

RAW FILE
WTSA - PARALLEL SESSION
NOVEMBER 1, 2016
1430 CEST

Services Provided By:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-481-9835
Www.Captionfirst.com

This is being provided in a rough-draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is 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. We will begin precisely at 2:30.

Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen. Let's resume. So we have some work ahead of us. It seems like we only have two documents and it should be easy, except for the fact that one of these documents is Resolution 1. So Ladies and Gentlemen, if we proceed this afternoon without a coffee break that gives us 180 minutes to complete our work. Resolution 1 text as we have it in the marked up copy is 30 pages. So just a simple arithmetical process here that gives us six minutes a page. It doesn't give us two or three minute intervention on every edit in this document. I know this is document that we feel strongly about. But let's try to keep our interventions to a minimum and focus on the most important points so that we can complete our work on this recommendation.

So the document that we had opened just before lunch is DT98 R1 and we are first focusing on the considering concerning the ITRs and I understand there is agreement on text to include here. Then I have clarification of what has been agreed? TSAG Chairman, please.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Thank you, Chairman. I'm not sure if there were consultations over the lunch period but the way I understand it was left a legal opinion was sought from the legal advisor with respect to the ITRs. I did have an opportunity to speak to the legal advisor over the lunch period. He thinks the

easiest fix would be to remove a reference to Dubai 2012. So it is a general reference to ITRs. It could either be Melbourne or Dubai. I think that would be the best way to proceeding. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. There were some consultations on this issue and usual text was proposed and I would speak very slowly in English. That the international communication regulations contains references to ITU-T recommendations. That's all.

>> CHAIR: So the text.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: I forgot one word, relevant.

>> CHAIR: International telecommunication regulations contain references to the relevant ITU-T recommendations.

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

>> CHAIR: Okay. So we have this on at least one screen and shortly it will be on the one that you see. So going through the rest of the considering on page 1, there are no proposed changes. I assume we can move beyond that -- I'm sorry, page 2 in the document. Page 3, new text for considering I. Not in square brackets. So I assume that's okay and that would bring us then to the start of section 1.

Okay. So top of page 3, the new considering I referring to Resolution 72 of the Plenipotentiary Conference. I see it not in square brackets. So I assume we can accept that. The next change is in clause 1.3, a new item D. If the actions proposed have been accomplished the Resolution should be viewed as fulfilled and its need should be questioned. This is not in square brackets. So in agreement of working group 3A. The next changes that we have we can move on then to clause 1.5 at the top of page 4. Item B, there are some edits indicated. Oh, okay. So I did say it was not in square brackets but I'm advised that we can back up to clause 1.3, item D. The text which apparently resulted from informal consultations and were not seen by Working Group 3A reads if the actions proposed have been accomplished, the Resolution should be viewed as fulfilled. And its need should be questioned. So can we see the text on the screen? Okay. Thank you. Now that we have it on the screen, are there any -- can we scroll it up above the captioning so people can see it and ask for confirmation? So people have seen this text. I see no requests for the floor. Then the terms of reference in the budget control Committee are unchanged. Clause 1.5 on the next page the first changes are in item B. Okay. So this again 1.5B was the results of some informal consultations and I don't know if it is the -- just the text in to be struck out in the main paragraph or the text to be added in the subsequent Roman numerated items but let's take them one by one.

The struck out text, so that's proposed positive struck out and then for the Roman numerated items there are some additional qualifying words. So I think down to Roman numeral V we have Consensus text? And then the first dash item under item V there was further consultation United States and Russ Russia. So can we reconcile what needs to be completed here please?

Russia please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chair. We believe that the square brackets could be removed and the text kept. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Are there other views? Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. I would like to ask the Secretariat in cases to have a reference to the country, not only to the brackets so that there is no longer any questions arise. So in this case delete U.S. and Russia in this case. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. When we have reconciled the issue the countries will be removed. Orange, please.

>> ORANGE TELECOM: Thank you, Chair. I think we need the Member States in plural.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I assume there is no problem with that. Russia please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. I agree with the representative Of Orange but if we have Member States then we would have to put proposals in the plural as well. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So that will be done. Any other comments on this text? United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The in front of ITU Member States may not be needed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So we are doing very detailed editing but not changing the substance here. So are we within striking distance of text we can agree to? So I would suggest then with what we see on the screen let's remove the brackets and U.S. and Russia. And we can move to the next edit. So item 7, Roman VII some edits without square brackets and also in 1.6. I think that lets us move then to the -- the next page and we have a note on item B. So okay. So I think I understand the comment now.

If new section 2 is inserted, then this changes the number of the subsequent sections and the editorial Committee will take that on board. I don't think we need to spend time discussing that. There was a numbering of the reference. The next text at the bottom of this page indicates to revisit this text after the section 2 discussion and indeed this seems to define some of the same terms. Oh, okay. So this is square bracketed existing text. So we will revisit these square brackets after we discuss the proposed new section 2. 1.13 is -- has some edits on the next page. Okay. So we can scroll there. And now this -- this

text I think hasn't been discussed as perhaps overly pessimistic. I think it has been discussed in the result of some informal consultation. So let's take this section by section. So general principles, any comment on this section? Egypt please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am taking the floor as a Chair for Working Group 3A. I would like to clarify the note, the note before section 2. Section 2 proposal by RCC discussed during the Working Group 3A. What we didn't discuss is the result of informal consultation group. I would like to clarify this. And as to my understanding that we have few square brackets in the new section 2. But there is a proposal to add provisional text by the end of -- at the end of provision -- the new section 2 to remove the square brackets. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for that clarification. So I'll proceed then subsection by subsection. So any comments on 2.1.1 and its subclauses on presentation of texts? United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I gather there is a reason for having Resolutions not capitalized and questions capitalized and opinions not capitalized. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I think all of these should be capitalized where they refer to the official document types. And I see that while there were separate clauses on them, some of the nomenclature that we had some issues with consultation with the TSAG Chairman and TSB come up here. So I'll take the easy one first. So in 2.1.1.3 there is a reference to technical documents and I believe what's referred to here is what is called technical reports. So I wanted to clarify if that was what was being referred to here and in the subsequent section and if so, if we could align the terminology with the actual documents that are produced.

So Russia and then Orange please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. First of all, thank you very much to the United States for the comment as regards the use of capital letters in question and recommendation, et cetera. I think that we don't need to take work away from the editorial Committee. They will correct all of this further on. And perhaps it is not worth discussing this here particularly. As regards technical documents, we have quite a flexible position on this. We just wrote technical documents to cover as wide a sphere or type of documents as possible. But if this is not suitable then we can agree to any solution. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And I think the concern was the technical documents is perhaps wide a sphere because that also

would encompass recommendations. Orange, please.

