

RAW COPY

WORLD TELECOMMUNICATION STANDARDIZATION ASSEMBLY
WG3A
HAMMAMET, TUNISIA
28 OCTOBER, 2016

Services Provided By:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-482-9835
www.captionfirst.com

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

WORLD TELECOMMUNICATION STANDARDIZATION ASSEMBLY
WG3A.

>> Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to our third meeting for Working Group 3A. I'm sorry for the delay. We have a problem in projection. Since it will take some time, I would like to propose to you that we can start without projection for the moment. The technician could solve this problem.

I thank you for understanding and talking slowly until we find exactly what section we're talking about until we have projection on the screen.

Based on yesterday's discussion we stopped at item 1.11.4. We have a brief presentation from CTEL on their proposal about -- the AIP/4610. We suggested this proposal is linked to the new proposal from RCC for a new item for ITU documentation. Based on that I propose we start our session from .113, voting. In this regard we have a proposal from RCC.

Is the projector working now?

Great.

We can go to 1.13.

Our plan for today's meeting, we'll do our best to go

through the documents. I need your understanding, cooperation that we can go as fast as we can since we're still on page number 7 and we have around 40 pages to discuss.

Would you like to present?

1.13. Any comments on your side regarding the proposed amendment from RCC? 1.13.

Can we approve this Amendments in 1.13?

No objection.

Now we can go to the new section 2. Since it's many changes, a newly introduced section, I will give the floor to RCC to give us a brief presentation about this change before we start discussion of its substance. Russia federation, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you very much, Chair.

Good morning, dear colleagues.

The aim is simplifying the work of all Delegates, particularly those who to date have not participated in the work of the sector and also Delegates from developing countries who could -- who can only take part periodically. We tried to bring together the documentation from the sector, the ITT sector that is, from different documents and overall use the existing text that was distributed between a series of resolutions and particularly Recommendations under series A.

I would like to say straightaway there is some new definitions, in particular those -- a lack offish, to date, there was no definition for opinions and we have proposed a similar definition as is used in the radio sector.

Also in this section we propose to include a brief description of procedures or methods, rather, for approval of sector documents and I would like to draw your attention to the fact that in many places it said that approval is carried out usually based on consensus. However, if there is no consensus then the 130 rule is a I plied, the majority, the majority of Member States who are present at the meeting. So that's my brief presentation.

You can see the methods for suppressing documents.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia, for your brief presentation.

I would like to open the floor for any comments, points of clarification to Russia before we go to the substance of the text.

No requests for the floor. We can go straight for the section, the new section 2. We'll take it very fast, one by one to get your opinion.

Any comments on 2.1?

2.1.11, presentation of text?

Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you very much, Chair.

I would like to propose if, of course, the meeting agrees, in terms of deletion -- in terms of exceptions, ask the Secretariat if they note any lack of accuracy note this and we'll try to fix it ourselves.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. We'll work on that.

I would like to also draw attention that we're trying now to approve the text of the new section 2. Any comments? 2.1.1. United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chairman.
Good morning, everyone.

Chairman, through you, if I can ask our colleagues from Russia the text regarding 2.1.1.3 -- sorry. 2.1.1.2 regarding -- if we could have an explanation on why Russia would like to include this text in section 2 of Resolution 1 is that would be very helpful for us.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

Russia, please give us clarification.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you very much, Chair.

This is an existing text and I'm not quite sure where it is included. I can find it a little later. It is not new text here.

While I have the microphone, I would like to note that we have found some mistakes in the translation in the English version, that is. In 2.1.1 is.3 on the second line it says implementation guides but it should be implementation guidelines. This is one of the documents we published which you can find in the catalog of publications of the ITU-T.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. I hope you can provide us with your reference for .1.1.2.

>> RUSSIA: Offline.

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

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: It could be a translation issue but in 2.1.1.3 it says their series were important. We're not familiar with the series. Could we have an explanation of that as well?

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

Russia, could you clarify us about 2.1.1.3, the series.

>> RUSSIA: Perhaps to speed up the process let's just -- the series. Yes. Sometimes we update reports and also guidelines and so we need to show which number of update it is. If that's not clear we can just delete this series where important.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia.

Delete that series.

>> SECRETARIAT: There is difficulty to show the right color. If we chose the background then the modifications colors, if we use automatic ones it will also not be tracked. There is no better solution. We have to use same color for all the modifications and try to fix that.

>> CHAIR: Can we delete the series in 2.1.1.3.

>> RUSSIA: Very series or important to be deleted.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you.

Any other comments to 2.1.1.4 or 5? Any comments under this section?

We go to 2.1.2.

Any comments?

Can we agree on 2.1.2, any comments from your side?

2.2, International Resolution, this part was moved from 1.11.4, the original text of Resolution 1. Any comment from that?

We can go to 2.2.2. Approval. Any comments from your side?

2.2.3.

United States, please.

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

I'm sorry to take you back.

2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2, I believe I understand but I would like to have clarification from our Russian colleagues on each Study Group may adopt by consensus of all Member States attending the meeting of the Study Group draft revised or new Resolution for approval by WTSA. I believe that's okay. I want to make sure I'm understanding it correctly that we're saying that the Study Group can adopt draft resolutions for WTSA to approve.

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

>> RUSSIA: Exactly.

>> CHAIR: United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: If we could square bracket this text and we can have more conversation with our Russian colleagues on this on 2.2.2 I would be grateful. There's some concern and we just want to make sure we're not expanding the mandate of the Study Groups.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

Can you please square bracket that.

We can go back to the deletion, 2.2.3. Any comment for that?

United States, please.

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

It is the same on this section for deletion. We see this

as possibly expanding the mandate of Study Groups and we want to make sure that we're understanding what the intent is here.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

Please square bracket that.

Russia, can you clarify anything, come up with an addition or same for approval?

