

RAW COPY

WORLD TELECOMMUNICATION STANDARDIZATION ASSEMBLY
WG3
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.

>> CHAIR: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, please take
your seats. Resolution 55 drafting is just concluding and we'll
start momentarily.

We'll get started. Sorry for my voice. I seem to have
been talking too much.

The Agenda for this afternoon's session of Committee 3
you will find in ADM-18.

The first item of business while we're waiting for the
Resolution 55 drafting group to conclude would be a review of
the report of the second meeting which you will find in DT20.

We began DT20 with some draft or informal reports from
Working Group 3A and 3B. We took decisions from 3A on
Resolution A.1 and Resolution 32 it which have already gone to
the editorial Committee as you have seen.

From 3B we took decisions on suppression of 38 and 81 is
resolutions and heard a report. We'll ask for more
amplification.

The first session is reported on the ad hoc section of
Resolution 22.

As you know, we have a follow-up session to conclude that work tomorrow.

We agreed on the four items that I just mentioned, the approval of draft revised Recommendation A.1, suppression of 38, resolutions 38 and 81 and approval of revision of Resolution 32. Those have all gone to EdCom and are ready for plenary this afternoon. Resolution 32 it also as we have discussed we sent to the attention of Com2.

Resolution 35 we heard in the introduction of the proposals and had discussion. I'm happy to report there's been some offline consultation to further progress this work.

We'll try to conclude that today. We agreed to no change but to republish A.7 together with its appendix to that recommendation.

We had introduction of proposals and the initial discussion on resolutions 71 and 80. My understanding on these is so some informal consultations is continuing and we'll get the report on the status of that.

Resolution 68 we heard the proposals and created an ad hoc group to cover that. Resolution 67 we had the proposals from RCC as well as the report from the acting Chairman of the SCV. My understanding is that they have made some progress and came up with a consolidated set of agreements for us to consider there. That's the report of the second meeting of Committee 3. Any comments to this report?

I see no requests for the floor. That report is approved.

The next thing, the status of the work in the working groups. This morning Working Group 3A met for two sessions to continue the work on Resolution 1.

Can you inform us of the status of this work, please?

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Working Group 3A conducted two sessions. We continued our discussion for Resolution 1 as it's the only document now under our mandate. We created an informal discussion group regarding the adding of new section for the finishing of the documents. We continued our work for revision of Resolution 1 and section 4 and (microphone issue).

>> CHAIR: Excuse me. We have some problems with the audio. We were having -- okay. You're back. Continue.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Working Group 3A conducted two meetings in the morning session and we did our discussion for Resolution 1 as on the document for our Working Group.

We created informal ad hoc drafting group for the new proposed section for ITU documentation and we'll conduct that work during the weekend, maybe today. Regarding the Resolution we reached through section 4 and I believe as we have only one

session left, we may need an extra session, including work from Com3.

This is my brief report.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

While I hadn't written it down on my Agenda, Working Group 3B has not had an additional session, my understanding is that there is an additional information regarding the progress of the work as far as consultation.

I will give the floor to the Chair of Working Group 3B.

>> Chair of working group 3B: Thank you.

Good afternoon, everyone.

Chairman, as you correctly point out, we haven't had a meeting since the report I provide to you yesterday. Nonetheless, progress has been made on several of the resolutions, mainly Resolution 7, we have been able to I believe complete that activity as well as Resolution 11. The remaining two resolutions, namely 18 and 57 I understand that consultations are continuing, but I would urge all of those that are participating in this activity to ensure that at our final meeting on Monday there is no square brackets remaining in the text and I would urge those who are involved in this to complete their consultations to reach agreement and to reflect those agreements in a text.

I'm reluctant to provide any square bracketed text to you, Chairman, and your full Committee. We'll soon be under extreme time constraints and it is imperative that we reach agreement.

I remind everyone, if we do not reach agreement we will simply go back to the original text.

While I have the floor, Chairman, I would also like to report on the activity of the ad hoc group on Resolution 22. As you pointed out, we have a meeting tomorrow, I have taken the liberty to produce another document, which will be posted on share point which not only reflects the conclusions, if you like, that we reached at the first meeting, but also includes some -- I hope, some helpful solutions on how to progress that work.

Again, I urge everyone to come to the final meeting of that ad hoc group in the spirit of compromise so that we can complete that task on time tomorrow. That's all I have to report at this stage, Chairman.

