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>> CHAIR: Ladies and Gentlemen, good afternoon. Welcome to the first meeting of Working Group 3B on the subject of languages.

Ladies and Gentlemen, you had the temporary document distributed which shows the Terms of Reference of this group. It is basically to review Resolution 67, which deals with the creation of a Standardization Committee for Vocabulary and to address the various proposals on translation and interpretation in that regard.

So I'd first like to introduce the secretary to this committee of Mr. Bruce Gracie, who will provide support to our group.

So I'd now like to refer you to Document ADM 7, which outlines the agenda for this meeting. As you can see, we have two, Addendum 4, Document 4, and one from the CPT, or Europe, and European common proposal in Document 45, Addendum 8. We also have a document from the Telecommunications Standard Bureau, Document No. 29, which outlines the various editorial updates to this resolution. If it is so decided to maintain the resolution, this will need to be taken into account.

So those are my opening remarks, Ladies and Gentlemen. I see ‑‑ I will provide you with some background information, however, before we begin. I think it's important that we take into account the background documentation, background decisions that have been taken with respect to the use of languages. While recognizing, of course, that this is a very important subject and one that has been discussed not only at the sector level but in the course of discussions in the ITU council and the plenipotentiary conference.

Now, as far as the ITU practice is concerned, this is to publish all of the ITU‑T recommendations in English, French and Spanish. This was the up to a certain point, but in October 2000, recommendation ITU‑T A.8 on the alternative approval process for new and revised recommendations was first approved during the WTSA held in Montreal. As of the 1 January 2001 who publications were in effect. At the WTSA in Brazil in 2004, the report of the WTSA committee on working methods of ITU‑T indicated that the meeting supported in principle the priority to establish priorities in the translation of recommendations. The committee agreed to amend Resolution 1 on rules and procedures of ITU‑T in order to fully reflect the Article 29 of the Constitution on languages.

However, the committee recognized that in accordance with Resolution 115, which was adopted in Marrakech in 2002, the plenipotentiary conference set January 2005 at the date at which all ITU‑T work will be carried out in the six official and working languages of the Union on an equal footing.

Now you recall, those of you who participate in plenipotentiary conference, that decision 5 of the 2006 plenipot held in Italia set a limit for expenditure on interpretation, translation and text processing in respect of the official languages of the Union for the years 2008‑2011.

Furthermore, Item 7 within Annex 2 of 2005 said one option for reducing expenditures would be consideration of savings in languages; i.e., in particular translation and interpretation for Study Group meetings and publications.

So, Ladies and Gentlemen, this provides a context for our discussion and a framework for carrying this discussion forward.

I should mention that the ceiling on expenditure is concerned, the Guadalupe established a limit of 85 million Swiss francs for the four‑year financial period.

Now, it's important in this regard, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the ceiling on expenditure was not considered to be a budget; it's simply a ceiling on expenditure, so that's an important distinction to bear in mind. So with that context and that background, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd like to proceed with Item 3 of our agenda, the proposals for the work of this assembly concerning the equality of languages.

And we have before us the proposal, as I mentioned earlier, from the RCC found in Document 44, Addendum 4, and various proposals are outlined in that document. So I'd like to give the floor for the spokesperson from the RCC to present Document 44 Addendum 4 and the various sections that are indicated in our agenda. So I assume this is the Russian Federation? The Russian Federation, you have the floor, thank you.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. You already said a great deal about this subject, so I won't repeat, if you permit. I just want to draw attention to the fact that in resolution 154 of the council, it was stated that there should be an indepth analysis of the services of documentation and publication in order to avoid any overlapping and to create synergies, unfortunately, so far the inequality has persisted, especially in translation into Arabic, Chinese and Russian. This is for translation of ITU‑T documentations. In our document, we've given some examples.