>> RUSSIA: It is the same approach as for approval. So Study Groups can prepare drafts which will be presented at the Assembly only if there is consensus and the Assembly can -- will consider these drafts and can approve or not. The process is used whereby everyone in the -- as already use in the radio sector and they usually have a stricter approach to these procedures in radio but we'll discuss this with the American Delegation, and I think we'll find a common conclusion on this.

>> CHAIR: Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman.

We found there is some proposal for the definition of consensus elsewhere and I would like to define that first before we agree on this part. Here we use the word consensus. I would like to make it in square brackets and see the definition of consensus afterwards.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Yes, section 7 if I remember a proposal for the definition for consensus.

We'll square bracket 2.2.3 and 2.2.2.

Regarding 2.3 United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much.

Good morning.

Mr. Chairman, we thank Japan for their proposal to put the words in square brackets but whether we're going to define the term consensus we come back to this discussion, of course, when you go to a specific section so if we're going to define the term consensus or define the definition or have no definition for the word consensus, this will not change. While we put the term consensus in the square brackets, it is not clear to me, Mr. Chairman. This term here will not be effected, either we define, keep, modify the definition or not to have a definition, this term is the same. If I can clarify through Mr. Chairman why Japan is proposing to put the consensus term in square brackets.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Arab Emirates.

I think simply we have already square brackets the whole text for deletion and approval and I will -- I think I'll discuss the issue of consensus when we reach the section 7, the member of the proposal will discover.

Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair.

I have to note that we are not -- we shouldn't be putting square brackets on the whole section. Proposal was to put in square brackets only points where the -- because 2.2.3 for example, 2.2.2.2, the paragraphs, in case it was a Resolution based on flurry membership for TSAG, it was no problem.

It says current practice. Especially 2.2.2.2. My understanding is that we should put square brackets around subparagraphs 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.3.1 is, as was proposed by the United States.

Japan, I would like to recall that the word consensus is used in existing text of Resolution 1. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia federation.

United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Yes.

For the issue for 2.2.2.1 there should be square brackets. We agree that WTSA should examine the approval with the WTSA resolutions, that's correct.

The issue on 2.2.3, deletion, it is a precision of wording and language. We don't use the term necessarily delete as suppression. That text in that entire section should be aligned and we still have concerns. However, I do understand where this text is coming from. At the coffee break I believe we will be able to quickly resolve this section.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. I would like to be reminded, we have limited time. I just propose to square bracket approval part on the deletion part of this section, that we complete the discussion of the new section 2 and see how we could proceed forward for this section.

Just that we have a limited time, we would like to proceed now. Regarding the word consensus by Japan, yes, it is mentioned there is a proposal to discuss it in section 7 and for now we would like to not square bracket consensus everywhere we see it. We'll come back to this point in section 7 and discuss it.

Now can we go now to 2.3, ITU opinion. Any comments for 2.3.1, definition of opinion?

Any comments for 2.3.1?

2.3.2, approval.

2.3.3, deletion.

United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Through you, if we could have an understanding that where deletion appears it should really be suppression, that's the correct terminology in the Union.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

Russia federation.

>> RUSSIA: Yes. We agree if the U.S. prefers suppression, then let's put suppression everywhere.

>> CHAIR: So we have a global change for this new section to replace suppression instead of deletion.

Can we go to 2.4, ITU-T questions.

The definition that's from the 1.11.4, the original text of Resolution 1.

2.4.2, United States, please.

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

Just under ITU-T Recommendation the text where it says question, should it say -- should it be written at new or revised ITU-T Recommendations? Right now it just says Recommendations?

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

Any other comment?

Back to 2.4.1.

United States, please.

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

In the note section I know that this text is carried over from 1.11, the new text states ITU-T Recommendations are standards. I do believe it should have voluntary standards because that's the text that's in front of ITU Recommendations, we would like to say ITU-T Recommendations are voluntary standards.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

Transportation China, please.

>> CHINA: Thank you for the clarification from U.S.A. Delegates.

I would like to clarify the meaning of standards, there is not a clear definition for it. Please clarify it. Thank you.

United States, could you clarify about voluntary standards.

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

Through you, when we look at ITU-T standards on the vet first page of that standards, of all standard documents produced in the ITU it says ITU-T, these standards are voluntary standards. It is the text that's placed on the front. It's been there for so long as I can remember.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. I hope this will be clear for China.

Regarding the note part, as I mentioned when we start our session that we have a proposal from CTEL to change the amendments in the note part. Can we go back to this proposal also to consider?

Also we have a change proposal from the Africa Group for the note part. We have a proposal from Russia and from CTEL and no change from the African Group.

>> Thank you, Chair.

We agree with the African Group to not make modifications to this section. We feel there is no reason to add a second observation here now concerning note 2. This is to be found under 9.3.8. We agree with the African proposal.

>> CHAIR: Agree not to is already mentioned in the Resolution, we don't need to remention it again and Resolution note 2.

Can we agree on that? Regarding note 1 we have three proposals, RCC, CTEL and no change from African Group. Comments for that.

Russia federation please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you.

In our proposal as regards the note we don't change the idea of note. We just tried to express this in a clearer language and start from ITU-T Recommendations that is. Further on, if you look, it is simplified.

Thank you.

The language was not changed.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia.

Since it is an editorial change the major change would be -- all the changes would be in the CTEL proposal. Can we agree on the CTEL proposal for note 1?

Any objection from that?

Russia federation, please.

>> RUSSIA: From our point of view the proposal from CTEL contains a series of words which are very difficult to interpret. For example -- apologies. I'll ask again tore the floor. I'm just finding what words I'm referring to.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia.

You understand that we'll have a position regarding adding or accepting note 1.

Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you and good morning to all.