Our work will continue and my objective, again, is to provide you with a report which indicates that we have completed all of our tasks and that there is full agreement.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Certainly hopefully all of our groups take their work with

the same seriousness and endeavor to come back with the Committee with no square brackets. I think in we have proposals that we're unable to reach agreement in Working Group it is likely that the same individuals will disagree in the Committee and the same individuals could disagree in the plenary and that doesn't get us any further. The default at the end of the day is if we can't agree on a change we'll leave things as they are, and it is easier to reach that decision in the Working Group if it is clear that there is no agreement than to try to persist and repeat the same arguments over at the next level. Hopefully we can add some value at each stage and not simply go through three layers of repetition.

I would encourage you all to try to solve the issue and find a way forward. I know there have been some productive consultations and I encourage you to continue those consultations.

I see Russia asking for the floor.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you very much, Chairman.

We would like, firstly, to note the progress we achieved in group 3B thanks to the activity of our Chair's leadership.

I would like to clarify one issue, it was said that on Resolution 22 there will be a draft document which will be placed in the share folder. Could you clarify when this is planned? When it is planned that this document will be uploaded? Just a rough idea? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia.

Please.

>> Yes. Thank you, Chairman.

Yes, that document should be uploaded this afternoon. It will give you sufficient time to review it prior to our meeting tomorrow morning. Of course originally we had considered that it may not be available until 11:00, but of course that's not satisfactory. We fully realize it is necessary for everyone to have a thorough review of any proposed text. Hopefully it will be posted as soon as possible this afternoon.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Our final request for a verbal status report, we had a drafting group on gender issues, whether it be Resolution 55 or a new Resolution which was just concluding as I had to leave it a bit early to come to the room. I see a number of participants in that activity are back in the room. I thought things were -- seemed to be going well.

Can you give us a verbal report of the status of this group, please?

>> Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We come up with a consolidated text and discussed details, resolutions and unfortunately due to the short-term we still are

not finished the work and hopefully by the end of this space, maybe after the sessions of Com3 so we'll maybe finish.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Are you looking to meet at the coffee break between Com3 and the plenary today or do you need time over the weekend?

>> I think it depends on the exchange, and if we have the solution and then we have the permission letter.

Thank you.

It is envisioned to be from 1730 until completion, as late as 1930 and presumably it doesn't take that long. I think the room -- no room yet.

Check the screens. That should be arranged. Let me call your attention to another document. I don't propose to open it up. As many of you know, we have a set of ad hoc and drafting groups that we have published in DT38. If you've lost track of the number of these that we have created you can see which the groups are, the ad hocs are listed first. They're not in chronological order. To make a map of your Saturday, that may be a helpful document for you to know what the full set of activities are that will be authorized.

The next set of documents that I had put on the Agenda was to go back to some documents where we had heard proposals.

In terms of Resolution 35, our initial plan had been to go from a consolidated merger of the proposals because the CTEL proposal and APT proposal were changing different parts of the text. From the discussion there were some concerns with the CTEL proposal expressed by the Emirates and it is my understanding there have been informal consultations that have resolved some of the differences of views.

With your permission, I would like to work from a copy of the text which is -- what I would have started with, applying some additional modifications that seem to result in a common understanding between CTEL and Emirates' concerns that were raised in our earlier session. If we can bring that document on the screen. There is actually a working document on the share point now that is simply a mechanical combination of proposals. If we can look at the version that's been provided to us, I think we can avoid having to read out at dictation speed some changes that have been agreed and we can give the floor to either Argentina or the Emirates to explain those changes.

Seems there's some mechanics to get that going. While the file is getting to the right place to be projected, I would like to inform you also we had some discussion regarding academia and Resolution 80 and there were some consultations that occurred to try to resolve some differences of views. I understand some progress has been made but that work isn't yet complete. I have

asked if we can be provided some information on the status of the consultations.

>> Chair, if I -- may I ask, I had some -- I had a question of -- a question on it clarification on Resolution 35 before I report Resolution 80. Is it possible to give --

>> CHAIR: Yes. The mechanics are to have the text ready or we can go back to the 35 if the text is ready to project.

Please ask your question and we'll see if we need the text in order to have a reply.

>> I think probably we'll need the text. I will just give the report on Resolution 80 first.