In Russian, there's only at best one tenth of the amount of translation as there is into other languages. And unfortunately this trend exists and persists even for the traditional approval procedure which ‑‑ for which there should be translation into all six languages and our statutory provisions. But unfortunately this doesn't happen, and our operators and administrations therefore experience difficulties in using administrations ‑‑ in using recommendations, especially recommendations of a policy and regulatory character which have been approved through the traditional approval procedure. This is one of the points which we would like to emphasize.

As for the procedure for the Alternative Approval Procedure, there was an agreement, as you will remember, Chairman, at Council when we were discussing this issue. It was linked to the loss of income in the sector because of the free‑of‑charge dissemination of recommendations. And then we found a compromise. And it was said that the opportunity would be provided to translate a certain number of pages under AAP, but this also is not being done to the full extent. And we are highlighting this, as well. And we were saying that this should be done because the Council decision was taken into effect and this Council decision should now be implemented in full.

I must admit that at last the first report of the TSAG has been received in all six languages. Thank you very much. A big thank you for that. We hope that will continue. So that problem which is mentioned in the report seems to have been resolved for the moment.

And then there's the general problem that the sites in other languages than English are not the same as the English language site. And, for example, if I use the Russian site, I can't go to the links which I need to either because the site hasn't been updated or for some other reasons. And even if at the top of the site it gives all the six languages, I can click on the Russian and then the answer will be: "This site exists only in English." So unfortunately up till now, I know that the situation is being improved. But nevertheless, up till now, the sites in the other languages are not user‑friendly. Well, the site is not user‑friendly, anyway, but in the languages other than English, they are very un‑user‑friendly. And so we have specific proposals.

First, that the Telecommunications Standardization Bureau should take steps to eliminate the imbalance in the translation of ITU‑T recommendations and establish a procedure for translation when ITU members are informed of a approval of a recommendation it should be indicated whether it will be translated or not because we need to know that in advance. That's our first proposal.

The second proposal that translate all recommendations approved under the traditional approval procedure as well as the TSAG reports in all the languages of the Union.

And number 3, when taking the decisions to translate within alternative approval, 1,000 pages per biennium, we recommend TSB should consult with representatives of the language groups, indicate Russian, the RCC is prepared to send proposals to the bureau for what should be translated.

And our next proposal, we think that the work of the consultative committee on the standardization committee on vocabulary is very important. The Study Groups are preparing new recommendations and the Study Groups are proposing the use of new terminology. So there has to be some sort of group or committee to analyze what is being proposed and how the Study Groups are to use the terminology so that there are no discrepancies within the sector and the work has to be coordinated with the consultative committee on vocabulary in the radio sector. So we have to have coordination between the SCV of the ITU‑T and the CCV of the ITU‑R.

Recently we had a conference call. And the secretary of our meeting participated in that. And we were discussing issues which also have to be discussed in the CCV of the ITU‑R and in the SCV of the ITU‑T. We have Study Group 6 on television, for instance, which has terms which are probably very interesting to Study Group 9 of ITU‑T. And we have to work together.

And then we propose that "ensure that information on the ITU‑T website are available in all languages on an equal footing." And then we have proposals on modifications to 67 in the text, as well. That is our proposal number 6.

The main modification is that we think the work of the committee should be continued, and we think that those aspects which we raised should be incorporated into Resolution 67. And that this resolution should definitely not be suppressed. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Yes, thank you very much, Dr. Menken. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, the floor is open for any comments with respect to this particular aspect.

And I remind everyone, we're dealing with proposals for the work of the assembly dealing with the equality of languages. We will deal with the issue of Resolution 67 in the next agenda item. But in terms of the presentation just made in respect to the issue of equality of languages, does anyone have any comments? The floor is open. I see no ‑‑ oh, yes, United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Really, this is not ‑‑ I just wanted to point out that apropos of the concern that's been raised, Resolution 154 asks the Council ‑‑ what is it? Excuse me. One second, please.

