FINISHED FILE

PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE 2022

BUCHAREST, ROMANIA

ROOM CUZA

COMMITTEE 6

OCTOBER 7, 2022

9:00 AM EEST

Services provided by:

Caption First, Inc.

Monument, CO  80132

+0017194819835

www.captionfirst.com

\*\*\*

This text 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. This text,

document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

\*\*\*

>> CHAIR: Good morning, everyone. Thank you so much for your patience. I apologize being late. I was coming from the ad hoc group, the informal group on 162.

So, our agenda today is in ADM/10. So, there was a request in the room yesterday, and I had informal requests to make sure -- to make sure that to show where we are in our work and what has been completed and not completed.

So, for this morning for today, we have two sessions and our agenda is in ADM/10 Rev. 10. So, we will have two sessions today. We will have a morning session and then we will have an afternoon session. In between, there are some ad hoc meetings. This morning I would like to approve the agenda for items 1 through 4 and then welcome back this afternoon and there is a possibility that there may be additional, if we are able to get the documents completed, additional items. But for now, we are only looking at approving the agenda for the 9th meeting which is Item 1 through 4. Questions? I have Ireland asking for the floor. United States requesting the floor on the agenda. So. Ireland, you have the floor.

>> IRELAND: Pressed the button. I'm sorry. Thanks.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Ireland. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think we had mentioned that we had been working on a couple of minor edits to the Resolution 193. It's not posted as a Resolution document but I think you have the documented and we should be able to put it on the screen, I think, and hopefully we can approve it here even though it's not noted as a revision, if that helps.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Yes. We are trying to get that document posted as a revision. I did receive it. I will see if there are no other comments, so that Item 2, 193, there is a Rev. 1 to this document. If there are no other objections to the agenda for the 9th Meeting, I will consider it approved.

Thank you.

What I would like to do is in Plenary yesterday, we went through a similar document and we approved it without delegations taking the floor. I would like to do the same with this document. It has been coordinated with all involved and I greatly appreciate that. If there are no objections to taking Resolution 193 and the edits proposed to this resolution and have been coordinated with those with interest involved that we take this document as a whole with no comments. Any objection to that approach?

Thank you very much. That will be done. Resolution 193 is approved, will be sent to the Editorial Committee. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Thank you, everyone. My Secretariat, who keeps me honest and makes sure that I am following the correct rules of procedure, has indicated that I need to at least get one country to approve this document and project the edits that have been agreed to, so I will ask that the proponents of this document please take the floor and support that we send this forward to the Editorial Committee, and we can go page by page, but I really, really encourage delegations that this is a carefully crafted compromise on this document and that we have no discussion. I will do that so that we're consistent with the rules of procedure. So with at that, I have this presented by the Arab Region and I have this coordinated with other delegations involved, and if those other delegations would please raise support to this document. Brazil, you have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Madam Chair. Brazil fully supports moving forward with this document. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. With that, Page 1 -- excuse me, Page 2?

Page 3?

Page 4?

Thank you. Approved. We'll send that to the Editorial Committee. Thank you very much.

New Zealand, you have the floor.

>> NEW ZEALAND: I'm sorry to take the floor. Could I ask the Secretariat to share the document through the Zoom session as well? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I will ask if that could be done, but I do know that it's on its way to being posted as a Rev as well. Okay. Thank you.

Now, if I could turn to Item 3 on our agenda, Resolution 77, and I will ask our Vice-Chair, Ms. Blanca, to introduce DT/38 Rev. 1. You have the floor.

>> VCE-CHAIR: Thank you, Chairman. The group dealing with Resolution 2 and Resolution 77 met yesterday and for your consideration in DT/38 Rev. 1. You can see in green the paragraphs which are agreed at the ad-hoc meeting that was held yesterday, and in yellow you'll find the paragraphs, and I believe there were three of them in the document, which we were not able to approve yesterday.

On Page 4, noting (a,), you'll see text which was not updated. There was a proposal to delete it and another proposal to update it. The Secretariat just informed me it will be Council decision 642 approved by correspondence in 2021 with the dates for the RA and the WRC. If nobody disagrees the new correct dates can be in subparagraph (a), noting (a). Would you like us to go paragraph by paragraph or just look at the three paragraphs highlighted in yellow at the moment?

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Ms. Blanca. If we could go through, I think if we go paragraph by paragraph -- or actually page by page, that would get us to the same result. If there are no objections to that, we can proceed that way.

>> VICE-CHAIR: Thank you very much. Page 2, Everything was approved at yesterday's ad hoc, so nothing on that page is pending for approval. The same thing goes for Page 3, we approved all the text and nothing remains there to be considered any further. Paragraph 4, there is the Noting (a) that I mentioned a few minutes ago that is still highlighted in yellow. The change had to be made to the dates there. There were two proposals, one to eliminate Noting (a) entirely and then the other to update it with the dates of the next WRC.