Actually after the discussions that we had yesterday about the CTEL proposal and the suppression there were -- that was proposed by Arab Group and also with some comments of Russia we had some informal discussions, these discussions are undergoing. It is not finished yet.

Now we have some other countries, especially from African Group that are joining us in this informal discussion and we think that during the weekend we will have some progress on that and probably in the next session we will have a compromised text to present here.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

I think on these two items we actually pick up a lot of time here because we had allocated a half hour for these two documents together. We understand the consultations are ongoing and that we can look forward sometime on Monday to have a consolidated text to the satisfaction of all parties that is hopefully easy to reach an agreement with in the Committee.

Let me ask, TSB, are we closer to availability of Resolution 35 text to project?

The computers are not synchronised and there is a Dropbox that we have to go through to see. Sorry for the delay.

This document is what was merged from the two different proposals. As you may remember, there were some items in the Resolution that was going to be worked with on the CTEL and items toward the end, this were proposed for modification by the APT contribution and there was no overlap of that.

The questions that we had in our previous discussion were all on that first part.

I think the second part was a bit simpler.

If I could invite Argentina to give us a description of what's different here from the CTEL proposal we have already seen?

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you very much, Chair.

As you just said, we have taken onboard the suggestion that was made to gather all of the contributions made from APT and include them in the final part of the Annexes. This is what we

have been taking into account, a few of the concerns that were expressed on imposing a limit for candidates to be proposed, it would be difficult for regions. We did a bit of drafting work with the Emirates and have come up with this consensus text.

The first change if you follow this document is in -- taking in account C, considering C. This has to do with the Vice-Chairs of the advisory groups and B, taking on different leadership roles, taking into account.

The same change is to be found in the Resolution part under resolves and also considering the number of Vice-Chairs that should be nominated by SDGs and limited to 3. You see the rest of it, editorial changes, not very many.

This is the main -- this was the heart of the matter that we just wanted to highlight.

If anyone wants more details on this, or if we want to go through paragraph through paragraph, of course we're ready to give any explanations.

These are the changes that have been introduced of the document.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Argentina.

I would just note from that installation, from that introduction that the results also seem to mean that taking into account D would also need to change from 2 to 3. Just to align that part of the text.

Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Yes. Thank you.

The text is already aligned. This is a considering. On something that's already happened.

Here reference is being made to the advisory group. If you would like, we can change around the proposal being made.

The first one is the paragraph indicated with C on the screen where it says encouraged. Encouraged to assume leadership role. The rest of the text has not undergone any change with regard to the proposal from CTEL.

If you scroll down, please. There in results further, the same change has been made which came from the considering part, to ensure it is consist and then it has the clarification that the Vice-Chairman be limited to three. This was an agreement, a compromise agreement that we achieved yesterday.

Finally, if we continue down to the Annex part, in Annex B on qualifications we can see the contributions made in the Asia-Pacific proposal. Those are the Amendments on the pro pow -- to the proposal that CTEL made.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I'm sorry, I'm -- I'm somewhat confused a bit here on the -- the taking into account, the convenience of nominating two, I didn't understand that was

current practice.

Why don't we move line by line. Bearing in mind this the result of informal consultation and the combination of two proposals that we have discussed but neither of which we have agreed, we can go through each line of the proposal.

The first bit is editorial. I don't think we need to take a look there.

The next, can we scroll so we see the left side of the screen? We seem to be losing part of the text to the left.

Now we lose the right side.

Well, we had it.

Then we see pursuant to new item B referencing Resolution 70, maintaining Agenda perspective and promotion of gender equality. Any comment or objection to adding this item? Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman.

I would like to know there is a site I can find this document because what we see on the site is the old document, not the new one. The amended version, the latest version, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: There's a document in the share point which is a mechanical combination. The few Amendments over the top of it that were shown in a different color and the turquoise and the screen is additional -- it is the results of the consultations between CTEL and the Arab States.

Everything in purple is what's on the share point.

We will try while we're starting to discuss this document to get the version with these edits also on the share point as soon as possible.

I think the first edits we're looking at are in the Consolidated Document and only when we get down to these additional items. The first being taken into account C, do we start to see something different. Hopefully by the time we're there we can ask TSB if they can get this new version into the share point.

If we can return to the top that we were looking at, which is the same --

They're taking care of getting this copy in the share point and we have another being presented.