I would emphasize in this note, when we talk about Recommendations, we have to stress that they're voluntary standards which is not presented.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada.

I think we reflected that with the proposal from U.S.A. to add the particular Recommendations in the definition part.

My proposal since we have -- we don't find -- there's no agreement on the note 1 to add that for that informal discussion for the new section 2, we can continue now the new section

2.5.2, the Recommendations, 2.5.2. Any comments on 2.5.2?

2.5.3.

6?

7? Japan, please.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In the 2.6.2 approval, each state may approve improvements but it says supplements do not require approval and agreement by the Study Group is sufficient. I want to know the relationship between them.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan.

Russia Federation, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you very much to Japan for your question.

In many places in Resolution 1 the word agreement is used. Nowhere in the official documents of the ITU is it defined what agreement is. So therefore, here we use in this proposal, we use a standard text. However, perhaps another opinion, there are other opinions and we're open to other proposals, if we want to write agreement then we need to understand what agreement is.

>> CHAIR: Japan, please.

>> JAPAN: Thank you.

As far as my experience as Study Group Chairman, Study Group can give agreement with no need to adopt TAP and AIP so we need to clarify the difference of approval and agreement. At least agreement may not only be relevant to the administration but I like to clarify that point. that definition.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan. Mine proposal as this point, approve the deletion of supplement to that discussion so we can agree on the definition to the 2.6.1 # is and give the approval and deletion.

China.

>> CHINA: Suggestion to add reference to ITU-T for the approval procedure issues. It is not an approval procedure, we think that would be helpful. Thank you.

We'll keep this for informal discussions at this point because we need to proceed.

Now we can go to the ITU-T implementation guides. 2.7.

Japan, please.

>> JAPAN: Thank you.

The implementation guide is also the same level as supplement for our understanding.

Please clarify approval for the Recommendation and other documents which include the report and implementation guide and supplement.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan.

Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: I would like to note here again an inaccuracy in the translation. The title should be ITU-T implementation guidelines.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia, for that.

I hope this is clarifying the point for Japan. Russia, you need the floor again?

>> RUSSIA: Yes.

Then lower it should be implementation guidelines throughout the text. I won't flag this up every time up with I think that the Secretariat will be able to correct this.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia.

You have a comment regarding 2.7?

We'll move to 2.8. Technical documents. Any comment on 2.8?

2.9.

ITU-T adviser would like to talk, please?

>> ITU-T: Yes, thank you very much.

I have a small question for clarification as a person who will be called upon to provide advice on this text. The concept of normal is introduced. Above we had used the word consensus of all Member States. I wonder if what is the meaning of normal here. The second is a question for clarification, is this meant to exclude the sector members from the decision making process? In that respect I would like to recall that as of Resolution 14 of the the PP and table 3 of the constitution sector members participate fully in the activities of the sector. These are two questions for clarification. Perhaps these could be taken off line into the small group.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Russia, could you please clarify about this point? Russia Federation, please, can you clarify about the question about the legal advisors, about inclusion of the sector member in the process.

>> RUSSIA: According to the ITU convention, we participate in all kinds of discussions, inputs, papers, participate in discussions, many documents.

According to general rules of procedure of conferences, meetings, conferences, assemblies and meetings, decision taken by Member States, it's only related to decision and not generally by consensus of all Member States present in the meeting, we already introduced in the Radiocommunication Assembly had and it means that the ITU ideology -- if I could say, if I could use this word -- we are all this time reaching consensus as much as possible. Normally by consensus that -- we should do all efforts to reach consensus. However, in certain

cases there's no other way than to accept the view of majority of Member States.

We may talk and get legal advice offline and I'll provide all official inputs and documents.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia.

Canada, please.

>> CANADA: A question for clarification: The text reads that normally by consensus of all Member States attending the meeting. Attending the meeting would be physically inappropriate. The Federation of Russia had said to the clear, physically in a meeting, attending, it is kind of open.

It.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada.

Russia, I would like to keep this and then we have some sort of an output, drafting group for approval and deletion. I found many difficulties for the text regarding the approval and separation of whatever the document. I would like to -- now we can maybe approve the definition part. Any difficulty for the approval or separation we can keep it for that informal consultation and we'll conduct in the outgoing meetings.

Al Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Chairman.

For the informal discussion I just want to share the current view on the involvement of the sector member administration and approval of the other decision you're making.

As far as the ITU-T has a 60-year history and Chairman, we're taught to adapt and respect sector members' involvement also. If we want to apply the high level, general guideline of the administration only I'm afraid from bad impression to the industry. If we want to define by administration, if you prefer that it gives us a very big change to understand the ITU-T. That's our current understanding with the comment made.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your clarification. I hope we can agree on that in this informal discussion at this point.

United States, please.

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

We would like to participate in this small group regarding this small point. We have read Resolution 14 and we would love to understand the legal adviser's interpretation of that Resolution.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: During the very short break we'll arrange for this drafting group and the informal discussion group.

Now we can go to 2.10. Please, we'll discuss the definition part. If there is in I difficulty or objection for the definitional part of 2.10. Approval and suppression, we'll

discuss it.

Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIA: Apologies. Sometimes I automatically use the word radio. In the second line rather than radiocommunications we need to use the word telecommunications. I do apologize.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation.

Any other comments for 2.10.1.

United States, please.

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

On this section for ITU-T handbooks I completely understand the sentiment of the section and I do think we need to align the text more closely with the T sector. If we could work offline with our colleagues from Russia it focuses on the radio sector.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Canada, please.

>> CANADA: A minor remark. This has -- (indiscernible).

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada.

I think by this we can agree sure we have agreed on the principles of most of the definitions and if there is any fine tuning we can include that in the formal group that would be conducted and we could propose Russia to take care of that.

Please, Russia. Regarding approval, suppression, I would ask the legal adviser to join this discussion in the group so we can have agreed text on the new section too.