My understanding is Res 154 has asked the Council working group on language ‑‑ languages, which is to monitor this situation. So if it's a concern and it sound like a concern, legitimate concern, then the place to go is the council working group on languages, which is ‑‑ which has been given the oversight on this issue. And I only say that because in order to keep this issue separate from the other committee that sounds very familiar, the standardization committee on vocabulary but in fact has a very different responsibility. I'm not expressing ‑‑ I'm not disagreeing with the concerns that were raised, just commenting on that technical aspect.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Any other comments, Ladies and Gentlemen? I see requests from the floor from Sudan. If you wish to speak, I would suggest you press your microphone. You will see a green light. And then I'll give you the floor and your microphone will come on. In this case, the microphone's on already. Thank you.

>> SUDAN: Thank you, Chairman. Chairman, this is a very important subject and is very sensitive for many countries who we fully support the Russian proposals on translation. We are part of the Arab group. We represent some 100 states which suffer from the current the present situation therefore we support the Russian proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Any further comments, please? China, please.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Regarding the equal utilization of the languages, we support the Russian delegation. In terms of the harmonization of the terms, and we agree with the U.S. delegation because these are two different issues to be discussed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. France, please?

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. We understand absolutely the issues raised by the Russian Federation on the problem of equality between the languages. This is a very important issue and it is multifaceted. Of course we must remember the financial aspects as well as all the others. I think we have to see this question in isolation from that of Resolution 67 and the committee on vocabulary. That is something slightly different, which we will discuss later. I think that all of the subjects raised by the Russian Federation require and call for an appropriate mechanism, but I think this still requires further discussion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Any further comments? Yes, I'd like to give the floor to Mr. Ratta, please?

>> MR. RATTA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't intend to go through all those statistics, but in order to be complete in terms of understanding several of the assertions that have been placed in the contribution relative to the practice of publication and translation of ITU‑T recommendations, the TSB has been publishing since January 1, 2005, by means of the Traditional Approval Process 100 percent of the documents published in that fashion. I did find three that were approved in May of 2006 that somehow were lost. They have since been initiated for the translation. And that's why I'm confident in saying 100 percent of the traditionally approved recommendations.

In terms of the AAP, the alternative approval process, we have not refused a request yet that has been placed to us by the Study Groups.

Now, it is true that there is no mechanism that's been agreed to and documented in any recommendation or any resolution or any other kind of guidance so the TSB on how to decide to manage the resources within the guidance that the Council's already been providing on the funds available for translation. But whenever a Study Group has made a request, at least since I've been there in early 2008, we have never refused a request from a Study Group to translate into any of the other languages. That's the facts that I see, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, if I may summarize so far, there appear to be two issues being discussed here. Number one concerns the equality of the languages pursuant to very plenipotentiary conference and Council decisions. The plenipotentiary conference resolution that's relevant here is 154 concerning the use of the six official languages of the Union on an equal footing.

As has been mentioned, some of these issues raised in the contribution from the Russian Federation perhaps would be more appropriately addressed at the level of the Council itself, given the fact that the financial implications of some of these points would be important to consider in the context of the impact of the work of the Union as a whole as opposed to just ITU‑T, in measures that could be undertaken and implemented would have to be approved at the level of the council or even the plenipotentiary conference.

Now, for example, the proposal if the RCC number 5, concerning that information on the various websites be made available in all of the official languages of the union on an equal footing applies to not just the T sector but also the R sector and the D sector, if I understood correctly. So I think this is a matter that should be brought to the attention of Council. And if, in fact, the Council working group on languages is still functioning, I'm not absolutely clear if it is, but assuming it is, then certainly this would be one issue that would need to be brought to their attention.

So I think as one outcome from this assembly, we could bring to the attention of Council the need to address this particular issue and request that either of the Council itself or the Council working group on languages address this particular issue. Now as far as proposal number 3 is concerned, it indicates when taking the decision to translate recommendations approved under AAP, within a quota of 1,000 pages per biennium, the TSB should consult with representatives of the language groups. In the case of Russian, an appropriate agreement should be concluded between the TSB and the RCC.