As I say, it's Council decision 623 adopted by correspondence in 2021 in which established the dates for the Radio Assembly and WRC 2023 from the 20th of November to the 15th of December that's for the conference in the Radio Assembly from the 13th to 19th of December. There is another paragraph on the same page also still pending approval, and that is the paragraph Resolves 3. There is a proposal there from the United States that we add "taking into consideration the possibility of virtual depends", that is a paragraph on which we were not able to reach consensus. That's it, Chairman. The other aspects can all be adopted on Page 4 anyway. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So, with at that, my question to COM 6 is that, can we leave the first text in yellow which is a factual statement, but it needs to be updated with the current text that was approved in Council. Any objection to asking the Editorial Committee as Ms. Blanca has stated, to update this as an editorial matter?

Do I not see any objections to that, so we will do that. The Secretariat has placed the text on the screen that says that Council decision 623 approved by the majority of the ITU Member States set the date for WRC 23 as 20 November to 15 December, 2023 in Dubai, UAE proceeded by the RA 23 on 13 to 17 of November, 2023 and followed by the CPM 27-1 on 18 to 19 of December, 2023. That would be the text that would replace the yellow text in Noting. That is a factual statement. Any objections to that text? I see Canada, you have the floor.

Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Yes, now I do have the floor, Madam Chair. Good morning to you. We're not objecting, just a question for clarification, why is there a need to state that it was approved by a majority of ITU Member States? Is that necessary? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. This was the, if you recall, to answer your first question, no. It was approved, so I do not think that we need this text and it could be deleted. I think that it is here because that was the wording that was coming out of Council and so we don't necessarily -- we don't need it in this session here.

With that, if we all agree to delete that sentence, that will be done. I have no one asking for the floor. Thank you. Kuwait, you have the floor.

>> KUWAIT: Thank you, Madam Chair. Madam Chair, I am unable to see the screen. Could you please notify which is exactly the paragraph that will be deleted? Is it the one regarding policies? The screen is not legible from where I'm sitting. Could you please specify where the paragraph that will be deleted is? The Arab Group thinks that the policy forum should be held in conjunction with the WSIS in 2023 as we previously suggested. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Kuwait. We are in the Noting section of DT/38, and we are on the section where we're talking about the WRC, and we are replacing the text that is highlighted in yellow with the new text that is a factual statement from a decision of Council. So, we have not -- we are not at the point of where we're listing out the different conferences. Thank you.

The next yellow text is where the ITU -- Resolves number 3, that the ITU exhibitions, forums, high-level events, and symposia of a worldwide character shall be scheduled -- so "taking into consideration the possibility of virtual events and" and I don't see why -- I understand -- well, what is the objection to including that "taking into consideration the possibility of virtual events"? Based on the last three years', we've had a pandemic and we've had to be flexible in how we achieve our work. And I will say that a council that has been virtual for three years has been -- it was a rewarding experience to see that we could all come together in this crisis and figure out how we're going to progress our work, and we did that under our able Chair from the UAE. Was it painful sometimes? Absolutely. Was it required? Absolutely.

So, I'm wondering what is the objection to this text? I have the Russian Federation and I have the United States. I would like to close the floor on this point on Resolve 3. So, if you would like to take the floor on Resolves 3, please do so now; otherwise, the list is closed for this point. The list is closed. I have Russian Federation; you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. I would like to highlight what you already said yesterday at the ad hoc on the issue of forwarding high-level events and the participation of delegates in them. We think that we need to take into account decision reached by the Council and also the experience we have had in wording the world telecommunications conference, council and other PPs. We think that it would be better for high-level events to be held physically, which apart from anything else would make it easier for all delegates participating in these events to vote. There is the time difference to take into account always, that nearly always for countries has a negative effect on the level of work people are able to do at solely virtual meetings. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation. I think I'm lost here because if I heard this is taking into consideration the possibility and it's not requiring. And at high-level events, I'm not aware, and I could be completely wrong, that we take votes there. But I will now give the floor to the U.S. and make a decision on the way forward. Thank you. U.S.?

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair and thank you for the question from the Russian Federation. I think this paragraph actually mentions, excuse me at the end, it's referring just to the high-level expeditions and other events and it's not the mandatory and statutory events. I think we would 100% agree those would be very difficult to have virtually. I think this is simply taking into account not to have any -- we would never want to have the WRC be in virtual, but the just to note that there is a possibility of some of the other forums that Council can consider whether or not they be virtual as we did in the last four years as the Chair was saying. I think it's just mentioning the possibility of it, and just I think especially with the new building construction project, it's something for us to make sure the Council is always taking into consideration on that possibility. But we would agree that this would not apply to the conference, assemblies, or Council. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Russian Federation, the text in English is pretty clear. Perhaps is there -- could we see more clarity in the Russian text? I would ask the other languages to look at the text to make sure that it's clear in the other languages of the Union. But in the English text, it's pretty clear that this is relating to the laws before it, and actually it's the ITU exhibition, forums, and high-level events. Really, these events can't take place if our core meetings of the ITU are taking place, so the sentence is -- this Resolves is a priority over our core activities versus these other events. Thank you. So, I don't see anyone objecting on leaving the text based on that explanation, so we will do that.