Now we go to the next point, the old section 2. Sections and relevant groups. We have point C, a newspaper C by RCC.

Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair.

Editorial comment, I would like to remind the Secretariat that they need to change the numbering as well.

>> CHAIR: Which numbering?

>> RUSSIA: There's a section 3 and all the subparagraphs need to be 3.1.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. We'll take care of numbering issue by the end of our discussion and editing of the text.

Any difficulty for the new point C? Any objection to approve the new point C in 2.1.1?

Agreed.

2.2, a small editorial change. Any problem for that? Any objections for adding C? Agreed.

2.1.5.

Proposals. RCC proposal. Can we agree on that? 2.1.6, we have two proposals in this point. There's no contradiction between the two proposals. Can we agree on the RCC proposal? RCC proposal 2.1.6. Agreed.

African proposal. Modification for 2.1.6. We agree with that? Agreed.

2.3.1 and we have three proposals for that.

Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair. Honestly I don't see any controversy between these proposals and we could just perhaps ask the Secretariat to bring them together into one proposal.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Simply I can -- can we approve the sample proposal just to take out the footnote and to bring it to the text itself? I don't think there is any problem for that. Any problem for the EPT proposal just to simplify our life and then we will discuss the RCC one? Any objection for the APT proposal? Agreed.

Then we can talk about -- we have two proposals on our hands. We will start with the Arab part. Any objection for the 2.3.1 for the Arab proposal? Expert participation in the activity? Of the Study Group?

Can we agree on that?

Agreed. Finally the RCC one.

United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: The text in blue --

>> CHAIR: The Arab proposal -- okay.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: The question through you, are these reports and submissions at the request of the Chairman, what's the status of these reports? Are they information documents? Are they to be treated as part of the text? Could we have more clarification on that point?

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. You're talking about Arab proposal? The expert participation? Any clarification from the Arab Group from this point? 2.3.1.

Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Mr. Chair, could you ask the question again that was asked by the U.S.?

>> CHAIR: United States, the format of the reports that will be submitted by the expert to the group, it will be as information document or which type exactly could be considered this document in ITU-T Study Group documents.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: We want to say that these are just information reports.

>> CHAIR: Is that okay for you, United States? Can we agree on that? United States please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Yes. Thank you for that clarification from the Arab Group. My suggestion would be that we add in that the reports are informational reports. These are only for information. They're not part of the information process. Thank you.

>> Thank you.

We may read it, the information reports.

May present information reports.

United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: The information goes to the reports as well as any submissions they may have. They are all information documents and they're not part of the decision making process. I think that's an important point. Only the members of the sector and the members of the union could have contributions in the document that forms the decision-making process.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

You have any text you would like to be reflected?

United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you.

Experts may present reports and submissions for information.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

Can you read me now the text?

The last point, now come back for the RCC one. Any difficulty with the RCC proposal in 2.3.1?

Agreed.

United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: No problem with 2.3.1.

My question, I'm sorrier to take you back, a em looking at this on the screen and it is difficult to read, it is in 2.1.6. We node with other standards bodies has been deleted and we're wanting to have a understanding of why that's been deleted. It is important for us that we maintain the text with other standards bodies.

Thank you. The RCC2.1.6 with Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair.

We propose to use the text from the Convention. The Convention, there is a reference -- there is no reference made to standards bodies. But rather given due consideration to the work of national, regional and other international standardization organizations. And we prefer to use (audio issue).

>> CHAIR: I would propose that we conclude our discussions, not to repeat the same discussion of that. I would like to defer 2.3.2 and 2.3.3 and we'll conclude our discussion.

I hope you can agree on that.

Okay. We have proposal on 2.4.2, the APT proposals. The 2.4.2.

Any comments on that. Any objection to add?

Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair.

We're not quite clear what is meant by with quantitative activity analysis question.

This could be interpreted in many different ways.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia.

APT could clarify about that? China, please.

>> CHINA: Maybe these words are not worded clearly. We prefer to have some editorial changes to we're committed according to the standard activities of each Study Groups. Thank you, China.

United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: While it is useful for the sector to analyze the effectiveness. The U.S. believes that contributions are not necessarily negative but effective international telecommunication standards development. Quantitative analysis should not be a financial burden to the sector nor should it be used to have speed over quality. The U.S. would not support adding this text to the end of this section.

Thank you very much.

China, you have another text for our meeting.

>> CHINA: The Study Group activities has been done in TSAG and in the community. I think this work is still continuing in the next study period. We would like to add some clarifications on how the Study Group is to report their progress and output in the WTSA meeting. We have to have a unified request to our Study Group Management Team. If the U.S. thinks the terms here is not very clear we can offline discuss what is the proper word for it.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China.

Maybe it is just the clarity of the words and to clarify the request from APT.

I think in the coffee break we can work and arrange for the proper words of this proposal.

We can keep it for more discussion. We can go with a new dash, a new point. strategic planning. Any opposition for this new add for 2.4.2?

Can we agree on that?

Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIA: We're not quite clear what you mean by standards strategic planning.

As far as we know, there's no standard on this. In our proposal we use other wording, a draft plan for the following study period. I think that this would mean the same thing in principle but it is clear that we're drawing up a plan as wards to what standards and strategic planning is, honestly I'm not

quite sure.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia.

I think it meets the proposal that the Study Group would propose in the next study period activities and plan and new questions and new activities in the next study period.

I give the floor to APT to clarify more this point.

China, please.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Chairman.

The interpretation is correct.

Also I would like to mention this new standards function has been equated in the TSAG meeting, we would like to explain the new item is to enhance the function in the Study Group.

Thank you.

>> Thank you, China. I think there is no problem in the principle. We may -- I could propose that we could use the next study period with the strategic standards in the TSAG if this wording is okay with the meeting.