If we can scroll back up to the clause we were discussing.

Pursuant to B as the new item referencing Resolution 70 from gender perspective. Any issues with this point? No requests for the floor.

Let's scroll down to the next exchange.

The next bit is editorial.

In noting we have a new noting C in particular, resolve 2 it of Resolution 38 of Busan, this was from the original CTEL proposal.

I see no requests from the floor.

That's easy.

The next, editorial.

The next item that the Management Team of -- we can probably delete the A in front of TSAG and Study Group should include at least the Chairman, Vice-Chairmen and Working Party chairmen. The meaning being that the Management Team rules that apply to Study Groups should also apply to TSAG.

The next one, the first one changed from the original document in the share point. That the Vice-Chairmen of the TSAG and Study Groups should be encouraged to assume the leadership role of new new activity to achieve greater involvement of the Vice-Chairmen in the management and the work of TSAG and Study Groups.

I'm informed that the document should be in share point now. By the time we ask whether there's an agreement to taking into account C we'll have the document available.

Egypt.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm just having to try to make comment on C in taking into account. I think this part is identically in the resolve so we should move it from take into account and keep it in resolves.

Thank you.

The wording seems to be similar, quite similar to the -- what we find in resolves further.

It does seem to be more operative.

Nearly the same text here.

Is that okay that we keep it in one place?

Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman.

I would like to go back up the document, please.

We say the -- the Study Group should include the Chairman, Vice-Chairmen, Working Party chairmen, we have to be careful of the size of the Working Parties or we should separate it or give some other wording for this. Vice-Chairmen and -- we have Correspondence Group in TSAG, it should be more clear if you speak about TSAG.

Concerning the C -- you're not touching C now? Could I talk about C?

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

I think the discussion we just had was that we seem to have almost the same words in taking into account C and in resolves further. We should presumably only have that text in one place. That was comment of Egypt.

As far as the other point, you could put -- I hate to make it too complicated but Working Party Chairman, if applicable -- there is a freedom to include other appropriate experts on the

Management Team.

Maybe you can clarify.

>> Thank you.

I would suggest expression subordinate groups so it include Rapporteur groups, Working Parties, Correspondence Group, whatever. Subordinate groups may be a way of dealing with that problem.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Chairmen of subordinate groups, of course. Well, yes, subordinate group chairmen, that probably addresses the point.

Russia.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you very much.

I have similar proposal but couldn't find the English wording.

I have a question, on C where it says role of any new activity, as far as I understand it Vice-Chairmen do not only work on new activities so we're somehow restricting the Vice-Chairs here. Perhaps you could say current or new activities or simply activities. We should not restrict them to being maybe new activities.

Thank you, Russia.

With a view of doing this in one place (Chair) could we agree that since there seems to be a more operative part than taking into account that we not include this text here but include resolves further copy of this to make that adjustment. I would say we strike it here because we have the same text in two places, almost same text. If we scroll down we'll fix it once and then we'll pass by it. Resolves further. Here we would make that modification to assume the leadership role of activities in order to ensure.

Does that meet with everyone's agreement?

Let's go back up then in the document.

Here we have taken into account D, which would become C, some words from the original contribution, the convenience of nominating by consensus up to two candidates per region. For Vice-Chairs of the advisory group.

I see a request for the floor, first Egypt, Russia, China. Maybe the same concern.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm sorry to take you back further to number 2 --

>> CHAIR: If tick ask you to wait until we get back to it again. I think we addressed the problem that the text had in the first place but we'll get to that in order and then we want --

>> Thank you. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman. Are we only talking about TSAG? Are we also talking about Study Groups?

If we say yes -- it may mean for other groups there could be more if I have understood correctly.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I think this was some alignment we may need to do. I think that the original -- the original proposal from CTEL had two at the top and two at the bottom and current practice has been that at least for the previous two cycles by an unwritten rule there was one TSAG Vice-Chair per region not written into the Resolution but that was the practice.

What I don't know is whether the regions agreed on what candidate they would put forward or whether that was a decision made by Member States and a Delegation meeting was held here but in general at least where Study Group nominations, those come from the Member States as nominees and Study Group Chairs and Vice-Chairs I think typically were not put forward by the regions. They were put forward by Member States.

This would seem to be a new practice and if the regions are expected to put forward a given number of candidates and the proposed text was no more than three for a Study Group then presumably this text should reflect that.