Now, again it would seem to me that this issue has wider implications, and we must, I believe, bear in mind the comments just made by Mr. Ratta where he has indicated that there has been as far as the AAP‑approved recommendations, our concern, it has been the practice of TSB to translate without exception and up to the budgetary limits. And I think that's a very important set of words, those documents for which translation is specifically requested by the ITU‑T Study Group. So I believe that we need to reflect that in the report of this group back to Committee 3.

And as Mr. Ratta has also mentioned, the TSB, without exception, has translated all of the recommendations under the Traditional Approval Process. So that's with respect to recommendation or proposal No. 2.

And as far as proposal No. 3 is concerned, again, it would seem that this would be a wider issue that would need to be addressed at the level of the council. And perhaps at the level of the working group on languages of the Council.

Now, as far as the first proposal is concerned, that the Bureau should take steps to eliminate the imbalance in the translation of ITU‑T recommendations and to establish a procedure for translation, when ITU‑T members are informed of the approval or recommendation, it should be indicated whether it will be translated.

Though again if I refer to Mr. Ratta's remarks, it would seem that whenever a request is made to translate a document, whether it's into Russian, Arabic or Chinese or any of the other languages of the Union, that action is undertaken on that basis to undertake that action. I do believe subject to confirmation from Mr. Ratta, perhaps that when ITU members are informed of the approval of a recommendation, it should be indicated whether it will be translated. Perhaps I could ask Mr. Ratta? He tells me it's not common practice, so we could highlight that in our report.

So I think we have addressed at least the four proposals that have been put forward. Proposal, 1, 2, 3 and 5. So before we proceed, are there any further comments with respect to those particular proposals before we address specifically Resolution 67? So the floor is open, Ladies and Gentlemen, I see no requests from the floor. Oh, the Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. This contribution gives examples. And we would like to stress this issue of inequality of languages. You're right about some things, about equal presentation of information on sites. That is for all sectors, you're right. This has to be discussed at Council, you're right.

However, for Proposal No. 3, which recommendation should be translated, the recommendations which are approved under A, Alternative Approval Procedure, this in our view should be decided by the Member States and not the Secretariat. And that is why we made this proposal, so that the Secretariat could secret the advice of the regional language groups to ask them which recommendations at that point in time are most important and relevant for those language groups and which should therefore be translated.

As for the Council working group on languages, well of course this is a very important group. But unfortunately, it doesn't deal with terminology issues. The secretariat also should not deal with developing terms and definitions, in our opinion. That is why we have the groups in the radio communications sector, for instance, at this time. We also have a group in the ITU‑T, the SCV. And we propose that a similar group which would take account of the views of members of ITU on issues of development of terminology and definition and coordination of work, that such a group, in our view, should exist in one form or another. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. Welcome to that under item 4 with respect to the maintenance of the SCV under Resolution 67. Now with respect to the proposal No. 3, I see that the proposal is to ‑‑ when taking a decision to translate recommendations approved under the alternate ‑‑ or the APP, within a quota of 1,000 pages per biennium, TSB should consult with representatives of the language groups.

Now, as we have noted in the discussion on this particular issue, on the equality of languages, with regard to the reference to the quota of the number of pages, I do believe that that is a wider issue than may need to be addressed by council within the whole context of the expenditures that are available to undertake such a translation.

I'm not sure whether 1,000 cost of translation per page is too high, too low or whatever, but I do believe it would be necessary in the consideration of the biennial budget that will be coming up for approval of the council in June of next year. Perhaps that this would be something that would need to be addressed however, these are only my observations on the issue. Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. I'd like to draw your attention to the fact that Council already has adopted such a decision in 2009 about 1,000 pages per biennium. This decision already has been taken by Council and there is no need to go back to that again.

You will recall this decision was a compromise when there was a consideration of access to issues free of charge. I think the Chairman also participated directly in that, didn't you, Mr. Gracie? You remember that decision. So I don't think there's any need for us to go right back to Council with that except if we ask them to increase the number of pages, of course. Then we could go back to Council and ask them to do that. But I don't think the budget would allow for an increase. Thank you.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Okay, thank you very much, Dr. Menken. I do quite recall that decision in 2009. There was mention made of the 1,000 pages per biennium. But as you mention, if there are proposals to increase the number, that would have to be considered within the context of the budget.