Next, study period activity.

In alignment with the strategic planning of TSAG.

United States, please.

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

We have a comment on the introductory text on 2.4.2 but we can come back to that.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, it United States. First we can agree on this point and had then come back to 2.4.2.

Can we agree on that? Can we agree on this text? Russia Federation, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair. We would like to delete the word standard because there is no formal standard on this. It is strategic planning and we completely agree with this.

I don't quite understand why TSAG shall be aligned with its group.

>> CHAIR: Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you.

I would also request clarification here. This question is under TSAG. If the Rapporteur group of TSAG starts working at a different point in time we'll have a problem with that. That's why I want clarification.

>> CHAIR: Bahrain.

>> BAHRAIN: We're getting in lengthy wording and we'll run the risk of complicated wording that people will object to. I notice in the following -- in the following amendment from the RCC they have some text that reads a draft plan for the following study period. Based on interventions I have heard, particularly from our colleague from China Elumina this should encapsulate the spirit which was requested from the APT. If it

does, may I suggest that we stick with the RCC wording and avoid complicated wording that may TRIP us up in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Bahrain.

United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Yes. Thank you, Chair. We believe that this text is not clear enough and for that reason the suggestion made by the Russian Federation here, and as explained by my colleague from Bahrain we think could be sufficient, could be adequate, so we would ask that we retain the proposal and talk about the future activities. We think under the current wording that the reported submitted are on the future activities. To TSAG. We have the wording suggested by Russia in this case.

>> CHAIR: China, please.

>> CHINA: I agree. This could keep it simple, the solution. We agree based on the proposed text and then add standard activity for the following study period. It is acceptable for this assembly.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China.

I propose to all of you that the proposal for Russia Federation to be reflected in this point.

Can we agree on this text?

Any objection from that? We reject the proposal by APT and take the new draft. The new proposal.

Now we'll go back to the proposal of the -- fine. Great. We'll go on.

I will propose a 5-minute break for stretching. Yes. We're just in section 2 and we need more time to go on.

Please, 5-minute break for stretching. Just a stretching break. We'll come back at 11:50. We'll come back at 11:50.

10:50. Not 11. 10:50.

>> CHAIR: Ladies and gentlemen, let us continue our business.

Please take your seats.

Now we can go to section 3. We have proposals from APT.

Any comments? Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: It is not on the APT proposal but more in general, we have noticed that you have made good progress this morning. It is a positive thing.

The other thing, we have also noticed during the discussion that there's a lot of coming in with regards to voting on this supplementary documents and we're not quite sure whether this is something that we can actually support so far. We would like to point out that we reserve our position on this issue with regard to the voting as well as the other issue was on the making references only to I think the recognized standardization of

organizations. Maybe that will be discussed layer. Don't be disappointed when suddenly something comes up there.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany.

We agree to the informal discussion group regarding all of the point in new section 2 and you're welcome to join the discussion.

Russia.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair.

I would propose to be careful in our words. In the document there is no reference made to the word recognized.

>> CHAIR: Sorry. What do you mean?

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair.

On what Germany just said, they said that they were concerned with reference made to recognized standardization and the word recognized was just invented by Germany, just a -- we cannot have the institutions of the Convention, and the proposed text is from convention and covers all kind of organizations which somebody prefers to say standardization bodies, national, regional, other standardization organizations I'm simply trying to avoid the introduction of new -- when this is not absolutely necessary.

>> CHAIR: Thank you t we'll have our informal discussion on these points and we'll keep that as an offline discussion. We have limited time to go over the document.

Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Yes. Thank you for the comment from the Russian Federation. I hope there is a misunderstanding, our interpretation is that standardization organization is smaller than standardization body and by the way we would exclude ones which have been before. Maybe we can clarify that and if it is really a misunderstanding, we will see. Yes.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: We would be included in this discussion. (indiscernible) (audio disruption).

>> CHAIR: I hope you come back with agreed text on this point. we'll go back to section 3.

>> CHAIR: United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: We would like to thank you for the proposal. There is two pardons here where it says that the Chairman should be responsible for the establishment of the appropriate sector for the distribution of work we agree with the text but with the selection of the -- this is already reflected in the recommendation A.1. Do we need to repeat this? It says only Chairman, what about the Vice-Chair, what about Vice-Chairs and the Rapporteurs and -- instead of a lengthy text here we would propose that we stay Study Group Chairman should be responsible for the appropriate structure for the

distribution of work of the Study Group. The reason is just because it covers this specific part. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Can we agree with that proposal from the United Arab Emirates? We agree on that.

>> Apologies, Chair, do you -- are you going to go to the next proposal? We try to consolidate the two texts together. Want new 3.1.

The any comments, objections regarding the 3.1?

Can we agree on that?

Agreed. We'll work to consolidate the two points together on the working document with the Secretariat.

>> SECRETARIAT: I would like to ask for clarification for this text. This is about Study Group management. The addition proposed in the proposal starts with the work of the Study Group rather than starts with the actions or responsibilities of the Chairman.

Can we think about another text to align the subjects of the sentence?

>> RUSSIA: Thank you to the Secretariat. The main aim of our proposal is to involve the Vice-Chairs in issues of managing the groups. This is why we're not advocating any specific wording of the text but would like to note, nevertheless, that the Chairs need to carry out consultations with the Vice-Chairs. As regards to the text, we're ready to hear any proposal that you may have.

Thank you. Thank you, Russia. I'm within it's proposal, the section 3, there are many texts to enhance the role of Vice-Chairs. Can we, Russia, accommodate your text within it? If we agree with the accommodation, do we -- Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair.