Any other text that is a -- that's in square brackets? Russian Federation, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Good morning, everybody. It doesn't seem to us that this question was fully discussed and that we came to any agreement. That being the case, I feel that the discussion could be continued. At the moment, I really don't think we've got a clear decision on this question. We've already expressed our opinion on it, and at the moment our feeling is that there is no decision on this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation. The decision is that we maintain the text, that is the decision. We remain the text of taking into consideration the possibility of virtual event. Thank you. Russian Federation, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, again, Chairman. We agree with your decision to retain this text, but only if it's retained in square brackets. Once again, we would like to repeat our position, which is that as this is worded at the moment, it is not in line with the founding documents of the Union or with the decision of Council. As far as this looks at the moment, we do not think that this proposal can be included in Paragraph 3 of this resolution. Therefore, our proposal is that if you wish to retain this, it be retained in square brackets. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Just to support your way forward. This is just an invitation taking into consideration that possibility, so Madam Chair, we have until tomorrow at 9:00 p.m. to finish all of these articles and meetings, and if we don't move at the appropriate pace, we'll be stuck with having to come on Sunday, so I just encourage all of us to move forward in a constructive way. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Canada. So, we will put this in square brackets. I will just remind COM 6 that I will bring this back this afternoon. The whole text is not in square brackets actually. It's just the new text. In there is no agreement on the new text, then my preference is not to send it to the Plenary because he has noted he's not turned the plenary into a drafting group, so I will work with the U.S., Canada, and Russian Federation on a possible path forward. With that, I will now go to 4.4, the 6th World Telecommunication Policy Forum. There is no agreement on this text, and until we resolve Resolution 2. So, what I would like to do is to have the Secretariat, all the other text has been agreed to, so clean up this text and leave Section 4.4 and Resolves 3 in square brackets and we will bring it back this afternoon.

If we could all agree on that? Thank you. That will be done.

Now, moving to Resolution 2, which is in DT/37 Rev. 1, so as we did with resolutions, I would like to this Ms. Blanca take the floor and introduce what the outcome of the discussions of Resolution 2 which is in DT/37 Rev. 1. Thank you. Ms. Blanca, you have the floor. Thanks.

>> VICE-PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, Chair. Just like in the previous document, the Document on Resolution 2 was not able to be met with agreement fully in the meeting that we had yesterday. In green, we have the paragraph where we were able to agree. And then in yellow, we have the ones where, unfortunately, we were not able to reach agreement; because in my opinion, Chair, there is a difference in opinions but a fundamental one between Member States in terms of the timeframe for these fora since some countries have a certain timeframe in mind and other countries are opposed to that possibility. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: All right, so we are going -- we have an hour -- or actually no, we don't have an hour. We have about 40 minutes to look through Resolution 2 and that is the last -- this is the last item on our agenda. But 10 minutes before we end our session today, around 10:15, I would like to go through all of where our documents are presented on Page 2 of our agenda.

So, let's get started. So, Resolution 2, the first Considering (a) through (b). Looks like (a) through (b) is approved. No discussion there.

Item (c) taking into account Resolution 77, we all agree on that text.

The next disagreement on the path forward in addition to this text is item Considering (d). So, we will look at Item (d). Blanca.

>> VICE-CHAIR: Thank you very much, Chair. If I remember correctly, (d) had a mainly editorial issue with it on the telecommunication/ICT, and whether we put it at the end of that and while in (f), it had to do with including digital technologies. Now, that's not an editorial issue, but rather an issue to do with content. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. That's very helpful. So, it happens that Considering (d) and (e) are indeed editorial changes, and we should change those to green. And that the text in Considering (f) where we are proposing to delete telecommunications/Information Communication Technologies and replace with digital technologies is in contention. So, I guess my question, can I have some explanation as to the reason for deleting telecom/ICTs? Because from a number of discussions within the ITU at various forums, digital technologies has been part of telecom/ICTs. So, is it intent to make distinction here? Thank you. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning, everyone. If my point of view, we should start the discussion as of the lower parts of this page, the operation part of the Resolution. If we start with that part, it will save us time. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Any objections to starting with the Resolve section of the Resolution 2? I have a request from my sector member. I'm sorry. Sector Members are, I understand, are not able to take the floor during the Plentipot. Apologies for that. I don't see anyone objecting to the starting with the Resolve's part of this. Let's do that. Let's see if we can back into the text above.