So I think we've taken careful note of all the comments, the proposals that have been made. The TSB has taken note of those that can be acted upon. But as we noted under No. 5, that the issue of the website is a wider issue that would need to be considered by Council given the fact that the ITU‑R website and the ITU‑D website are also relevant here.

So unless there's any further comments, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd like to move to Item 4. Now again we have the proposal from the RCC, No. 44, Addendum 4. This is Proposal No. 4, Proposal No. 6 and we also have a European Common proposal in Document 45, Addendum No. 8, Number 8.

First I'd like to give the floor again to the Russian Federation for the presentation of Document 44, Addendum 4, Number 4 and Number 6, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Our first proposal is to continue the work of the Standardization Committee on Vocabulary. And the reasons I have explained already. If you have any questions, I am happy to answer.

As for equal information on the site, I won't repeat that, either. I absolutely agree with you, Chairman, that this is a general issue for all the three sectors. And we raised it also in the radio communications sector and also the Council working group on languages. So that issue that is Proposal No. 5, is a general issue. It is for the council working group on languages. We agree with you. But we'd like to draw attention of our sector to it, nevertheless, because unfortunately, each sector has got several different practices for the way in which they present and maintain their site. So in each sector, we have to draw attention to this issue.

Coming now to Proposal No. 6, we propose specific proposal to change, to modify Resolution 67, both the title of that resolution and a new subparagraph C in the recognizing section. Also, there are some pure editorial modifications in recognizing ‑‑ in considering B, we're talking about term not sancha, and further we are proposing to add references to Resolution 154 of the plenipotentiary conference, and also we are proposing to add a section on coordination of the work with the radio sector, with ITU‑R and the CCV. And we are stressing the importance of equal provision of information on the website of ITU‑T. That is K.

And then if you go to resolveds, scroll to resolveds, please. We don't have any additional proposals on the annex, there are purely editorial changes.

So our proposals basically are about the subjects of the first sections of this resolution and the other provisions are fine for us. The main thing is that this resolution should actually work in practice. We don't see any need to change the other sections of it. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I'd now like to give the floor to representative from Europe to present Document No. 45, Addendum 8, No. 8. I believe it's France. France, please, you have the floor?

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. With regard to Resolution 67, in it is contribution, we indicate the reasons why we think that certain parts of the resolution could be deleted. It's an overall global problem that we have dealt with. We've already presented this document at other sessions. And in particular, Resolution 67, which mentions the SCV, we think that the tasks that were set out in this resolution have been achieved and that is why that as a resolution, it can be deleted.

And elsewhere, as Chair of this vocabulary committee, I can indicate that we discussed at the last TSAG that we have come to the conclusion that in the end, the resolution and the committee for vocabulary could be finished since they have completed their task. And these tasks were part of the normal work that would be carried out by TSB.

I should say that certain number of problems raised by the contribution from RCC and clarified by Mr. Menken are certainly problems that we understand. But that is not within the remit of this committee for vocabulary that it can be dealt with, as we said earlier. So this is another way of working that will need to be found.

So our proposal is to delete this resolution. Thank you, Chairman.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you very much. The floor is open, Ladies and Gentlemen for your various views on I guess two alternatives: Whether to modify Resolution 67 or to suppress it. Or, in fact, there could be a third alternative, to replace the current Resolution 67 with an alternative text, which focuses, perhaps, on the issue of the equal footing of the use of languages in the Union.

So the floor is open, Ladies and Gentlemen. The Russian Federation, please?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. We have a question to our distinguished colleague, Marie‑Thérèse. How is it that the work of the committee on terminology is finished if the sector hasn't stopped developing new recommendations? It hasn't stopped the development of new terms and their definitions.