>> ORANGE TELECOM: Thank you, Chair. Part of the rules and regulations that deal with capitals and miniscule is in the ITU English style guide. I am sure the Ed Comm will be able to use that document to its full extent and we agree with Russia that we should leave these matters to the Ed Comm. However concerning nonregulatory or standardizing texts several remarks and I think we need to make them now because if I say this later we may have to go back to previous sections under L1 here.

A bit earlier in the preceding meeting of your Committee we agreed that the American contribution to 8.13 would be rediscussed in TSAG. And this was going to be dealt with under nonnormative texts. So first comment, I think it would be premature to include under 1 here, subject that the TSAG is going to be dealing with a bit later. Also it may be premature to include a section on documents information documents at this stage is that later on in particular in the bracketed text that Russia has already mentioned if we don't take enough time to understand all of the ramifications of certain sentences I'm afraid we might be putting certain legal concepts in to Resolution 1 that we don't really control at this time. So I think we need more time to understand that. Lastly more editorial remark in this first sentence of 2.1, we talk about implementation guidelines. In the original text implementers guide was the term and I think it is indeed implementer's guide that we mean here because ITU does develop implementer's guides. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Orange. And indeed that was one of my next points of clarification from my consultations. So there are unfortunately two document types with very similar names. So there is a document type which is described in recommendation A.1 called an implementer's guide which is a place where you collect defects until the next revision of the document. And the procedures there are nonnormative text subject to agreement of a Study Group or working party. There is actually a document with a name implementation guidelines and this is a regional implementation guideline produced under Resolution 44. These as I understand are not always even developed by Study Groups but they are also not produced very often. In fact, I was informed that the first recent one produced was produced in 2011. And so I think that if we are referring to the former type of document rather than the latter one, the text later on makes a little more sense but we should seek clarification from the authors of this text which of those two document types they are referring to. Russia please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. You are correct. In the catalog of publications of the standardization section of

ITU there are implementation guidelines and therefore they are referred to here. Implementer's guide is something completely different. It simply describes the procedure or for changing recommendations. And we don't -- we shouldn't be confusing these two documents.

We after looking at implementation guidelines you found these useful and therefore we included it here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. So I think our clarification we can look for text later on to see whether it is consistent is that those implementation guidelines were not necessarily produced in or approved by the Study Groups. So implementer's guides we could link to the procedures in A.1 but not implementation guidelines.

So can we -- if that was the intent of the contributor we can leave implementation guidelines. I would suggest however no objection aligning with the terminology for technical reports to use a term that would not be misunderstood to include recommendations.

In fact, you could delete documents, and I think that covers it. So technical reports and handbooks. Any other comments concerning 2.1.1 or its subsections? Orange, please.

>> ORANGE TELECOM: Thank you, Chair. You skipped over part of what I said earlier. I mentioned that we had previously agreed in Committee 3 that the informative documents in particular recommendations are A.13 suggested by the Americans would be dealt with later. And here we are dealing with definitions of information documents. And we may be thus modifying two documents at the same time because of that. So I feel that we shouldn't at this point in time introduce definitions of informative documents in Resolution 1. One which deals with formal approval procedures.

That should be used just for recommendations which are normative documents and informative documents which are agreed should come under A.13, recommendation A.13. We didn't have time at the WTSA to fully discuss that. So at this point in time we shouldn't prejudge future paragraphs in informal documents. Because I have a thing we are inserting certain clauses, certain wordings that may have an impact on them. So the reason I make this remark now is that in 2.1 they say that we are defining informative documents in 2.6. So we can go back over the first sentence perhaps once we reach agreement here of 2.1 in dealing with informative documents. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. In particular 2.1.1.3 the normative documents would be in the brackets Resolutions questions, opinions, recommendations whereas the rest supplements implementation guidelines, technical reports and handbooks would be informative. Russia please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. First of all I would like to note that we discussed in detail in Working Group 3A. And then in the informal group and this text which you can see on the screen was agreed upon. I think it is not best practice to go back to the discussion of this from the beginning particularly as text that's already been agreed on both in the Working Group and in the informal group. The informal group was created to consider issues of approval of documents and as regards the definitions everyone agreed on that. So I would not propose that we go back and start everything from the beginning. Perhaps something has prevented our Delegate from Orange participating in this group but there were other sector representatives and I don't want us to start this discussion from the beginning again. So I would ask Orange to accept the approach that has been approved by the majority of participants in the Working Group 3A. Of course they can object. That's fine. But I would invite them to go with the majority. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Are there any other views on this section? Orange, please.

>> ORANGE TELECOM: Thank you, Chair. I am not going to oppose the text. But please in your report put we have to remember to be consistent when we get to A.13. I was just saying this. If we start defining informative documents here then it is no longer necessary for TSAG to discuss the American contribution under A.13 since we will have already concluded that work. So it was just a matter of being consistent and logical in our work. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Orange. So any other remarks on 2.1.1 or its subclauses? So we will move on with a correction as noted to the next section on publication of texts. So 2.1.1.2 and its sub clauses. Any remarks on this? And I suggest that we make the same correction deleting the documents comma. To technical reports and handbooks that we made in the previous clause. Aside from that alignment any other comments on this text?

I see no requests for the floor. Let's move on to the next section and ITU-T Resolutions. And I heard indirectly that there may be a reason that this text used the word deletion rather than suppression. So I would offer that as an opportunity if that was not the intention to make that adjustment. So if we can scroll this up slightly. So definition approval and deletion. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. During discussions in the Working Group 3A there was a proposal raised to use the word suppression. However, during the informal group apologies for the reference to administration but Germany noted that further in the text the term deletion is used. And all

members of the informal group believed that it was necessary to use this term as it is used later on in this Resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So with that understanding can we accept this part of the text, 2.2 and its subclauses? I see no requests for the floor. So let's move to 2.3 on ITU-T opinions. So nearly the same text with deletion rather than suppression. I see no requests for the floor from this section. Then we move on to ITU-T question and forward references to the subsequent clauses of the recommendation regarding approval and deletion of questions. Then we can move on to ITU-T recommendations and here is the definition on one page and then the approval and deletion of recommendations on the next. Okay. So this text contains a proposal from an IEP which seems to have separate square brackets. So is this a decision we need to take? Russia please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. First of all, I would like to note that the text under note higher up in the -- above the CITELE proposal is the text that's contained today in Resolution 1. RCC has removed its proposal in terms of -- in order to reach a Consensus and the CITELE representative who was at the meeting in preliminary fashion agreed to withdraw its proposal. So again move to Consensus. But we noted that they would need to consult on this.