The first Resolves to convene the WTPF once in the interval between two Plenipotentiary Conferences. I know that is a point of contention. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you very much, again, for your patience and for agreeing to what we have asked for. The Arab Group asked for some flexibility in this text. Because in Resolves 1, it's better to be held or to convene. Or preferably convene the WTPF, asking to have a WTPF between conferences, but to preferably convene.

>> CHAIR: So, I have the point on Resolves 1, I have the United States, Brazil, and Romania, Japan, and I would like to close the list on Resolves 1. So, all that would like to take the floor on Resolves 1, please do so now.

Okay. All right. I'm closing the list for Resolves 1. So, I have United States, Brazil, Romania, Japan, Russian Federation, Jordan, and China. China is the last to speak on Res. 1, the list is closed. Thank you very much. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think for us still, we prefer not to have this new resolves. There is already language on Resolve 7 that talks about the WTPF as ad hoc event to respond quickly to emerging policy issues. I think this would significantly change the nature of how WTPF has been convened to make it more like a statutory event. I think we should, again, I think the discussion that we had was the possibility of Council making a decision on the duration, the dates, and the events, and I think this language would make it something that is different from what it has been in the past. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. I have Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Madam Chair. Brazil believes in the outcomes of WTPF and prefers to have an indication of convening the forum in a certain interval. The addition provided by Saudi Arabia gives it enough flexibility for the decision to be made regarding the right time to convene. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. Romania?

>> ROMANIA: Apologies, Chair. This is the United Kingdom.

>> CHAIR: Okay. United Kingdom. It's coming up something different on my screen.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Apologies for that. The United Kingdom would agree with the United States that the inclusion of Resolves 1, as proposed here, even including the word "preferably" would significantly change the logic behind how the WTPF has been convened in the past.

The idea behind convening the WTPF when the membership believes it is necessary to do so, when there are topics to be discussed is something that we believe has worked well, and we're not -- we don't believe that it's necessary to change that in the way that this new Resolve 1 would do. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom. I now have Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. Yes, we agree with all of those countries connectively participating on the discussion on this question, and we're convinced that the forum, however it's held, will promote to -- promote the priorities that we have, and it's also important that our preparation to the World Telecommunication Standardization Assemblies and WS. So, we would like to support the proposal from Saudi Arabia and think it fully meets our common interest as a Union. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russian Federation. I now have Jordan.

>> JORDAN: Thank you very much, Chair. Good morning, everyone. Very briefly, we do support as well the proposal made by USA and Brazil and supported also by Russia.

It's very important to have an effective timetable for holding the WTPF, and in our point of view, convening this very important forum will give us a very important input for all decision-makers, and this in turn will support the work of the ITU, and it will also lead to outcomes related to other events of the ITU. For us, the development of such policies evolves with time. This is why to hold the WTPF once between the two PP, it is enough and sufficient time so that we can consider the holding of the WTPF in such timeframe. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jordan. China, you have the floor.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Chair. Good morning to everyone. As Jordan and Russian Federation, we also support that we add the Resolve 1 at this part, and just now you also mentioned that concerning this question, ad-hoc group had vast discussions and many administrations have showed their support to the convening of the WTPF. We think that, yes, the Council may make decisions on the duration or the days or the venue of the meeting. However, it is necessary to form a consensus on the convening of the WTPF at the Plenipotentiary Conference level so we make appropriate arrangements for this meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, China. So, there I have two requests for the floor after I close the list. If you recall, China was the last speaker on Point 1. I really would like COM 6 to agree to this rule that we have established that with we close the list that -- because if we don't, we will not finish our work and we need to be completed by Saturday -- well, we will have another COM 6 meeting on Monday, but I really would like to try to get through as many documents as possible. So, I will be sticking to that rule and please support me on that.

So, on resolves 1, what I've heard from every delegate that has spoken is that the preference is to have Council make this decision. No one is objecting to that. We're not objecting to having Council make the decision on when the WTPF will occur.

So, my proposal is that we add Resolves 1 to Instructs the ITU Council to continue to decide on the duration, date, venue, agenda, and themes of any future WTPF with a preference of holding between 2022 and 2026.

So, I would like comments on this proposal. This would move to Instructs the ITU Council instead of under Resolves. China, you have the floor.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Chair. On the question of whether the decision will go to the Council, maybe there is some misunderstanding here. I think many administrations are of the view that first the PP should decide first, and then the Council will decide the specific arrangements of the WTPF. So, we think that we should keep the Resolve 1 in the Resolve part. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China. I have Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. If you please would comment on the proposal that I have made to move this to the Instructs because I think we have discussed Resolves 1 and the question is their support for including this text under Instructs the Council. Thank you. So, I have Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and if you would like to get in the queue for this, Jordan, Algeria, United States. All right, the floor is closed. Russian Federation, Japan. That is it, the last speaker on the list is Japan. The list is closed. The last speaker will be Japan.