As I understand it, I maybe mistaken, of course, but as I understand it, the Secretariat has no right to deal with these issues, otherwise why do we have an editorial committee in this assembly and the other conferences. The Secretariat does not have these powers. It is up to administrations to decide how a given term is to be translated correctly.

So I have a question to you. How can you say that tasks have been fulfilled and the work has been completed? We haven't stopped the work of the sector.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Before I give the floor to France to respond, I would like to give the floor to Mr. Ratta, please, with respect to the practices undertaken by the Secretariat.

>> MR. RATTA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to clarify what our practice is. The TSB is not engaged in trying to decide which terms are defined in which manner. We are extremely rigid about taking only terms defined by the membership in ITU‑T recommendations. And since the end of 2010, we have restored the practice of instilling in an online database every term defined in an ITU‑T recommendation. So we haven't caught up with all of the terms that have been defined for a period in an earlier time, but we are current with the documents as they are approved now.

We do this only in English, it's true, because since 2005, the activities in the T sector have been limited to practicing only in a single language. But it is anticipated that through the normal infrastructure, the terms that are applied in English, because that's the language that we are using, will be translated into the other languages. That's outside the scope of the responsibility of the TSB.

But the point is we do not invent or decide which terms are defined or how they're defined; that's done by the membership. Thank you.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you very much, Mr. Ratta. Could I give the floor to France now, please?

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Chairman. I think Mr. Ratta has replied in large part to the questions from the Russian Federation.

Chairman, what I could propose is that we have perhaps a small group which looks more closely at Resolution 67 in order to see what has already been done and maybe to discuss in more detail with RCC what it is that they wish to see and to come back with a revised resolution or a slightly different resolution for this issue of languages, because I think it's going to be difficult to agree here in a plenary meeting of your group because I think we need to discuss this more precisely. Thank you.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Yes, thank you very much, Ms. Alajouanine. As usual, you make a very constructive proposal.

Do believe the proposal to establish a small group so that these could be discussed in detail would be a good way forward. So in that regard, I do believe that it would be useful perhaps to use the next timeslot that we have available for Working Group 4B, which is tomorrow morning, we would use this timeslot. You can see that the timeslot is from 9:30 to 10:45. And perhaps we can use that timeslot for the purpose of this small group. So obviously it would be France and the Russian Federation who would participate. Is there anyone else who would wish to participate in that group? Yes, Spain and United States? No? United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Well, I would like to suggest that if Mr. Ratta is available, that perhaps he could sit in on that meeting. I was going to say, Mr. Chairman ‑‑ Mr. Chairman, can you hear me? I didn't know. If it's possible, Mr. Ratta could sit in on that meeting? Because he seems to have an intimate knowledge of the processes that are being used.

As far as the U.S. is concerned, it sounds like a reasonable way forward. But just having been a Vice Chair of this committee, I concur with Madame Alajouanine.

I believe the functions of this committee are mechanical, almost. They have no role in determining what is translated. But they take what is given to them and they make sure that it is put into the online terminology base and they try and get the Study Groups to work according to some guiding principles in developing and using definitions.

And the reason this committee has fulfilled its function is that it has got the TSB up to speed and the processes are established that things are working well enough so that there's no real need to continue the committee at the present time; nevertheless, we support the idea of an ad hoc group to see if some ‑‑ there's another solution there. Thank you.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you very much. I'm sure Mr. Ratta would be delighted to participate in this group.

Sudan, please. My apologies if I didn't see your request for the floor. Sudan?

>> SUDAN: Thank you, Chairman. It is clear that the Russian Federation's proposal is clear and so is the text. France's proposal is clear, as well. And we're looking for a compromise.

So we support the proposal by the Russian Federation. Thank you.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Okay. Thank you very much. I assume by your remarks you would be interested in participating in the group? So, Sudan, please?

>> SUDAN: Thank you, Chairman. We would very much like to participate in the work of this small working group, thank you. Thank you very much.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you very much. I also assume China would like to participate. China, please?