And that's all I have to say on that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the clarification, Russia. So we -- we would then seem to have -- okay. They are not quite the same note. So we have -- is it your understanding then Russia, that the note outside of the CITELE proposal was a proposed replacement for what's in the CITELE text that follows below? Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: The CITELE representative is here but I understood that CITELE is almost ready, or if not, then let them say so, they are ready to delete the CITELE proposal and keep the existing text under note which is above the tee tell process. It is not new text. This is existing text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So if I can ask a CITELE representative to speak concerning the consultation on the next part of this proposal. Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you very much Chair. Now a representative who dealt with this is not in the room but we tend to align ourselves with Russia on this.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Are there any other views? I see no other requests for the floor. So the bracketed text then marked from IEP46810 we would delete at this point in time. And then scrolling down underneath is the approval or deletion of clause 9 and it will become clause 10 and clause 9 also refers when the alternative process is used to recommendation A.8. So that's an

indirect reference. So any other comments about recommendations? Okay. Then we move to the section clause 2.6 on ITU-T supplements. Definition, approval and deletion which is under A.13. United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sorry to get involved in these details but I noticed that you call it clause and it is called section in the document. What's the correct term? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: And thank you. I think the official term is clause for ITU text. If you look at the author's guide. It is referred to as clause. Although Resolution 1 for historical reasons the main headings seem to have the word section inserted in front of them that has existed for a long time for reasons that predate my involvement. But clauses is the term according to the author's guide. I hope I'm not misunderstood there. So with respect to supplements, any comment on this section? So then move to 2.7 and to repeat some of the earlier discussion Orange please.

>> ORANGE TELECOM: Thank you, Chair, 2.6.1, we need to strike out supplement at the very start. We need a sentence the definition of (inaudible) is found and so on. Just to clean the text up. Otherwise we wouldn't be along the same lines as the Ed Comm of ITU.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for that editorial improvement. And so if the -- once we undertake the effort to improve A.13, this will apply.

So then 2.7, so we had a clarification earlier that the intention of the RCC proposal was to refer to implementation guidelines as described in Resolution 44 rather than implementer's guides as described in A.1 and I would repeat my observation that these haven't necessarily been developed in or approved by my Study Groups. And so this would be a new approval and deletion process for these types of documents. Orange, please.

>> ORANGE TELECOM: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Sorry but you are going a little bit fast. I had another remark to make on the preceding clause. Sir it seems to me in 2.6.2 we should say agreement and not approval. Likewise in the next sentence, procedure for agreement of revised or new supplements.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Orange. So I think that actually is the terminology that is used in A.13. Approval is used for normative texts where there is a Member State consultation. So can we change the word approval in the title of 2.6.2 to agreement. Procedure for agreement of revised or supplements set up in A.13.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. Of course, we agree with the existing terminology. However in the informal

group and at Working Group 3A, the question was raised about the lack of definition for the word agreement. Therefore we don't intend to stop the work here. We agree to the change but we would ask in your report to include the request to TSAG to define the term agreement in the next period. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia for that and indeed I think this is part of a growing task for TSAG to revisit many of the working methods along with the update of A.13. So we will align with the currently used terminology so as to not create confusion that we have given normative status to these documents. So we change for supplements both in the title of 2.6.2 and in the paragraph below we change the word approval to agreement.

Anything else on supplements? Thank you. So let's move on then to implementation guidelines. And one editorial point, it says information and publication, I think that would need to be an adjective. It is either informational or informative publication. And maybe informative is more consistent with the other nonnormative documents that we have used. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. I'm just jumping ahead but I am doing this so life would be made easier. To all the subsequent documents we have approval or agreement, I am not talking about specific terms, but we have square brackets here. So in terms of adding the last proposal to this section, we would propose to delete the square brackets and the text of Member States and sector members attending the meeting of the Study Group and then delete the square brackets and keep the word of the Study Group in all the subsequent cases. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. That helps simplify the text we have in front of us. The square brackets of Member States and sector members. So you are proposing that we delete the first square bracket and accept the second. So we keep the text of the Study Group. So I think that simplifies the text. It doesn't necessarily resolve the issue because as I said if this is referring to Resolution 44 implementation guidelines, at least so far my understanding is that these have not necessarily been developed in or approved by the Study Groups. So I think this would be new. And we should understand that that's what -- that we are doing this intentionally.

So if there are no requests for the floor we will leave the text as it is but I did want the meeting to be aware that we are taking that kind of a decision regarding implementation guidelines. Tanzania.

>> TANZANIA: Thank you very much. I remember attending the meeting there was a concern if members attending online how do

you consider them in making such kind of decision?

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. I very much understand Tanzania's questions and that exists in all sectors. But I don't want to respond to him straight away because this is not the subject of this Resolution. There are questions that are general in nature and we can't define this in this particular Resolution. Although we do need at some point to define it. So therefore, I would ask them -- ask them not to discuss this right now. I will clarify with Tanzania offline the essence of the problem as regards remote participation in Study Group meetings. On a lower level there isn't a problem here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Orange.

>> ORANGE TELECOM: One editorial comment, so we are in line with the editor's guide, in 2.7.1 in fact, definitions have to be short and not to contain sentences with verbs. So I would propose that the sentence beginning with it should be self-contained be included as a note. Usually we have a definitions the first part and then there is a note which specifies the document further. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, Orange. So I understand that the initial sentences is even -- even the initial sentence is relatively long but would your proposal be to put the word that note prior to the sentence beginning with it should be self-contained, blah blah. Okay. So that is the proposal to insert the word note in front of everything but the first sentence of this definition. Okay. I'm seeing nodding that participants are okay with that decision. And then we have the rest of the text here by Consensus of the Study Group and then as far as I think this would be sort of a funny one to think of in terms of decision making since these are nonnormative texts. We think of decisions relating to normative outputs. So I think this is the first time we've described any formal approval or deletion of implementation guidelines as we understand needs to be. United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So apologies if I missed all discussion in regards to, for example, 2.7.2 on the approval. Understand the first bracket was deleted. And the second bracket of the Study Group is retained. However if I read each Study Group may approve revised or new implementation guidelines by Consensus I don't really see the need to add all the Study Group at the end. So was there a need to actually include that ending? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Editorially I would personally tend to agree since the sentence begins each Study Group may that would be understood when you say Consensus. So would that be

satisfactory for all to simply put a full stop after the word Consensus and then continue with the next sentence the Study Group may authorize its relevant and subordinate groups and under deletion the same thing, full stop after Consensus? Okay. I see Orange please.

>> ORANGE TELECOM: Thank you, Chair. I waited a bit to push the mic button because I agree with this proposal to simplify things from the United States but I also hope that my preceding proposal to replace agreement from a approval this will be applied consistently throughout the other clauses of the formative document, 7, 8 and so on.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So this is the next part of the proposal. So approval certainly we use with all of our normative texts. We don't describe for every nonnormative text what the -- what the process is. I think where we do describe a process as in A.13, for example, we do in fact, use the word agreement. So would there be any objection to replacing approval with agreement for the two nonnormative texts we have which would be these implementation guidelines and the technical reports in the next clause? Okay. So then we would take the title in 2.7.2, change approval to agreement. And each Study Group may agree, revised renewed implementation agreements. Okay. So I think we have captured all edits from the interventions. Any other comments on implementation guidelines? So let's move then to 2.8. So we can apply several of the earlier edits. First of all ITU-T technical reports in the title of 2.8. And then technical report, let's see under definition we don't need the -- well, we -- we don't need that at all because it is underneath that. Then we want an informative publication. And then this becomes agreement. And a Study Group may agree. And we end the sentence after technical report. And then presumably by Consensus and end the sentence there. And then under deletion also end the sentence after Consensus. So any comments other than those edits? Orange please.