I have Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: May we put please on the screen, Resolves 1? Thank you very much. As agreed, and as it is the practice, the PP will define which year the WTPF is held and this is how it is very explicit in Resolves 2. So, in 2018 we decided that it will be held in 2020. And we have left all details to the Council. So, I think that we have to continue this practice. We will be deciding this year that this forum will be held in 2025, and that all the other details will be left to the Council. This is why we have said in Resolves 1 that to convene preferably the WTPF once in the interval between the two PPs. We do not think that the proposal that you made, Madam Chair, will address the issue. It's very simple and clear. Resolves 1 to convene the WTPF once. When, we don't know. In Resolves 2 we say that we have to have the WTPF in 2025 and we will leave all the other details to the Council. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Next, I have Kuwait.

>> KUWAIT: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I do support what my colleague from USA has just said. Over the past six forums, all the details have been decided by the PP, so what happened today is that we have to also leave those details to the Council, but why now? Why now? The Council decide the agenda. The Council decides also the dates and the other specifics and details of the WTPF, but not the year. The year is usually decided by the PP. This is why we insist on keeping this as it is and it has to be decided by the Plenipotentiary Conference. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you very much, and briefly, we cannot support your proposal. We see that it is a general practice and a rule that the Plenipotentiary Conference is the one that defines the convening of the WTPF. This is why we support what the colleague from Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and Kingdom of Kuwait have just said. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. United States?

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair for your proposal. I think it gets us closer to where we want to be. I think, again, thinking about the Council since the language already is in there about making the decisions on the date, duration, and theme, I think I want to just reiterate one of our points on this particular proposal is that we're in an unprecedented time facing the Union with respect to that we have just come off of a challenging time with COVID where we've had three major conferences in the past year, and we are also facing some challenges with respect to the building and where conference spaces won't be available, including perhaps for the WSIS Forum. I think having another major event in 2025 when we'll be preparing for and having a WTDC at the same time, we're just trying to look practically at a decision that we refer to the Council so that the Council can take the full consideration of the financial and human resources picture, including for the Member States, so our preference is not to use the word "preference." I think it's really that we want -- I think we just need to work a little bit harder on how we can have a decision to not necessarily block us into a WTPF in the next four years. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. I have Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. WTPF has been in every four years or eight years in recent years. We recognize that the posting will be costly. This needs transition to the forum with interval between PP could be carefully considered with financial impact. It's vital for the Council to make a decision on holding after conducting financial review, including whether exists or not. Thank you. We support U.S. proposal. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Japan. I have Russian Federation; you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. We are convinced, convinced that, yes, times are difficult at the moment but when they were easier, we held Plenipotentiary Conference so as to take the most key, important decisions. A lot of people are raising the issue of financial resources of the Union and the financial impact on those resources, but we know that when we carry out our mandate and implementing projects, we always have to make the choice to carry out the mandate whatever the financial impact, that's what the Member States and administrations expect of us. We therefore think the decision about holding the forum should, without a doubt, be taken at and by the Plenipotentiary Conference. That is our mandate, that's our agenda. All the remaining details, the when, how, with which resources, how long it lasts, all that, it can be and should be decided by the Council. That kind of decision is where we have it. The key decision as to whether to hold the WTPF or not is one at that we should take here today. That being the case, we should like to support the proposal as it is in Resolves 1. That's the approach we advise to this resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russian Federation. I have Canada and I also have online from Cuba. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair. We have to be very mindful to the comments and intervention by the United States in a sense that we are still in a subdivision in which it is not clear what it going to happen, among other things with the building, where meetings will be held, how much would it cost, no one administers the importance of WTPF, but we should be extremely careful at taking decisions on the Plenipotentiary Conference on established fixed dates or fixed intervals. The WTPF should be convened when and if necessary, but our recommendation would be to wait until we have a clear picture as to what is going to happen with the scheduling of conferences and assemblies, particularly as it relates to the situation with the Headquarter's building. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Cuba, online, you have the floor.

>> CUBA: Thank you very much, Chairman. We've been following the discussion on this proposal, and we think that it would be better to keep the text as it has been thus far. You always take these kind of decisions starting with a decision taken by the Plenipotentiary. Therefore, we would urge that the Resolves 1 be agreed as it stand. The proposals made by other colleagues, I think, relate to other organizational issues which can and should be discussed as they have been in the past by Council. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I have two countries asking for the floor after I closed the list. So, here is what my proposal is going to be. There is no consensus to include the new Resolves 1, so it will continue to stay in square brackets. We will now move to Resolves 2.