>> CHINA: Yes, Mr. Chairman, thank you.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you very much.

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, as I mentioned, we do have a timeslot tomorrow morning from 9:30 until 10:45. So I would suggest that we use that slot for the purpose of this meeting of this small group.

Now, I would like to point out as far as Resolution 67 is concerned, that the Annex B or Annex 2, which outline the guidelines for the preparation of terms and definitions, if my understanding is correct, the Study Groups use the guidelines given in Annex B to the authors guide for drafting ITU‑T recommendations. So therefore perhaps this Annex is no longer relevant. So I believe that that would need to be taken into account.

We have discussed the authors' guides in the meetings of the TSAG, but of course having Mr. Ratta available as a resource individual for the work of this group will be very important to ensure that the common practices that are undertaken by the TSB are reflected in any revision to either Resolution 67 or perhaps replacement resolution that reflects all of the concerns and proposals that have been made during the course of this meeting.

So are there any other comments, Ladies and Gentlemen? We have been very efficient in the discussion of these proposals. So I don't believe that we need to continue unless, of course, there's any other business under Item 5? Yes, the United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Just one further comment.

In this meeting, the ad hoc meeting, I would encourage the group to not duplicate the effort that's being conducted by the Council Working Group on Languages. In other words, if the Council Working Group on Languages has the task of monitoring the TSB to make sure that adequate translation is occurring, then there's no reason for the vocabulary committee to undertake that task. So it has to be some new task assumably dealing with the terminology aspect that would be relevant here. Thank you.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you very much, Mr. Ennis. I'm sure that the group will take that into account when it discusses the matter tomorrow.

Any other business, Ladies and Gentlemen? If not, I'd like to thank everyone for their participation, and I would like to wish the ad hoc group the best of luck in their deliberations. Hopefully by the end of the period tomorrow morning, we will have agreed on a way forward so that we can discuss this at the final meeting of this group on Friday, which if you look at the schedule, this group is been allocated the second period on Friday.

On the subject of vocabulary and editorial committees, I would like to remind everybody that the Editorial Committee will meet at 5:30 in the Ed Comm Room. This is at the end of the meeting. This work is very important. And we should make sure that those who have an interest in proceeding, that we would with the important work of this Assembly, that we would be participating in this group.

Now, one thing I had overlooked with respect to the group itself that will meet tomorrow morning, I did not designate a Chair for the group. I do believe it would be perhaps appropriate, given the fact that the Russian Federation had made most of the proposals, if they would accept to Chair this group so that we can make some progress. Would that be acceptable to Russia? I see that it is.

So, Ladies and Gentlemen, again I wish you all the best for the work of the ad hoc group tomorrow. Do I see another request from the floor from the United States, please?

>> UNITED STATES: Very short. Are there other agenda items in 3B? Or this is it? So once this issue is resolved, we will no longer need a 3B? Very good work, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Well, of course having only one resolution to deal with is advantageous from the point of view of concluding quickly; but in any case, not to make light of the fact this is a very important and sensitive issue that we've discussed at length at the level of the plenipotentiary conference, at Council and at previous Assemblies, not only of this sector but the radio sector. We have discussed this, as well, at the development conferences. So it is important that we address this issue correctly and that we agree on a way forward it is appropriate and of course cost‑effective and in the interest of not only the membership but also of the Secretariat.

So with that, Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you all for your participation. And I'd like to declare this meeting adjourned. Thank you.

Oh, I'm sorry. Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: I apologize, Chairman. I just wanted to ask a question to the Secretariat. Will you display on the screen the place where this ad hoc group will meet tomorrow morning?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, it will be displayed ‑‑

>> MR. RATTA: I have a feeling this room is too large for the group interested. So we will see what room is appropriate. I know this is silly, but can I see a show of hands for those who expect to participate? Okay. A very small room. We will have it posted. Thank you.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Okay. With that, Ladies and Gentlemen, meeting is adjourned. Thank you.
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