I would like to agree with you, but at this point I can't do this because from our point of view the structure and appointment of Chairs of subgroups is the first and most important point that has a significant effect on the work of the group in the future. We could say something like -- I'll read it in English -- the Study Group Chairman after consultation with Vice-Chair man shall be responsible perhaps other words could be used but at the initial stage it is important to have Vice-Chairs involved in the consultations with the structure and the chairmanship of the group.

>> CHAIR: Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you.

I would like to propose a text to accommodate the views that were discussed later. Maybe we can add after the distribution of work we can amend the sentence after consulting with Vice-Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt.

Can you a I agree with that Russia?

Thank you.

Now we consolidated the text in -- United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: In our proposal to include the Resolution two is important, maybe we can look at that also in the text so within the mandate set out in the Resolution 2 I think this is also important.

If we can add that to the text.

>> CHAIR: We added that.

Eye Egypt and then United Arab Emirates.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman.

I propose to add one of the mandates set out in WTSA Resolution 2 Study Group Chair and Chair be responsible for and continue the sentence.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt.

No comments. Agreed. 3.2.

We'll align the text with Resolution 35. To align the text with Resolution 35.

Any comments? I believe none. Can we agree?

Agreed.

3.3 we have four proposals. We'll take it 1 by 1. First the CTEL one.

Any comments on that?

Can we agree on that?

Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair.

We feel this is going to limit flexibility here, activities under taken by Vice-Chairman, there is no mention of their role, in fact.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

Any clarification from CTEL? Canada?

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair.

I don't see how you will limit the work because in every Study Group the Vice-Chairs are allocated specific functions. If you ask to add clarity to the process, as far as I know, in all the Study Groups I participate, Chairs are giving the specific functions to the Vice-Chair.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: United States.

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

Just to support CTEL colleagues on this, we feel very strongly that the Vice-Chairmen should have a role in the Study Group management. They're not there as -- they're there to help progress the work of the Study Group. It is very important for them as well as our administration that the Vice-Chairmen have a role.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Saudi Arabia, the proposal, it is arranged a well organized structure of the group, not to limit the scope of the Vice-Chairs. Can we agree on the CTEL proposal? Thank you.

Any comments or objection to that? 3.3CTEL version agreed, now we can go to the RCC proposal.

Any comments?

Can we agree on the proposal?

United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: (Audio difficulties).

>> CHAIR: Thank you and I'll give the floor to the Russian Federation to give us clarification and then the United States.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair.

Thank you for the question.

Perhaps there is different understandings of the Russian version when translated noon English. We fully would happy put Management Team rather than Steering Committee and further reduce the text composed of all Vice-Chairman, Working Party Chairman to assist in the organizational work.

>> CHAIR: United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Our comments were taken into account. We support the change of Steering Committee to management team.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

The new 3.3, the consolidated one. From the RCC and CTEL proposal.

Now we can go to 3.4. We have two proposals, APT and RCC. We'll start with the APT one.

Any comments for the APT proposal?

Study Group management?

China, please.

>> CHINA: On behalf of APT proposal I would like to explain this new (audio issues).

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China, for that.

Can we agree to 3.4, APT proposal.

We align 3.4 with the agreed 3.3.

Can I have your approval for this text? Alignment of 3.4 with 3.3?

Russia Federation, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair.

In principle we agree with the proposed text with only one exception, marketing.

We understand that ITU-T carries out commercial activity of the related Recommendations but we're not sure that it does marketing.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia.

United States.

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

That was our comment as well.

However, the way we read the text is that the Vice-Chairmen are going to do this activity. Is that what we're asking, that if you're a Chair and Vice-Chairman that you're responsible for marketing promotion of activities of the related Recommendations? We would prefer to see that text deleted and ended with other SDOs. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Can we delete that? Can we delete the text? Any comments for that?

Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman.

Is it possible to change SDO to standard organizations instead? SDO is very constrained. ITU-T deals with many organizations which are not recognized SDOs like IDF. Keeping it as standard organizations is much better.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada.

United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. (Audio difficulties). S&P we would need to take out the word marketing and -- it should be promoting. Not promotion. And promoting the activities of the Study Group activities. Promoting the activities of the relevant Study Group activities but not recommendations. (Audio difficulties).

>> CHAIR: United States, please.

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

With that clarification, the question I have, are we only expecting the Vice-Chairmen to do this? Are we expecting this responsibility to be on the entire Management Team, not just the Vice-Chairmen to do this work.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

I think Vice-Chairmen are invited to assist Chairmen. This includes all the Management Team, Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen. Can we -- gives responsibility for the Chairman and Vice-Chairmen to assist the Chairman. This be reflected that those tasks are also within the Chairman's mandate.

United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Yes, I agree with colleagues from the United States.

It is the Management Team (indiscernible). (Audio difficulties).

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Concerning the SDOs deletion I would propose to make it

standards development organization to remove any ambiguity. That seems to be the standard organization, seems to be the objective for the organizations, not reflecting the meaning we mean.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt.

Germany.

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

With regards to what we just changed on standard development organizations, that's exactly the point where there may be misunderstanding, for the time being please put development into the brackets. That's to be checked in accordance with what we have passed before.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Russia.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair.

Perhaps if we write standardization organizations then this will respond to the doubts raised by Germany.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

>> I'm reluctant to take the floor on these matters. This is really a matter for Member States and sector members to discuss.

Nonetheless, I should point out that in Resolution 1, section 4.2 that describes the duties of TSAG that the references to standardization organizations forms and consortium, Chairman, as TSAG Chairman I have an interest in ensuring consistency in the text. Perhaps we could consider using that formulation to avoid any confusion and misunderstanding of what exactly you're referring to.

I understand the terms standards development organizations have been used extensively but that being said, I believe that we should try to be as consist as possible in the text.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the clarification.

Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. Very particular and briefly, since we're discussing the example that was set forth in the text, well we're saying for example here maybe we could say to assist the Chair in leading the group, the management group.