>> ORANGE TELECOM: Thank you. It is not a comment on this section. But just to ensure consistency with the preceding clauses. Now we want to find implementation guidelines. Now. What do we do with the implementer's guides? Do we also give them the definition under one here? Because I think we may -- just after implementation guidelines we have to give the other definition and it is not the same for the two.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Orange I think my proposal given the limited time available is that we not attempt to survey additional document types. Also have things like stand alone appendices which are agreed. So I think we can spend a lot of effort and I think I would propose and perhaps we can discuss how we guide TSAG at the end towards a wholistic review of our

working procedures. So to try to restore some of the balance, if you will, between Resolution 1 and A.1 and A.13.

So any additional edits concerning the technical reports? We can move on to handbooks. And here we can delete the word handbook at the beginning of definition. And then add note in front of it should be self-contained as we have done in the previous. And then we move down to the next -- so we change approval to agreement. Each Study Group may agree. And delete the two square bracketed elements of this sentence. And then under deletion, delete the two square bracketed elements.

So my understanding of the text at the bottom which would need I think if we were to retain it a new clause number because it is not part of deletion of handbooks. So I think this was what was added I believe out of an informal consultation that perhaps wasn't as broad as it needed to be. So I think we need to have a discussion about this text first of all, whether to retain it. If we do it is clearly a new element and would need to be perhaps 2.10. So I think I have Orange and then Germany and then Switzerland and then Russia.

>> ORANGE TELECOM: Thank you, Chair. One editorial remark. On 2.9.1 we need to insert note in front of the second sentence. Just under the definition. I am going to let Member States speak out now on the last paragraph that you have just highlighted. And then if necessary, I will ask for the floor again to comment on that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I believe we did add note exactly where you had indicated. In front of it should be self-contained. We did pick up that edit as we went through that text. It is already done. So returning to this new text, at the bottom of -- underneath these document types. So Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I -- my remark is on the so-called section 2.1. I seek clarification where this last paragraph actually comes from. Was not discussed during the meeting. You told me something about informal consultations. And it was not contained in the output document of the drafting group. So the issue is who put it in there. Anyhow, I make that quite clear. We are strongly against introducing this paragraph there and we kindly ask you to remove it as it appears to come out of nowhere. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Switzerland, please.

>> SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair. We associate ourselves with the German statement, especially since in the English version should/shall is used here which according to tradition in the house and we can avoid -- we would like to avoid two hours of discussion on whether it is shall or should. Let's just suppress this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair.

>> Microphone please for the speaker.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Apology. My microphone switched itself off. First of all, I would like to note that at the end of this proposal the same process used at WTSA as described in 113 both shall be used is used twice in my view in text that follows. It is not new text in previous text rather. So if Switzerland would like to we can search this and find this expression. As regards the previous question I must note that the Chair of 3A Working Group 3A at the end of the meeting of the last meeting that is of 3A noted that we need to include what is a good idea to include a reference to the general roles of conferences Assemblies and meetings. To explain the situation and avoid a situation of a deadlock. Because many Delegates who took part in the meeting of Study Groups, of other groups do not know about the existence of these general rules. And thus there was text that was prepared on the request -- on proposal of the Chair agreed upon with various representatives of different regional organizations. Unfortunately Germany was not there. But as the representative of Germany noted during the discussion this is existing practice. This proposal doesn't include anything new. We just believe that Resolution 1 should clearly describe all procedures so that it is clear for everyone as regards what to do in various cases. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. So I -- I think in the position of Comm 3 Chair I don't want to focus too much on where the text came from but whether to keep it or not. I heard two Member States to say no and one to say yes.

>> GERMANY: Thank you. We still say no because we think it has always worked with the Consensus. We are Consensus oriented and we had something like a discussion, as I remember in the drafting group and actually we are strongly against having here rules on voting in there. So for us it is quite clear in particular with those documents that is a Consensus oriented process and in practice it has worked so far and we would not like to see here the door opened for any 624 ruling or whatever. We strongly favor the Consensus approach in order that we are all one ITU.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Egypt please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chair. We would support the Russian proposal here to add this paragraph because the rules have to be complete. We don't want to have an incomplete set of rules, especially if there is already a Consensus within the group. We need to add that paragraph or at least retain it here.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I would remind all that the superior body documents always apply. So I think we all know that the

constitution Convention and general rules I apply whether we say it or not. The Plenipotentiary Resolutions prevail over everything that we do whether we say it or not and below that are the decisions that we take in the WTSR Resolutions. China please.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In our view we have added something about when agreement is not reached we think it is very necessary, we support Russia and Egypt and their decisions. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. Well, people have expressed themselves here and the -- what we would like to say at this stage that we need to clarify in Resolution No. 1, this matter. Hence the importance of this text that we support following Russia, China and Egypt. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Switzerland, please.

>> SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Chair. Our concern with this paragraph is this, in its style it gives rise to a contradiction if texts further on in the Resolution. It disrupts a very fragile balance as our Chairman colleague has pointed out. In 1952, for example, concerning approval -- inordinate procedure, approval procedures where if we are informed of an abnormal procedure the President of the Committee can proceed with use of paragraph 931 which means that he will start up a consultation process or renew it. So this paragraph shows to what extent we have a very fragile, very delicate balance here. And it is not just a matter of following a checklist, getting a Consensus. We don't have that and then we go on to vote and so on and hence my idea of this paragraph leading to a contradiction and threatening this balance in our texts. So I think we should suppress this or at least put it in brackets at this time. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. I think that we have some misunderstanding. Perhaps also confusion because in the first line the word approval is used. In previous texts we replace the word approval with in consultation. If there is no specific consultation procedure, then section 9 isn't affected at all. This doesn't affect the approval of questions nor recommendations because for them there is a consultation process, procedure.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Argentina, please.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chair. Argentina wishes to support Russia in concerning the addition of this text.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Orange, please.

>> ORANGE TELECOM: Thank you, Chair. I earlier I had said

that I would take the floor at one point or other. Hence I am doing so.