I think the convenience as far as taking into account at least I'm not aware of any current practice where a region would select two candidates for a Study Group or for the advisory group.

I think we need to adjust this text or remove it and I invite your opinions on that.

China.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Chair. As you have explained, we also have some doubts on this point. From our experience for TSAG Vice-Chair one region only has one candidate and for Study Groups we do not have any number restrictions. As you said, Member States will nominate the candidates. We also hope that the Delegate from Argentina will clarify this point. To clarify the meaning of this text.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Argentina.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chairman.

Seems to me that these two concepts have somehow got confused. They are actually two different things. This is considering, what it is talking about is the convenience of nominating up to two, up to two. As you said, this rule existed in an unwritten form of having at least one and we agreed with the United Arab Emirates to say up to two candidates. It is not compulsory. It is only for the advisory group as the Russian Federation asked. This considering, it is only for the advisory

group.

Now, as you did indicate, there is no limit for Vice-Chairs of Study Groups. What we are doing now in the providing part is to limit the number of Vice-Chairs who can be put forward by up to three. We'll go up to three.

As regards to the advisory group, as considering and also the consideration that's up to two, by consensus from the regions. This is not in to the resolving part. These are two different concepts, one for the advisory group and one for the Study Groups. I hope that's clarified things a little. They don't have to be aligned because they're actually two different concepts. There is no editing mistake made here.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I have never had the experience of sitting as head of Delegation meeting, I can't say how the process works, whether heads of Delegation for the unwritten rule of not at least one but one Vice-Chair per region for TSAG has been the practice. Whether that's a decision made ahead of Delegation or whether that's a decision that's expected to be made by the Regional Groups ahead of Delegation meeting.

At least in the previous two cycles we haven't had regions selecting candidates for the advisory group.

I think this text still needs additional work here.

Emirates, please.

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

To recall what our colleagues from Argentina said about this proposal, the original proposal from the Americas region was to have two candidates for all groups, TSAG and Study Groups. After discussions, informal discussions with colleagues from Argentina we have a consensus that advisory group can nominate up to two Vice-Chairs, and for the Study Groups we have put the text in the results but says that at least one and not more than three.

We have limited the number.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, there was notice for neither TSAG or Study Groups with regards to the number of the Vice-Chairs and it was a practice, as you mentioned for TSAG to only have one Vice-Chair but for other groups it was open and normally the assembly used to approve all the candidates that put their candidacy forward for the assembly.

For that reason we would like to limit it now to 3 only from the next.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Emirates.

If I understand the discussion correctly, the intention, if you agree with my interpretation of the intention we'll find the words to reflect that intention, the intention would be that in

TSAG we'll have at least one, but no more than two Vice-Chairs per region and in the Study Groups we'll have at least one but no more than three Vice-Chairmen per region.

Let me ask to Argentina and to Emirates if that's the intention of what's trying to be conveyed in this modification.

Thank you. United Arab Emirates, please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Yes. This is the intention.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: The text below that we had done the work on seem to reflect that particular limit for Study Groups didn't specify a different role or rule for TSAG. Just an observation since we don't have a parallel statement here for TSAG and for Study Groups it might be simplest to only worry about putting it in the operational part because the important thing is how many Vice-Chairs will we choose and so if perhaps the easiest thing is to remove this statement about convenience we're not worried about how convenient it is, it could be really hard but we're going to pick at most two three per region for each of the different groups. Since it is not an operative part, I don't think it changes the meaning. I think rather than trying to come up with text that is not misleading here it might be easier to delete it here and make sure we have two clear statements below about the number of Vice-Chairs to be appointed.

Would that be satisfactory?

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me echo your opinion. If this is the intention to limit the number of Vice-Chairs of TSAG as for Study Groups, we should move further.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Argentina.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair.

I'm sorry to take the floor once again. It is for us important to keep this concept that's not in the resolves and should not be in the resolves and it should be on the convenience of nominating candidates by consensus. The intention of this Resolution is to eliminate the number of candidates or Vice-Chairman ships in Study Groups and then the resolves part when it comes to it, we can see specifically that it talks about Study Groups.