My proposal is to reflect that in 4.2 as mentioned by TSAG Chairman, the standard organization for our consortium would be acceptable for all of you.

Can we agree on that?

Can we agree on the text without any brackets? Using the terms (Chair) in 4.2? Any comments?

Thank you.

Now we can go on to 3.5.

A change from RCC. Updating it the Resolution. I think no problem with that.

Now we can go to 3.6. Proposal, just to remove in principle. The CTEL proposal, any comment on that? United Arab Emirates, please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Sorry to take you back to the previous one. The 3.4, I don't think we have discussed this, Mr. Chairman, (indiscernible) with this specific point it is the same comment as from APP. The Chairman of the Study Group shall be responsible for establishing appropriate sanction. I think in the previous part of this document you have wording in this text that the Chairman, Vice-Chairs are responsible for allocation of work questions and (indiscernible).

This part of Vice-Chairs and Working Parties and Chairman and Vice-Chairs, it is really in A.1. What happens it relates to the RCC and we agree to keep the text as is. Part of it is already in this Resolution. We'll talk about the structure and the other part in A.1.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

You're completely correct. I see Russia is agreed that we consider this point, discovery already made.

No problem to consider the RCC proposal that's already covered in our text. We can go back now to 3.6.

Can I have the approval for the CTEL proposal?

United Arab Emirates?

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you.

Just clarification from colleagues to see if we can clarify why this was deleted in principle. Just enlight us why they have proposed to delete in principle. It is not an objection, just seeking clarification.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Arab Emirates.

Canada.

>> CANADA: In principle means generally. Generally is not what we want in this case. We want to have commitment. A commitment, but when you say in principle, yeah, maybe, if possible. That's not acceptable.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. I hope that will clarify the text.

Any objection to remove in principle? Can we agree on that? clarification with Canada? Thank you. It is agreed.

Now we can go to 3.7. New items. 3.7. That's a new text. APT.

Any comments on that? My only comments on this point is linked to section 1. We can cover this point also in one text. Russia Federation, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair. We agree with your remark,

but in principle we don't object to this text. However we would replace shall with should because shall shouldn't be used. Perhaps a Chair can fall ill and they can't fulfill the Resolution. We don't use shall as regards to people.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia.

United States.

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

In principle we have no problems with this text. I do think we need to check the grammar. It doesn't read correctly. It should be in -- it just needs to be fixed.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. I think we can arrange those editorial changes.

Now it's text should be acceptable to you.

Any comment on that?

No comments.

Agreed.

We'll go to section 4. Proposals, most are editorials.

We'll take it one by one. The CTEL one first.

Any comment from that? African proposal for -- any comment on that? We agree on that.

Agreed.

This is a simple editorial one.

Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you. Concerning the African proposal, including the Clair -- a question for clarification, do we need to add this or is Resolution 11 enough?

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt. Actually Resolution 11 specifies the relation with the postal operation council.

Would you like to move that -- the proposed text from the African Group? Egypt and then Russian Federation, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman.

I think as we have already accepted to keep Resolution 11, maybe this could be deleted.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt.

Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair.

We have another doubt that I would like to raise. Do we need to recall postal operations council or the UPU as a whole. Just a comment on that.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia.

Please.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would like to comment again on the CTEL contribution with regard to SDOs and SOs and now this point might require some editing work where we have -- the other expression, end with other standardization organizations, agree not to include the

African common proposal since Resolution 11 is maintained. No need to specify the council. Can we agree to reject that text and -- we'll include -- we'll not include that in our -- Cameroon, please.

>> CAMEROON: Thank you, Chair.

We thought it was necessary to specify this in this Resolution because it follows the rules of procedure of ITU and we thought in terms of this Resolution it was necessary, but if you believe that 11 is sufficient, that mentioned, we would agree with suppressing it.

Thank you, Cameroon.

We need not to reflect that in 42. We come back to the CTEL proposal. Two questions with Saudi Arabia. We may have clarification from CTEL.

The standards bodies or only -- Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman.

Perhaps it would be more appropriate to use the same text that we use before. The standard organizations for our consortium to be consist. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada.

(Audio difficulties).

We need top mention the council or the UPU because the Russian Delegate has said.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: (Audio difficulties).

>> Thank you, following the words from the colleague from the United Arab Emirates we should also maintain -- (indiscernible) remove any duplication in the text.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt.

I think the point raised by Canada is covered in the text. We can maintain relevant bodies since there is a consortium for the work at the end of the text.

Can we agree on that, Canada? Great. This is accepted.

Now we go back to the African one.

Resolution 11 is considering the relation with the postal council. I see a request from to the African countries to include that and there is other points to improve the text to add the UPU -- to add another -- yes.

We can remove that from the text.

Can we agree on the African proposals?

Thank you for that.

Now we can go to 4.3. Sorry. 4.4.

(No audio).

>> CHAIR: Sorry for the technical problem with the computer.

Now we come back. Item 4.4, section 4, the proposal from AIP to add new text, 4.4. It is a new text. New item under section 4. I'm sorry, CTEL. Yes.

New item under section 4 from CTEL. Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chairman.

Before we go through this amendment I would like to add another amendment to this amendment. In the last sentence I would change it as follows. Are encouraged to propose consensus candidates for TSAG Vice-Chairmen, plural instead of singular. That's the only change.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada.

Any comments from the text with the changes from Canada? Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to be clear, I need some clarification on what is the meaning of consensus candidates.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt.

Canada, can you clarify about the consensus candidate? Can you clarify, Egypt, about what you mean by consent candidate.

>> EGYPT: It is a consensus candidate within a region.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you.

I think Resolution 35 also makes -- presents the condition for the candidates. I want to know how benefit it is to repeat that here again.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan.

It is now 12:00 sharp. This should be our time for the end of the meeting. I could ask our interpreters to have extra 10 minutes. No more than 10 minutes.