I suspect that we are going to have the same conversation that we just had in Resolves 1 regarding inserting the date of 2025, but I don't want to push through COM 6 but the floor is open for Item of and on the list, I would like to have a discussion on Resolves 2, adding 2025. The floor is open. I have so far Poland, Jordan, United Kingdom, United States, Saudi Arabia. If you would like to take the floor on Resolves 2, please do so now. I'm closing the list. The list is closed. Saudi Arabia is the last speaker on the list. Poland, you have the floor.

>> POLAND: I just want to reflect the previous point as I see we do support the position as stated by Canada, and we do -- we are looking forward to see more information on our possibilities to hold events every two years, every three years, or four or five. So there, at the same time, we do offer a more general approach with the proposal to straighten currently existing thematic priorities of WTPF that might have, as we believe, might have an effect on the financial resources, but as those resources are to be assessed by the ITU Council and I hope that that position clarifies. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Poland. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chairman. I'm somewhat surprised by the contributions made by some delegations concerning the ITU Headquarter's building and apparent lack of clarity around that issue. If the Union can provide meeting rooms for the study groups, then I'm sure it can provide premises and the necessary areas for holding what is an important forum, which hasn't been held for quite some time now. I really am rather taken back by the kind of opinion I'm hearing on this, and I think it would be preferable to take a decision on the forum here. As far as we're concerned, Resolves 2 is fine. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. United Kingdom, you have the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I think your recognition on this is correct. I'm going to have to echo the point that I made on the bracketed Resolves 1, that the changes proposed here in Resolves 2 are prescriptive and undermines the method that we've taken so far in convening WTPF, so we don't agree with this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United Kingdom. United States?

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes, we think this is the same question about whether we definitively decide here whether or not to hold the WTPF in the next four years, so we think it should remain in brackets. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. We support the holding of the forum in 2025. This is a slight amendment, one that really shouldn't create any difficulty. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. The date to hold the forum in 2025 is in square brackets. I recognize that this is -- that we will need to have some type of change, editorial change, but let's put 2021, 2025 in square brackets, please.

All right. My computer ran out of juice, low-battery mode and shut down. Item number 3, Resolves 3, again here it appears that we're deleting an information and telecommunication/ICT. I am not -- I know that we've had this discussion in multiple forums during this PP as well as in the previous PPs and conferences. So, let's see if we can get through the new added text here on Resolves 3. It's on the screen. I would also note that the last part, are we proposing to have another WTPF on IP-based networks? We've had the 2013 WTPF that was on these issues as well, so it seems that we're asking to hold another WTPF on the same issues. That's just an observation.

The floor is open to resolves 3, the new text. I have -- so we're only discussing Resolves 3 here. I have Saudi Arabia, United States, United Kingdom, if you would like to take the floor on Resolves number 3, please do so now; otherwise, I am closing the list. I have Australia, Jordan, Vanuatu, China. Okay. The list is closed. The last speaker on Resolves 3 is China. I would encourage everyone to, if we could have a timer on the screen, please IT, so we make sure to stay within our 3-minute timeframe. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. We can accept the first amendment, given that this is a term which was used at the Standardization Conference and at the Development Conference.

As far as the second point goes, we agree with you and we don't think at that we need to add such as issues related to IP-based networks and from there until the end of the paragraph. Not necessary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Saudi Arabia. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Saudi Arabia's comment helped me address one of my comments on this. I think if we defer the topic to Council this seems to get more into what the specific topic would be. I think we could accept some minor changes if we could to the rest of Resolution 3 if we're going to draft the point on the topic. I think we would prefer instead of new and emerging technologies, to use the terminology of new and emerging telecommunications/ICTs as we had discussed in other forums. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States. I think Saudi Arabia and United States are getting closer. United Kingdom, you have the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I'm going to echo the points raised by the United States. I appreciate the flexibility that Saudi Arabia has shown in dropping the second part of the proposal here. I think that resolves many of our concerns, but we insist the inclusion of digital technologies here raises questions for us, so if we're able to go forward with the proposal made by the United States to keep the terminology to telecommunications/ICTs as agreed, then we can work with that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United Kingdom. Australia, you have the floor.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. We have similar concerns to United States and United Kingdom. I'll just associate with their remarks and won't take up more time.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia. Vanuatu, you have the floor.

>> VANUATU: Thank you, Chair. My observation is that this paragraph appears to be somewhat lengthy, and we will agree with the proposal by Saudi Arabia to remove that latter part of that para as well as the sentiments expressed by U.S. we support. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Vanuatu. China, you have the floor.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Madam Chair. China can support clarification of this expression. And for the last part that, yes, ensuring the sustainable development of the ICT, maybe we can consider maintaining that part. However, there is no need for a specific reference to the IP-based networks and Internet protocol infrastructures.