The term Study Groups has been expressly included, therefore we believe that it should address any concern here. There is still some -- if there is some issue with the resolves part then we don't have any problems with changes but we would like to keep this phrasing about convenience.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Perhaps if I could paraphrase what I think the intention is, the convenience of nominating by consensus, the appropriate number of candidates of region for the advisory group and Study Groups, the intention is that each region would nominate at least one, no more than two for TSAG and one, no more than three for the Study Groups. Would that cover the intention? I'll ask if that's an appropriate paraphrasing. It felt like we were doing something different for the different groups.

Nominating by consensus the appropriate number of candidates per region for Vice-Chairs of the advisory group and Study Group or of TSAG and the Study Groups.

Argentina.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chairman.

We think that this would cast a doubt on the question. What would be the appropriate number? Some regions may even have five. If we prefer to come back to it at the end to draft it perhaps we should address the resolves part. This is only the considering part. If there is a concern here with regard to mixing the numbers and not being clear which number is for which group we do still think however that it would be better not to leave this open because otherwise what is an appropriate number, we get into a difficult world of clarifications and definitions.

We have no problem pace, however, with looking at the resource part if there are doubts about that.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I tend to agree. We're spending too much time on this. We'll come back to this point when we fix the resolves part to see that we have something consistent.

The next proposal, E, it is valuable, the prior experience of the nominee at least has Rapporteur and I think the actual term would be associate rather than associated Rapporteur or editor in the respective Study Group and perhaps if we're applying this to both TSAG and the Study Groups we consider whether that should be grouped but we could leave it as Study Group as well. That has all of those roles.

Other than the editorial items there. It will be associate Rapporteur.

Any other comment on item E?

United States.

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

Good afternoon.

Item E, I believe there is some wording issues in the first four words that is valuable, the prior experience. Maybe the best way to word that is the valuable prior experience, may be a way out of that.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Perhaps value of prior experience of the nominee.

Does that address the United States' concern?

United States, please?

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you.

Was that a proposal from the Chair to change that?

>> CHAIR: I was -- I was trying to paraphrase what I thought you meant.

I agreed the original words were not in the right order and trying to put it in context of considering.

United States, I'm happy with any other words you would propose.

United States, please.

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

I would tend to leave it up to the proponents who wrote the text to suggest what they would like to see.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Any additional comments on this particular considering? I suspect we're within editorial striking distance of what's intended.

Let's move down into the operative part of the text. Resolves, one, we have no changes, if we can scroll down, nor in 2 or 3 -- I think the changes are all in resolves further.

Someone in the back of the room, ITU sector member, Japan, please. Shows as ITU sector member.

>> JAPAN: As Study Group -- I would like to ask clarification. The Rapporteur can also be regarded as one of the Rapporteurs?

>> CHAIR: I would imagine so. I think the previous statement, if that's what you're referring to, was simply trying to give examples of the types of roles in a group that would provide valuable experience that would qualify someone for a Vice-Chair or Chair position.

I understood it as just examples, it was in the considering section.

Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: I have a question for clarification, resolves 1. If you can scroll back a little bit? On resolves 1? Actually the text was not changed, is the resolves 1. Scroll back. Yeah. No. Yeah. This resolve one, actually there are minor changes at the end but during the informal discussions we have identified constant states across the language on the word should after TSAG. Yeah. We have noted that in some -- in some language the original text that was approved by WTSAl2 there is a word that means more shall than should, more mandatory especially French, Spanish, Russian, it is a question for clarification if it exists, is a question for TSB and maybe they should and if exists, maybe we should be sure that it will not

happen with this revised version of the document.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

We had noticed this inconsistency. We're going to request the editorial Committee to try to align the text in all languages, advising them that that seems to have been missed in the last iteration.

That was the intention.

We had not discussed it here, we had no proposal on that text.

That's okay. We'll leave that in the hands of the editorial Committee and we'll proceed that way.

Russia.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman.

I would like to note and in fact send to the editorial Committee that if in English we agree on the word should then that should not be turned into shall through French.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia.

I think it is an interesting point.

In the -- I don't think we have changed resolve 1 in Dubai. I think it was left the same. Somehow the translations were inconsistent. At one level each individual because by the time we receive text from EdCom everybody was looking at the text in their own language. With the exception of the individuals that participated with the ad hoc group in drafting for this Resolution most people were looking at their own languages and people may have had different understandings. Those that participated in the ad hoc group, I agree probably had the understanding of the word as it is in English of should.