>> Yes. Certainly.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Canada, I hope you can clarify on this point.

Canada?

The question of Japan, the new item by CTEL is reflected in Resolution 35. Canada: Resolution 35?

>> CHAIR: This is mentioned by Japan, this text is already reflected in Resolution 35.

Russian Federation, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair.

We're grateful to Japan for their proposal. In our view we need to avoid repetition of provisions in different resolutions because often this leads to different texts and different interpretations. Therefore we would propose -- we would ask the CTEL to not -- agree not to include these changes.

The Resolution 35 is sufficient.

Thank you.

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

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

This text is extremely important to CTEL. We spent a lot of time. It is in line with Resolution 35. We could have a corner to Resolution 35, however we would like to have the text. We can align the text. I notice in in resolutions and in other resolutions of the conference we have repeated text that's included elsewhere. I would like to see the -- the United States would like to see that this text remain.

Thank you.

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

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Our point is duplication or repetition or misalignment may cause difficulty to understand. That's our point. if you could affirm the reservation between this document and Resolution 35 it is okay. As far as I remember, the contents of Resolution 35, the last text proposed by CTEL which says the region encourages to propose something, that may not have been included in Resolution 35. That point has to be discussed with the requirement or not.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I close the list at this point. we have 6 minutes. United Arab Emirates, Canada, Russia.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Mr. Chairman, if you look at the CTEL proposal, Amendments on Resolution that 35, what they're proposing, two candidates for TSAG, it is not consist with this because here we're talking about a Vice-Chairman, meaning one from each version, the other, proposing to have two Vice-Chairs for TSAG. There is inconsistency. Perhaps we should change from Vice-Chairman to Vice-Chairmen. It is not -- I think it was already proposed by Canada. Maybe that was not reflected in the text.

The other thing, Mr. Chairman, regions are encouraged to propose consensus candidates. However, this to us is very clear, Member States, we can also send candidates directly to the Assembly without scouring through the region, it is the right of the Member States. I'm not sure if this text takes into consideration what I just have said.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Arab Emirates.
Russia Federation, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair. We fully agree with what was said by Japan and the UAE.

However, we understand the concerns of the U.S. and perhaps or the regional organizations, we would like to propose a compromise. Retain the text, the WTSA shall appoint the

Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the TSAG in accordance with Resolution 35, et cetera.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Mexico.

>> MEXICO: Thank you. Briefly.

We appreciate the Russian proposal but we insist on maintaining the CTEL proposal. For us, we must make emphasis on the invitations for the candidacies from different regions so that we can facilitate the development of the assembly.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Canada.

>> CANADA: Chairman, was to clarify that is not Chairman, it is Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen, it is pleural.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada.

Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We are supporting the Russian proposal to suppress this text and to align with Resolution 35.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Egypt.

Argentina, you would like the floor.

>> ARGENTINA: Yes. I wanted to just say that we accord a great deal of importance to this to our region and Resolution 35 has been modified. We have been systematically working in all conferences, we think it is important to maintain the text as it is.

Concerning the other issues that were raised, we think that it is important to encourage different regions to put consensus candidates -- it is not mandatory but we feel this strengthens the regions and we have to reach a consensus among ourselves and it is not mandatory for each country to come up with candidates that they would like to advance. What we're trying to do is create a spirit of consensus between different regions so that we can come to these Assemblies with candidates who have already been subject to consensus and not having to go into extreme debates during the conference.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Argentina.

I think that the text itself, it will not limit the Member States from its right to propose its candidate directly to assembly. I think that the text is not limiting the Member States.

I think in principle there is no difficulty for the text in principle. I would like to invite Canada, please, to work informally with all interested parties to harmonize this text with Resolution 35 to ensure that the text is within the mandate and the text of Resolution 35.

By this, I think we concluded our work for today. Where he

still have almost 25 pages to look for in our next meeting. I would like you all to work for the text that we didn't agree on or that we need more fine tuning in the coming few days and I think we'll allocate a drafting group, informal drafting group led by Russia for section 2.

Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chair. Of course we agree to work with the group. The only thing I would like to ask for the Secretariat to provide information as to regards where and when we're going to meet. Ideally 3, 3A and Committee 4.

I said that we are ready to work but we need information from the Secretariat about the place and time. It would be preferable not during meetings of 3A, 3B, Com3 and Com4.

How many would like to join this group so we can allocate a proper room.

>> CHAIR: Any time preference for this?

>> RUSSIA: Our schedule is it changing all the time. Maybe I'm ready even in 15 minutes.

>> CHAIR: Secretariat is working on securing a room for us. That will be displayed on the screen.

We're recording also our work yesterday, we had 4 points for fine tuning, I hope every participant, that hefney agreed text to send it to me and if there is any agreed text that we had skiesed yesterday, send it to me immediately so we can reflect it in the next meeting.

>> Thank you. We would ask the colleagues, if possibilities bible, not to have the meeting immediately now. We have the Friday prayers, Mr. Chairman. If possible, we would like to ask our colleagues not to have the meeting now and perhaps have it a day later in evening or maybe tomorrow.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Yes. We'll consider that. We'll consider that.

Russia?

>> RUSSIA: Sorry. We may speak in English.

My preferable time outside of the meeting, we can meet at night, that's good for me. Tomorrow I hear there will be Committee 4 in the morning. Whether it was announced or not, I don't know yet. It shouldn't be any big Committee or big Working Group and today, tomorrow, the day after tomorrow, midnight, mid -- (laughter).

>> HEARING MASTER: Thank you, Russia.

By that, our meeting is concluded.

I see you all next Monday.

Thank you.

>> SECRETARIAT: Allocation of this information should be announced this afternoon in the Com3 meeting. Please pay

attention and the information will be shown on the screen the day and time.