And I'm also speaking here as President of 3A. The preceding Assembly it dealt with 3.1 here. Let me just say this meeting has to understand so that we can all agree on this perhaps. What we are doing here is seeing if there is not a Consensus in a meeting for -- on an informal document, an informal document, then we have a formal voting procedure that can be used. But do we really want to do that? That can take an excessive amount of time because there is several ways that one can proceed to a formal vote but a Member State could very easily ask that it be secret, for example. So one or two hours of a Plenary, of a SG would be used up to approve some technical document, a handbook, a reader's guide. I don't think that that would -- give a good image of the organization. I point this out now if states members want to push it to the extreme, that's fine but I don't think it is sending a good signal. If may just another remark, on in general conferences, we can delete that whole section because it is in 113 it is already mentioned. But that's an editorial remark. Ir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I would like to remind Delegates we are 75 minutes in to our time of what has been allocated and we are on page 8 of the 30 page document. So we are considerably behind our six minute per page pace ha that we need to be on to conclude by 5:30 with interpretation. I'm in your hands, Ladies and Gentlemen. We can go longer without interpretation if necessary. But just to remind on the time and the decisions we have to take. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. I fully agree with orange's representative statement and we must try to avoid a vote. At the same time when we say that Study Groups should reach an agreement, then what could happen is that everyone who participates in the meeting should agree. This could lead to the situation whereby so-called nonnormative documents will be not approved for many years. And obviously that doesn't give a good impression of the ITU. Therefore 113 rather is the last opportunity to move forward on this. Which we need to use with extreme caution and I hope that it will be acceptable but at the same time I don't want to nonnormative document to over many years not be approved because someone doesn't agree with it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. I would observe having Chaired meetings like this. So I think I take Orange's observation that we have precise procedures for all our normative texts. Either doing them by AAP or TAP and that prescribes some very accurate rules as far as the maximum number of Member States in opposition to any given text that govern

when we can approve a text without taking it to the WTSA. So for nonnormative texts or appendices or implementer's guides for supplements for technical reports and we have the word agreement and we say by Consensus and Consensus does not necessarily mean unanimity and it is the Chair's judgment when Consensus has been reached. So I think we are anticipating a hypothetical situation here where on a nonnormative text where the Chairman has the ability to judge Consensus on less than unanimity where we need a Member State vote to approve a document and to publish it. It seems like a very heavy weight procedure. That would be my observation. I would remind people again about the time. I will take a few more interventions and try to conclude.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair. I think you anticipated a lot of what I was going to say. I believe the problem we have here is that we don't have specific procedures for the nonnormative documents and would seem a little strange to me that we do have a specific procedures for those and suddenly for nonnormative documents we have a voting procedure directly. And so I guess what -- a way forward for this I have some problems having a voting procedure for nonnormative document. I am not sure how this would work at the Study Group level but we could at least urge TSAG to start work on procedures for these kind of documents as well since we only have four recommendations. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Orange, please.

>> ORANGE TELECOM: Just a quick intervention to say even if we don't write this paragraph down, in exceptional circumstances where there would be a stalemate, was really a problem, if a country asks our vote they would get their vote that's covered by the general rules of conference. We can't deny that that procedure doesn't exist.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Anyone who would like to take the floor on this issue who has not spoken? Zimbabwe, please.

>> ZIMBABWE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to support Russia on retaining the need to vote because I don't see any harm in keeping it there.

>> CHAIR: Tanzania, please.

>> TANZANIA: We are in line with Russia. Keeping it as long as it doesn't have any harm it will clarify more on the decision to be made rather than having a delay on making decision on documents that seems to be normative. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Final opportunity to speak on the issue. I ask only for those who hadn't already taken the floor. Do you insist Russia?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Perhaps this could help. But well noted by Orange when he said in exceptional circumstances perhaps we need to add these words to the text. So that it is

clear that this is really exceptional circumstances. And we could add it in the following way. If there is no specific consultation procedure for a document, and Consensus at the study group meeting is not achieved in exceptional circumstances in accordance, et cetera.

>> CHAIR: So we are starting to go around with many have taken the floor already. One more try for Egypt and then I will know and we are going to have to move on here because we have a lot more in this document that we are not going to have sufficient time to spend. Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just have a small editorial correction in this paragraph. Rather than using procedure for document for a text to be aligned with 2.1 we have just approved. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would refer to the consultation procedure. Is consultation a necessary word or can we just say is no specific procedure approval procedure? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes. I sense here we are trying to invent text to get around concerns and I think that's not what we should be doing at this point of the meeting. So I would observe -- I have heard many views and while I heard strong support for this text I at least in this Chairman's view I haven't heard what I consider to Consensus on such an important issue. I think it is completely accurate what has been observed is that the general rules always apply. And when there is a need and when a Member State requests a vote the Member State will get the vote. So that is procedure that can always be applied. In my experience at ITU we have only gotten to a vote once and I have to assure everyone this is a very painful process that we never want to deal if we don't absolutely have to, to prescribe it for a nonnormative text seems unusual to me. But that option is there on any issue, any matter that's of -- before a Committee. So unless a Member State would like to -- so I'm not going to suggest that a Member State ask for a vote on this clause, please don't. Because otherwise we will be here until midnight trying to finish the document. But I think we do have a request for TSAG to examine the process for nonnormative documents and provide more clarity about the procedures. I think voting for nonnormative documents seems like something we should avoid at all costs. It is something that's always an option. So I think we don't have text that we have Consensus to add at this stage in the Committee. So I suggest we strike that. So Russia does not agree?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: No. Mr. Chairman I should indicate that if you count those who made interventions, majority

supported it. And you cannot delete it. It is Member States first of all.

>> CHAIR: Yes. I know we had many Member States and as I indicated I observed significant support. The guidance we have received from our leadership is the default what we don't have Consensus is that we move to the original text of the Resolution. Now there is text referring to this elsewhere in the Resolution. So if you insist we can square bracket something and send it to the Plenary. I know Moktar will not be happy with me if I do that. But I think that I would be hoping for cooperation of the group as far as possible to say if we can agree on an addition, we will do it. And if we don't reach Consensus, so I think several Member States opposed and there were several who spoke against. It is difficult for me to be clear, we have Consensus to add this text. So that's my situation here from the Chair. So in most cases when we don't reach Consensus for an addition, we either don't do the addition and we stay with the original text. So that's the direction I was trying to go. Germany please.

>> GERMANY: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, I have already pointed out we have a strong interest in particular on this nonnormative texts we push really for Consensus and not for vote. So I can only confirm that I do not see a Consensus on this text here. So therefore we fully support your ruling. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Orange, please.

>> ORANGE TELECOM: Thank you, Chair. I am not going to take a stand on this problem which is up to the Member States. Sometimes it is nice to not be a Member States but what I see on the screen doesn't seem correct. We should say if there is no specific agreement, I don't think we should talk about consultation. I agree not to use consultation in the beginning.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I think that I'll certainly leave it to anyone who wants to retain this text in square brackets to tell us what specific text we would use. My proposal would have been to leave the original rather than try to take some partially wordsmithed version of it. I would share your concern with consultation because that only applies in TAP approvals, not in AP approvals or in any of the other supplement agreement processes. So if we were to change it to anything, we can say no specific approval, stroke agreement procedure. Okay. I see that that would be acceptable in place of the original text. With the insistence of Russia we will leave that item in square brackets for Plenary. If we can remove that later that will be much appreciated by our WTSA Chair that we not send in square brackets. Pleat try to avoid any more of these if we can. We are going to have to accelerate considerably or we are going to

be significantly over time. Hopefully the edits are less dense in the rest of it and we don't have so many square brackets. Let's move to old clause 2 and the editorial Committee will go as clause 3. A new addition 2.1.1C. No square brackets coming from Working Group 3A. I assume we can accept that. The next change is down underneath 2.1.5. Also no square brackets coming from Working Group 3A.

