments? Requests for clarification or any position on this modification? I don't see any. Thank you.

The following amendment is in 3.2.4. This was proposed by TSAG in Document 24 with a similar text proposed by RCC. So without any opposition from the room, I shall continue.

Now, in the next clause, 3.2.5, we have the usual modification from 10 to 12 days, this time put forward by TSAG in its Document 24 and by RCC. And we have a proposal to add a sentence from RCC which I think I will ask if here we wish to limit this purely to Member States or would we like sector members, which are also part of ITU‑T to be able to participate in this decision? This is a question I'm asking of the room. I see no requests for the floor. Is there any opposition to adding Sector Members as well as Member States here? I see no opposition.

Representative of RCC, perhaps it was something that was omitted, forgotten in your text. Or do you have any objection to us adding Member States and Sector Members, adding "and Sector Members" in here? Russia Federation.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We have no objections on this proposal. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Excellent. Thank you very much. So, since there is no objection and if there is no objection from any other participants, I propose that we add that term "and Sector Members". Thank you very much.

So, that brings us to 3.3.3. There is a proposal from RCC for deadlines for posting a number of documents. I noted that the TSAG correspondence group didn't manage to reach agreement in its discussion on deadlines. And there was a text, proposed text which I copied out below. But as I said, there wasn't agreement on it, but I just recall this in my paper so that we can use it in our discussion. And the list of the correspondence group, there was also a proposal from Mr. Hill, counselor of Study Group 2, based on procedures of Council. And it seems to me that the text proposed by RCC is very similar indeed to the contribution sent in by Mr. Hill on the correspondence list. I.

I would like to explain, however, that obviously documents managed by Council are sometimes different from those used by the Study Group. So I think we have to be careful if we try to repeat and reproduce Council procedures. We have to make sure that this is consistent with what we are accustomed to doing within our sector.

So I'll stop there. I apologize to the United States. I saw your request but I wanted to finish what I was saying. United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Sorry for that, Chairman, thank you. You're moving really fast. Can I please take you back to 3.2.5? Have we added Sector Members to this text? Just to confirm. We are concerned about the addition of this sentence. Through you, if I could ask the Russian delegation to explain what the intention of this added text is? That would be helpful. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Well, I imagine you are referring to the complete sentence rather than to the addition "and Sector Members" which I proposed at the end. You want to know the entire sentence is supposed to mean.

Russian Federation, could you please give us some more explanations about adding this sentence at the end of 3.2.5, please, Russian Federation?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. This sentence which we proposed to add is supposed to mean that contributions or proposals that this proposal about 12 calendar days should not apply to contributions which might be admitted by the Director if there is a notification of shorter notice. And in this case, the final decision should be taken at the meeting if there are no objections on the part of Member States. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Russia. I was wondering myself. It seems to me this is a rule which appears in the general rules of conferences. Perhaps is the legal adviser there? There he is. Maybe we could ask him to confirm my interpretation. This sentence added at the end of 3.2.5, the final consideration by the meeting. Is this the repetition from the rules of general rules of conferences? And therefore my proposal to add "and Sector Members" can that proposal be retained or not? Can we add Sector Members or not? If we are maybe repeating something that figures without "Sector Members" in general rules for conferences.

>> LEGAL ADVISER: Thank you, Chairman. Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen, strictly formally, no, this proposal is not a repetition of an explicit provision of the general rules for conferences and meetings, but it is a repetition of the spirit of those provisions because it is always up to the meeting in question to take a decision as to whether or not it is going to examine any specific contribution, especially when this is submitted late. So the spirit of the rules for conferences in meetings is repeated in this provision. As to the letter, it is not repeated literally. Therefore this provision in itself as it is worded would not run counter to the general rules for conferences and meetings.

Now, there might be a problem as to whether it is expedient to give a right to veto in inverted commas to Sector Members, because adding the words "and Sector Members" would result in a situation where a Sector Member, if I have read this correctly, would be able to oppose examination of a contribution even if this contribution may appear important to Member States. Thank you, Chair.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you, Legal Adviser, for your very interesting and valuable explanations.

We should highlight this text, have some informal discussions between the United States, the representative of the RCC, myself, Legal Adviser if necessary, and Friday we should be able to come up with a new proposal. Obviously anyone who is interested is welcome to join this small group to consult on this during the coffee breaks.

So we were on Clause No. 3.3.3. Have you any comments to make? We still have five minutes of this meeting time. So if you have any questions or requests for clarifications, then please say so so that we can have informal discussions to be ready for Friday morning. United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, we would like to thank the RCC for their proposal. We agree with changing of the deadline from 10 calendar days to 12 calendar days; however, the other changes proposed in the RCC document would be difficult for our delegation. We think that there's sufficient ‑‑ the existing guidelines for proposing of documents provides sufficient structure and predictability as well as necessary flexibility and the proposed changes are really complex and they offer a lot of exceptions to the proposed rules that have already been agreed to. So at this time without further discussion, the U.S. could not accept this text. Thank you.

>> OLIVIER DUBUISSON: Thank you very much. I propose to you that those parties which are interested should discuss all of this with myself before Friday.

We are drawing towards an end of our first session. I think we were very efficient this afternoon. I thank you for that. I hope we will continue in this excellent way so that we can send the text to Committee 3 very quickly. I'm sure Mr. Trowbridge is very keen to have more work.

And I'd like to remind you that for Resolution 1, there is the subject of intellectual property rights, patents, et cetera. And this seems to me to give rise to certain problems. There are issues of contention and stumbling blocks. So please come to see me and hold discussions among yourselves so that we can find a solution, a compromise.

Resolution 1 will be on the agenda on Friday morning. And I would like to remind you that on Friday, we will be beginning our session at 9:00 a.m. Thank you all very much for working so well, and I wish you a good afternoon. The meeting is adjourned.
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