Let me ask for a brief discussion here and I don't want to spend too much time, we didn't have any proposals on this, but a had brief discussion just to confirm what seems to be the prevailing understanding of what the understanding of this was. We could have asked the editorial team to simply align it and they have done their own research but if we have a direction we want to steer the editorial team, we can provide that.

Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman.

We just wonder here at the meeting, we look at the English text, we consider the English text and if we agree on the word should we do not want to see this word be changed by any actions of the editorial Committee. In our mother tongue, we simply follow.

It is important for us not to have any kind of feedback or feedback whip we hadn't agreed to.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So it's the opinion of Russia, if I can

paraphrase, that the intended meaning is should. And we should retain the English as the meaning.

Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman.

My point is that the should -- they should be the same word, that we agreed now. If it should be shall, should, what we agree now, not through the editorial Committee.

>> CHAIR: Okay.

This is always a dangerous thing to start drafting on text that we have no proposals on.

I would like to get a sense of the room maybe with a few interventions what the dominant preference is for how we steer the editorial Committee in this matter, whether we steer it toward what I think France and Russia, the word shall and English, others, they're -- no.

In any case, French, English, they're different. There were three languages each. There is no majority vote between languages.

I see three requests for the floor. We'll get a few opinions and see if everybody has a similar opinion and if so we can direct the editor yam Committee in that way.

Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. Thank you very much for highlighting this problem between the different language versions.

I understand the Russian Federations position here, if we indeed approve the text in English here and should is then translated as as more imperative form of word there are other versions that would be wrong and should be aligned with this one. We're working on English here.

To try to clarify this problem in itself, I think the requirements to be elected were -- to be a candidates here that we're discussing are not being suggested. I think we're demanding that they be there. We have to make sure that the procedures are respected along with qualifications and guidelines. I think it should be shall, in fact, in English, and not the should as in the original English which we haven't modified.

I think -- whatever the version we deem as authoritative, we can modify the other text.

For us, we should modify the English for shall.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Argentina.

Brazil, please.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chairman.

Actually we have quite a different position on behalf of Brazil.

We think this text was discussed and it was decided not to change this wording. As we work with this text in English and should was decided to be the appropriate word to have here so we think should is the proper word to keep in this results.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

China, please.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

In Chinese we also have very similar problem because when it comes to translation should and shall actually have the same translation ying and also has the implication of must. Therefore we hope the editorial Committee will make further clarifications in order to make a difference between the should and shall in Chinese translation.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I see no requests for the floor. While we don't normally try to make a vote on this close, 2-1, the -- well. Let's see. Okay.

One more request for the floor. It says ITU sector member, and back of the room, the ITU sector version of the United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you. Sorry for the confusion on the flags. The seats are limited behind the official flags.

This situation, I'm taking the floor as having been the secretary, head of the editorial Committee at the last WTSA, I apologize we managed to not catch this in the difference in the languages. We do need to reinforce the fact that when there's a difference in the versions detected, according to the constitution, it is the French version that applies. Unless we can find a real consensus to change, now that we're aware that there's an issue to be resolved the default will be to align on the French text I believe as the proper procedure forward.

Certainly, if the room is able to come to an agreement to go in a different direction, please be clear in the instructions to the editorial Committee.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

Russia, please.

>> RUSSIA: Thank you, Chairman.

Chairman, it seems to me that we could stop this discussion now because this is an issue which does not specifically pertain to this Resolution or the Committee. Its a more serious issue and more general one. There is a need to send to the council on the Working Group on languages and let them work out how to deal with this and provide us with Recommendations. It is a general issue. I don't think it is worth us spending too much time on

it.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Brazil, please.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair.

Thank you, Distinguished Delegate from Russia for that comment.

Our intention to raise this issue is that in our view it is important for the room and for all Delegates here to be sure about what we're approving. If we're discussing the English version and the English version is saying should, I would like to just -- to clarify it that way is the way the word will be translated by the other language. It is just a question for clarification.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

I'm afraid I'm going to have to stop the discussion here and we'll have to continue in our next session. The plenary, it starts in 10 minutes. We have already overran our time a bit here. I want to give everybody time to get to the next room.

I think now that that issue has been exposed people can continue their consultations and perhaps we find an easier way forward once people have a chance to discuss this issue further.

Thank you.

We're adjourned for now.

I look forward to seeing you in the weekend sessions and we'll meet again in Committee 3 on Monday.