So then on to 2.1.6 I see square brackets here. And I think the United States wanted the opportunity to come back on this text. At least that's what I have recorded from the Working Group 3A Chairman. So 2.1.6 United States, are you satisfied with this text or is there still an issue?

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I actually -- we are satisfied with the text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So we can then remove the square brackets under 2.1.6. And we'll also remove U.S. after the end of that point. No changes then proposed in clause 2.2. A few edits but no square brackets on participation in meetings under 2.3. And I will try to go relatively fast and please stop me if -- okay. So in 2.3.3 we had a note that it should be reconsidered after the discussion of Resolution 54 in Working Group 4B. So what we have had reported is that the proposed new resolves 5 in that Resolution was not agreed and so there is no change in the provision of Resolution 54 that would affect our text here.

So with that information would people be prepared to remove the square brackets around 2.3.2 and 2.3.3? Okay. I see no requests for the floor. So we will remove those square brackets and the note after Resolution 54 and Working Group 4B.

Then a few more edits in clause 2.4 but nothing with square brackets from Working Group 3A. That moves us then in to old section 3 which will be new section 4.

On Study Group management a lot of edits. So I think we don't have any more -- I will advise participants we don't have any more square bracket until 7.2. We will go fairly quickly. Anything in clause 3. Okay. I see no requests for the floor. Then clause 4 covers TSAG. And some edits here also with no square brackets. So scroll relatively quickly through this text up until duties of the director. Okay. No requests for the floor here. Clause 5, duties of the director, there is a 5.2BIS. And -- okay. Let's see we didn't have it in our list here but on 5.2BIS it was indicated that in the square bracketed text U.S., Russia and UAE, there were some further discussion. So are there any changes required here or is the consultation complete and are we ready to remove the square brackets? Russia please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. Our objection as regards this text was based on the fact that we say to the director to fulfill their obligations. Probably this isn't

correct although I do understand why this proposal arose. But I would refrain from supporting this because it is saying to the director that the director is -- must fulfill their -- its objections and -- obligations and staff should behave in line with UN standards for conduct between international civil servants. Therefore I think it is a delicate issue. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russia. Other views, positions in particular of the Emirates and United States? Okay. Let me ask the question, the other way. So we have heard opposition from Russia to this text. Would there be any opposition to removing this text? United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, is there still time to discuss this informally with Russia? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Yeah, we will try to come -- we will put this in abeyance for now and try to come back to it and we will just add it to the list of things to revisit. But I will remind everyone as to the time and where we are in the document.

So 5.4, we have an edit without square brackets and then a new 5.2 -- 5.4BIS in square brackets. Also indicating U.S. and Russia as the states involved here. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: After further consultations we are withdrawing our objection. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. I have a couple of comments as regards 5.4BIS. Given that the ITU is counting on contributions from Member States, can we substitute the term, on the contribution in its work (no audio).

>> CHAIR: I think we may have lost part of the intervention. Yes. Can you restate what you were trying to say?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: (Speaking in a non-English language).

>> CHAIR: Okay. We are not getting the interpretation of that intervention in English. Yeah. We seem to have an issue with the interpretation at the moment. Is it possible for you to make this intervention in English so we cannot lose time?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just wanted to clarify before my intervention, was the decision here to remove this clause or to maintain it?

>> CHAIR: Well, I think what I heard from Russia is they had removed their objection to the clause and so that would be saying to maintain it. So I don't know if the U.S. also was objecting and we need to check that or if this was indicating that the U.S. was of one view and Russia was of the other. So we need to verify that. The Russian view is that we should maintain this and they had been objecting in the previous discussion.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: I prefer to speak in Arabic but due to the circumstances. The issue is reading membership driven bottom-up work, we all know that ITU here is contribution driven not a

membership driven. So I would like to replace that whole sentence with in their contribution driven work of the ITU. That will remove all our concern. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. I see Russia is nodding to that proposal. So we would then change membership driven bottom-up and I think that would parse for me more or less as contribution driven. So I think that's consistent with my understanding of the meeting. So we would propose to make that edit. So we change this to contribution driven work. And with that Saudi Arabia is happy with that. United States, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We would also agree with Russia to remove those brackets at this time. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. So with the edits just proposed we will remove Russia, U.S. in the square brackets around this new clause 5.4BIS.

So then we'll try to pick up the pace where we don't see any indicated issues. So 5.6 no square brackets on the edits there nor on 5.9 or the deletion of 5.7. And then 5.17 also has a nonsquare bracketed edit and then we have 6.1 on contributions. Editorial and then section 7, development and approval of questions. So some edits to clarifying new or revised, don't seem to be any issues there. And then 7.1.2, I am looking at this. Okay. I was told that there had been some informal consultations but I don't see any square bracketed issue identified here. So 7.1.2 is there further modification that's necessary or is the text as we have it on the screen satisfactory? Any comments on this text in 7.1.2? So I could invite the Working Group 3A Chair to remind what the issue may have been here. I don't see any requests for the floor. And what I would tend to do is go with the text as we have it on the screen without any interventions.

Okay. So just asking one more time, are there any objections to the text as you see for 7.1.2? Kuwait, please.

>> KUWAIT: If you go to the read with intent to manage as efficiently and then optimize, optimization means efficiency. So I don't see after ITU resources I propose to remove that and to optimize the use of resources. Just keep as efficiently as possible the scars ITU resources. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I would tend to agree that's editorial but we had understood there is an issue of more substance in the wording. So I first wanted to clarify what that issue might have been. Canada please.

>> CANADA: Thank you. This was a proposal from CITELE Member States and there was discussion with UAE and what you see here is agreed text for UAE and CITELE. With regard to the comment we had heard before the first part of the text talks

about manage the resources and the other one is optimization of resources and they saying the same thing. You can manage the resources in an efficient way but you can also optimize your resources. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So while it may from a language Point of View seem a little bit redundant I think since this was the results of the consultation and it seems to not imply -- not have any unfortunate meaning I would be inclined to put forward this text. So I didn't hear any objection to this text as it is. So I suggest we go forward with this. Any objection to that for 7.1.2? Okay. I see no more requests for the floor. So let's move on. A few small edits. Mostly new or revised in 7.1.3, point 4 and point 5 and point 6.

Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Apologies, Chair. You are quickly going through this. I have a question about who will be managed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I am going to ask for a clarification from Canada, please.

>> CANADA: As a text refers to questions it should be managed by the management team.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And at least my reading of the text was that the development of proposed new and revised questions it should be considered what the impact was on the use of ITU resources. So I think that's the essence of the proposal. So I'll ask once more, can everyone accept this text in 7.1.2? Okay. I see no other requests for the floor. So we'll try to move to what I know is a rapid pace but we're -- we have a lot of pages left to go through and I don't want to miss any substantive point. So I think that the edits up through 7.1.7 are all pretty much adding new and revised. As are 7.1.9 and point 10. Then we a larger edit but no square brackets in 7.1.11.

So any comments on the rest of 7.1 including its subclauses? Okay. 7.2, we have the title and new or revised questions and then the figure with the new name for the figure. Substance of figure has not changed. 7.2.2, again new or revised. In 7.2.3 the Consensus, if Consensus is not achieved, the Study Group may continue to consider the matter or request approval by consultation of Member States.

Moving on, 7.2.5, in particular TSAG shall review any new or revised question and then adding some text, TSAG recommends modifying the draft new or revised question, the question shall be returned to the relevant Study Group for reconsideration. So I think that's clarifying the TSAG doesn't just change the text after it has come from the Study Group. They send back their proposed letters.

7.3.1, small edits. 3.2, 3.3. So here we see a reference to the general rules of conferences. And figure 7.1B the process more, approval of new or revised questions at WTSA. So this governs the work of our friends in Committee 4. 7.4 is the deletion of questions and here we have no more edits.

So section 8 is the next clause and the title has been updated. It used to be selection of recommendation approval process. Changed to be recommendation development and approval process. So these standardization domains I think used to mean something. I think the numbers are not so meaningful but the topics are still the ones that would be default TAP and the others are default AAP. And, of course, Member State in any meeting can propose to change the approval process and any recommendation.

So I see no more requests for the floor on this. So 8.1.1, Orange, please.

>> ORANGE TELECOM: Thank you, Chair. Just an editorial comment but as it is a sensitive phrase. In this new paragraph it is particularly related with a d at the end.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So this is the middle line of the three line edit, the word related with the word relate should be related. So the line that begins with implications particularly related, yes. I think that's typographical. Any other comment on 8.1.1?

8.1.2? Okay. 8.2 there is no proposed change. 8.3 is reconsideration of the selection. And then we move to section 9 clause 9 on the TAP approval process. So the initial edits here are just new and revised in 9.1.1. No more changes. Okay. We pick up some time here. So we get down all the way through up until clause 9.4 before the next proposed changes.

So in consultation I think it would normally have been understood but only Member States are entitled to respond in the consultation. No square brackets on that proposed change. Then we have further clauses with no change.

Okay. So it looks like we have no other changes through any of clause 9.

Orange, please.

>> ORANGE TELECOM: Thank you, Chair. I was asking for the floor for awhile just to go back to 9.4.1. And the reason for adding in brackets see clause 9.5.2. Because in clause 9.5.2 this only applies to Member States as much as I understand. It says sector members can submit contributions to Study Groups, that will be authorized or not, to approve a recommendation. So I do worry that adding this reference at the end of the 9.4.1 could be -- lead to misinterpretation by the reader. So I would like a clarification on that, please.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Orange. So I don't have a record of

which proposal this came from. This was an RCC proposal. Can you clarify the reason for the addition? Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. The addition is just to clarify the procedure and I think that we can delete the text in round brackets. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So yes, I think the 9.5.2 is clear that anyone who can contribute, contribute to the appropriate meeting the changes have to be reasonable for Member States not present at the meeting. But with deleting the reference is -- so we'll delete that. But keep the text only Member States are entitled to respond which would have been the normal situation. I'm seeing nodding heads. So that's okay. So there are no other proposed changes anywhere in clause 9. That gets us to the appendix. And there is one edit in the relationship with this study activity to other relevant standards or standard organizations.

And then appendix 2, no changes in the suggested note to be included in the circular.

So we had deferred one item then. So what I have in my notes here is that we had not taken a decision on 5.2BIS. So we can return to that, please. So here did we -- did we need -- I think Akhmed in 3A referred to it as a short break for stretching. Perhaps we should pause for five minutes to allow the discussion to conclude here and perhaps in five minutes' time we can resolve this particular issue. So we'll pause right now for five minutes and then we'll resume our discussions.

(Break)

>> CHAIR: Just to inform people what's happening to all of you are sitting here patiently, I am letting this consultation run a little long because it looks like we might have an opportunity to maybe send text up with no square brackets. So the amount of work we have left is actually a very short list. We have a solution we will put forward and 5.2BIS. There is a discussion going on in square brackets that we left in Resolution 1 and we will have A.12 which is the compilation of previous agreements but it is a very short document. So I think we can deal with all of those in 15 minutes maximum. So if I can ask for the patience. So we will resume no later than 5:15 and conclude no later than 5:30 would be my plan.

(Break).

>> CHAIR: Ladies and Gentlemen, let's resume. So I think the consultation has concluded. I think we came very close. I think consultations will continue and I think we will endeavor to find a way forward that we don't need to be asking Mr. Mnakri to put this before the meeting for a decision. I hope we have a decision on what to do with this bracketed text before we reach it in the Plenary tomorrow or Thursday. So if we can return to

the one other item that we had left in brackets which was the new clause 5.2BIS.

Okay. So on this particular text, the result of the consultation is that we would propose from the light brown bracket on the third line, 2014, so beginning from there to the end of the sentence to delete the remainder of that text. And the square brackets and the countries involved. So we will shorten it to that. And with that I think there is agreement of all the parties who were involved in that discussion to accept this text and remove the square brackets. So any comment to that proposal?

Okay. I see no requests for the floor. So that agreed as the way forward on 5.2BIS.

So with this we have completed our review of the text of Resolution 1. We do still have the 2.10, the square bracketed text and I would encourage all parties to continue their consultations and find a way forward before we reach that in the Plenary. Hopefully we don't need to take any Plenary time for lengthy discussion. So with that can I have your agreement to take this text forward with the changes we have done this afternoon to the editorial Committee to prepare the document for Plenary? Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. We would just like to draw your attention to the fact that in the document we need to take a series of clarifications on the editorial front and we actually entrust this to the Secretariat. Because in 1.1, for example, something needs to be deleted. Section 1, sorry. And I think that this can be done by the Secretariat. I wouldn't want to do this now at the meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And we will remind the editorial Committee about some things like capitalization of terms and so forth that was noted our discussion and we will trust the editorial Committee to take that on board. Any other comment to this document before we agree to send it to the editorial Committee? I see no requests for the floor. So that's agreed. Thank you Ladies and Gentlemen for your work this afternoon. And our work is almost done pending the consultation on the one set of square brackets. Russia please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. We discussed the situation with a series of other countries and we would like our comment Committee to instruct the Assembly or TSAG to carry out some serious review of Resolution 1 and also recommendation A.1 as one of the most important issues and prepare a proposal for the next Assembly. And I would like this to be reflected in the report. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED STATES: We fully agree with this and I would also

like to include A.13 with that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And we already had an instruction recorded concerning it at A.13 but we can certainly record that in to a single comprehensive and wholistic review of the working methods to be requested of TSAG. So we'll reflect that in our final report. Any other discussion on this agenda item? We do have one other document to consider.