In addition, if there is a wide consensus on the elements of the WTPF, then further PP should adopt a decision on holding of the PP and I assume the main concern is mainly about the financial implication and other organizational matters such as the venue. Actually, in the past few years due to the COVID pandemic, the ITU has confronted many challenges; however, under the leadership of the administrations in ITU leadership, we have overcome lots of difficulties. We believe that the newly elected leadership, supported by the Member States, can address such concerns. We believe that if there is consensus on the importance of the forum under the elements of the forum, then the PP, we should strive for consensus on holding of the forum. We should trust the newly elected officials and administrations who are able to address such concerns. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, China. So, after I closed the list, I have two more countries that asked to speak on this point, similar to what we have agreed previously.

Here is what I propose, that there seems to be broad acceptance to deleting such issues related to IP-based networks, and that is being prescripted and really should be a Council decision. I appreciate all of the delegates recognizing to and agreeing to delete the "such as." And then on emerging telecommunication/ICT, what I'm seeing or my objection is that the delegates do not believe telecommunications/ICTs includes digital technologies and services. I would like to see how we have agreed to this text especially at the ITU-T, WTSA as well as WTDC, and if we have accepted the text formulation at those two conferences, my question is I don't see the harm in accepting the agreements from those -- from those conferences in this text. So, what I would like to do is we agree to delete "such as." I will take and work with the Secretariat and come back with what was agreed to at the previous WTSA and WTDC and come back with a recommendation on a path to move forward.

If that is accepted, that is the proposal. The proposal is to delete "such as" and I will go and check the text that was agreed to at WTSA and WTDC regarding if you and emerging digital technologies to find a path forward for us. I have several Member State delegates asking for the floor. Are you objecting to this path forward? Can we clear the list. If you're objecting, I will give you the floor. Jordan, United States, Saudi Arabia are objecting to this compromise or this proposal. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you very much, Chairman. I think that the opinions earlier supported the decision of IP-based networks. I don't think we have any consensus, however, on the deletion of the rest. That is why we think we can delete the text until IP-based networks while retaining the rest of the text.

As to your proposal, to look at the decisions of IT and other conferences on emerging digital technologies and services, we think at that it's very important that we retain the reference to emerging digital technologies and services. After all, we're talking about policy and there are many policies on digital technologies. Digital technology and services, the term is well known and broadly used. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jordan. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I don't disagree with the compromise, I think it's a good way forward to look at some of the language we've used in the past, including new and emerging telecommunications, ICT services and technology, so I would support that way forward.

Just one point I wanted to raise is if we could retain the word "and information" in the second line. It was unclear why that was deleted, so continue discussing and exchanging views and information. I thought that would be a good point to retain. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Saudi Arabia?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. I have in front of me the decisions taken by the Development Conference and the text on which an agreement was reached. Could we put the text agreed in this conference? The text refers to new and emerging ICT.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Yes, that would be the preference, is to go back to look at the text from WTDC and WTSA and if the text is new and emerging ICT, I would note that in as per all of our agreements, that whenever we use ICT, we should be using telecommunications/ICT. But as -- but as I suggested and propose, I will come back this afternoon with a path forward for Resolves 3. I do think that we're very close.

As to the proposal by Jordan to delete such as issues related to IP-based networks, my understanding is that this entire line was deleted. I understand that you would like to keep Internet-critical infrastructures, so I will put this entire text in square brackets as well.

All right. I would like to stop there on Resolves 2 Item -- Resolution 2 Resolves 3, and we will pick this back up in the afternoon. However, it will be after we have completed our agenda related to Resolution 162, 212 and Resolution 30. It will come up after Resolution 30. Okay.

So, I'm moving now to, as we discussed earlier, to have a conversation on where our documents are and so to make sure that we have discussed all of our documents.

So, if you would please take a look at Page 2 of ADM/10 Rev. 10. As you recall, we started out with themes in our working group. So currently, these are the documents that have been presented and are under discussion. Resolution 48, related to human resource management and development, which is in DT/32, while we approved that document, there is a square bracket related to One ITU and we are waiting for a final discussion in Resolution 25, and once those two -- once we have finalized Resolution 25, we can move this document to Editorial.

On Resolution 162, Independent Management Advisory Committee, we had an informal meeting this morning, and this document will be discussed this afternoon. It's on our afternoon agenda and I do think that we were able to get through all of the proposals and we have a path forward. There are square brackets in the document -- there are two square brackets from the informal discussion, but I think that those can be resolved pretty quickly.

On Resolution 212, I understand that there will be text -- there is an agreement on possibly text here and we will discuss that this afternoon.

On financial manage am issues, we ask that the new resolution, strengthening ITU's financial resources, mobilization functions, we asked Algeria to come back to COM 6 on Monday with a path forward. After coordinating with the other COM 6 members, there are some issues in agreement and then there are some issues that have not reached agreement, so Algeria has the lead to look at that and bring it back to COM 6.

Resolution 1, ITU telecom events, there is an informal meeting this afternoon and 1:20 so look forward to seeing you there.