Okay. I see no requests for the floor. So that takes us back to A.12. So here we had the three proposals and one of the proposals we had tentatively agreed to once it was confirmed committee 4 to align the titles of D series recommendations with the agreed title for Study Group 3. In DT117 is the document that we have posted. We have -- I have done that and so this reflects the current agreement of Committee 4 for the title of D series. I would just make a sort of a side note that the D series is the only series for which we might do this because in fact, all of the recommendations under the responsibility of Study Group 3 are in the D series and all the recommendations in the D series are under the responsibility of Study Group 3. So that's not true of any of the other series. So many of them span study groups and we use a title for the series which is the general area of study. So I think this is the one where perhaps the easiest way forward is to use the same name to cover the scope. So just to read that out it is tariff and accounting principles and international telecommunication/ICT economic and policy issues. Now should that change in the Plenary for the title of Study Group 3, of course, the conf Chairman would take the floor and advise that we do any edits and also in A.12. The next part of the proposal if we scroll down through the text, so the text I just read out is on page 2. So -- okay. So we are not seeing it with revision marks but you are seeing the correct text. And then there is another change on page 3 in the title of Q series of recommendations. Adding the words and associated measurements and tests. Now I believe it was our intention there were two series titles. I believe it was L and Y that had been modified by TSAG. Can I ask TSAG Chairman to verify we have the correct titles for these two series based on TSAG agreements because we don't want to inadvertently undo anything agreed by TSAG. Mr. Gracie please.

>> BRUCE GRACIE: Yes, thank you. Yes, indeed those are the correct titles as far as I'm aware. I think that is completely accurate. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And then the one other change in recommendation A.12 is down in clause 2.5. A little bit further down. So the date of formal approval of the recommendation Study Groups responsible for the approval and record of revisions together with the approval process applied, this was from the

CEPT proposal. So I think these proposing taken together will shortly agree is the text of revised recommendation A.12. Any comment Ladies and Gentlemen? Okay. Thank you. Secretariat has just advised me. So at the bottom of page 1 and I think we can take down just below, further down in to the text of the recommendation itself there a footnote which seems to be out of date. And I think this can simply be deleted. So this publication starts from a 2008 version with corrigenda which are two the TSAG modifications and since those two TSAG modifications are taken on board in this revision of A.12 this footnote can be deleted.

So this will be the 2016 revision of A.12. So any comment to this text? Okay. I see no requests for the floor. So we can agree this or approve this revision of A.12 and send this forward to the editorial Committee.

Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. I thought that we were going to come back to the bottom of the proposal as regards procedure for approval agreement. What I fear is that the procedure -- the traditional procedure, TAP will be preferable or the opposite. And here we are in favor of the European proposal and if you agree, we can add a sentence to say that the two procedures processes have the same weight, the same value, or something along those lines to show that there is no preference for one process over another. Whether that be TAP or AAP. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: So I think while there is no harm in adding that sentence. So I would call attention of the participants to clause 1.2 in recommendation A.8 and I would have to search for the Convention reference but 1.2 says in accordance with the ITU Convention, the status of recommendations approved is the same far both AAP and TAP methods of approval. So I think we already have this in the Convention and in A.8 which was added to the Resolution 1 clause 9. So I would advise that that's present in the existing text and ask whether it is necessary to have it in recommendation A.12. Germany and then Saudi Arabia?

>> GERMANY: Thank you. In principle we share your view it is not necessary. But in the spirit of compromise if it is in the interest of our colleagues from Saudi Arabia and it makes the agreement possible here we would not object. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And I think my proposal would be if we are going to add a sentence here we simply copy the sentence we already have in A.8, clause 1.2 rather than use -- introduce new words like weight and status. So Saudi Arabia, please.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. I would thank the German Delegate for his cooperation and I would agree with you to use what is already existing in the text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And since the Secretariat probably doesn't have that immediately available I will read it out at dictation speed. In accordance with the ITU Convention, the status of recommendations approved is the same for both AAP and TAP methods of approval. Okay. So thank you very much. And I will open the floor for not more than about 20 seconds for any final interventions and say for real if we will agree to this text. Any other final comments Ladies and Gentlemen on this text before we send it to the editorial Committee? Orange, please.

>> ORANGE TELECOM: Thank you. Just an editorial change, AAP, TAP I think we have to define them or spell them out because it is the first time that we see them in the text.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I think either the Secretariat or the editorial Committee will look after that for us. It is a sentence copied from another recommendation. So I think we can deal with that.

So this is approved pending the editorial updates and editorial committee will see it. So I'm happy to -- I should do a final check of our agenda but I believe we have addressed all of our documentation. So thank you very much Ladies and Gentlemen. We have come to both the end of our time and the end of our work. And thank you very much for all the cooperation that's allowed us to successfully complete our work. I do want to thank in particular my Chairman of Working Groups 3A and 3B and my Vice Chairmen from Egypt and Vietnam who have assisted in the work and I would like to thank the Secretariat, Tatiana our secretary and Martin Hiroshi and Anna Maria who have helped us in our work and last to the interpreters who have been able to stay with us during the discussions and help us better understand each other. Thank you very much. I'm happy to be able to conclude the work of Committee 3 more or less on time here and look forward to putting this forward successfully in the Plenary. Of course, I'll remind those on the one square bracketed text to search for a solution so we don't have to take Mr. Mnakri's time tomorrow to deal with that issue. Thanks again. I have an intervention from Algeria, please. It is Germany.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The only one who has not got thanks now is you and I do this on behalf of all the participants, in particular your patience, guidance and experience is well noted and appreciated by everyone and in particular you finished in time. That is the very best I have to say. So I really grateful that we now can go all to other meetings and enjoy the evening. It would have been much better to enjoy it with you but unfortunately you have finished. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Egypt, please.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Chairman. I would like to thank you personally because you really made incredible efforts and you are very wise and very successful. I hope that this spirit of cooperation and solidarity will continue to prevail. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Egypt. Russia, please.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. We would also like to thank you and also the TSB staff and other Chairs of the Working Groups for the successful work that we have done, for the spirit of compromise and also for the wish to find most suitable solution based on compromise and Consensus. Thank you again.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And I do now indeed see no more requests for the floor. So the meeting is closed. Enjoy your evening and perhaps Quami has more activities for you after you leave this room.

(Session concluded at 1735 CEST)

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