New resolution organizing side events alongside major ITU conferences or assembly. There will be an informal meeting Saturday from 3:30 to 4:30. I don't have the room for that. We will discuss Resolution 30 this afternoon.

Decision 11 we will discuss this afternoon as well, and we discuss Resolution 193 and that was approved this morning to go to the Editorial Committee.

Now, page 4. Documents presented and sent to ad-hoc groups, Resolution 71, strategic plan, that is still being discussed and I understand that there are meetings on Saturday for that. So that is in DT/14 Rev. 3.

Resolution 25 discussions continue. DT/13 Rev. 3. And also, under we have Resolution 148-tasks and functions of the Deputy Secretary-General.

RCC proposals related to Resolution 191 will be discussed Saturday in the Resolution 25 ad-hoc group.

Financial management issues, Decision 5, DT/29, that will continue this morning at 10:30 in this room, I believe, and they're also discussing the India proposals related to that.

We just heard Resolution 77. We have a couple of square brackets here, but we are moving out on that document. We are still discussing Resolution 2 on DT/37, and we are only on Resolves 3.

The document was presented and concluded. We concluded terms of methods, DT, the working methods of Committee 6, 97, statement of staff council oral presentation is INF2. Under Theme 2, strategy governance and management, we noted Document 20 on implementation of the strategic plan and activities of the Union. The Report by the Council of the Working Group for Strategic and Financial Plan, Document 39, that was noted.

Resolution 151, improvement of results-based management, we approved the Resolution and sent to Com had and that has been dealt with in plenary and approved already.

Same with Resolution 157 that was sent to COM 4 and approved in plenary yesterday so that is approved.

We noted the report, the progress report on the Union's Headquarter premises project, on document 62. Resolution 94 auditing the accounts of the Union, DT/19, that was also approved by plenary. Also approved by plenary is Resolution 150 that was approved by COM -- approved by our Committee, sent to COM 4, and approved by plenary and same with Resolution 150.

Resolution 41, rears and arrears accounts, we noted the requirement by Council in Document 56. The draft financial plan for 2024-2027, which was in Document 57, we noted that document as well.

Results and implementation of the efficiency measures described in Annex 2 to Decision 5. We noted that in Document 75.

Report of the Council for the Council Working Group on FHR. That was note and Document 46. Moving to theme 5. Report by the council that was in Document 33 and we note that had document as well. Report by the council on ITU telecom events, hiring of independent external management consultant for events, with he noted that document as well which is Document 51.

Resolution 66, we sent DT over 23, it was approved and it was also approved in plenary and I don't have the number. We'll try to update that; we have a new revision.

Resolution of the WTD, world telecom development conference to the attention of the Plenipotentiary Conference, we noted that Document 65. Scheduled future conferences and assemblies and meetings, again, that was noted, and we now have a new DT, DT/38 Rev. 1.

Chairman, and vice-chairman of the Council Working Groups and expert groups report was in Document 65 and we noted that document as well. Four-year report of the Working Group on use of six languages that's Document 49 we noted that document. And Resolution 154 connected to that document was approved assent to COM 4 and approved in plenary yesterday.

New resolution on assistance to support the state of Palestine, that was approved in plenary, we sent that document to plenary.

That is where -- that is the status of all of our documents, and as you can see, we are moving -- we are in a really good place. We have a few ad hoc groups that will be meeting this weekend, but Monday we will be in all-day plenary, and if we need to have a meeting on Tuesday, we can request. But for the most part, we're going to try to finish our work by Monday. Any questions?

Thank you. Sudan, you have the floor.

>> SUDAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Did I miss something on Resolution 162? Would it be back to the informal or will be settled here? Because I think we still have some issues, and if possible, to bring back to the discussion before we come back here, Madam Chair. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So, Sudan, we had a meeting this morning at 8:00 a.m., and all the regions were represented at that meeting, and I would be happy -- I really would like to bring it back to 162, bring it back to COM 6 this afternoon. I'm happy to have a conversation offline. But like I said there are two brackets and there are two square brackets in this document, and it really relates to how we are -- what we mean by cybersecurity and what -- and making sure that we're not creating an impossible situation for the IMAC panel, but for the most part, everything is agreed to that was proposed by all of the regions for this.

Jordan, and I would like to close the meeting after Jordan if there are no other comments on this status of where our documents are. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I apologize for taking the floor. As you may well know, there are many meetings that took place this morning, and if possible, I would like to second what was just said by the Delegate of Sudan with regard to the possibility of engaging in offline discussions in this regard, and would be very thankful for that opportunity. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I will ask the Secretariat to print a Doc, several copies for me, and happy to have a discussion. We will be discussing it this afternoon as well. Thank you.

With that, I close the meeting and I thank you very much. Have a good day. See you this afternoon. Bye-bye.

(session completed at 2:36 a.m. CST).
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