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>> This meeting will start in just a few minutes. I will start the interpretation test. I will begin with the English booth.

(Interpretation check)

>> Recording in progress.

>> CHAIR: Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome back. I hope everyone had a great lunch. I know that we had a few ad hoc groups and informal working groups going on during the period since we had our last meeting. Our agenda is in ADM/10. Rev. 10. So it's a follow on from our agenda from this morning. And so this afternoon we have Resolution 162, 212, Resolution 30. And we also did not finish Res. 2. And we will come back to that.

We had a management meeting today at 1:00. Just to remind the Com 6 of our working methods, we are strongly encouraged not to bring square brackets to the Plenary. So we will try to do that. If you recall, during our first meeting, we also talked about if we can't come to an agreement in existing text, we go back to the text that was agreed to in 2018.

So I know that everyone has worked really hard in the past few days to get to a place where we can reach agreement on the text we have been discussing. And we do not want to send square brackets to the Plenary.

So just a reminder of our working methods.

I have UAE is asking for the floor before we approve the agenda. UAE, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: For the agenda, just a comment about the comment that raised about the principles. We had a meeting also, as you're aware, with the Chairman at 1:00. And we discussed about this, the principles. Yes, we all support that. However, the Plenary it's the place where they make a decision. So I agree we will try our best to ‑‑ not to take many square brackets there. But at the end, it's the Plenary that has to take a decision if there is no change for any proposal or any issues that we are discussing. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. Yes. I totally agree with that. It's every Member State's right to insist on square brackets when they go to the Plenary. So you're absolutely right.

So with that, I would like to approve our agenda for this afternoon. And ‑‑ it's not on the agenda, but we will also give a readout, a summary of the informal groups that have taken place and also get an update from our ad hoc groups on Res. 25, Res. 71 and move on from there. And then we will close the meeting.

With that, if there are no objections to the agenda, let's move to 162. I do believe there's a DT/16 Rev. 1. Let me confirm with the Secretariat. Thank you.

So DT/16 Rev. 1 is on ‑‑ it's not on the screen yet. But let me talk through what the informal group discussed this morning. The informal group met this morning at 8:00. And we discussed the proposals that were submitted to the Conference.

If you recall, last Tuesday we agreed on a major principle that the IMAC would add an ‑‑ would go from 5 to 6. That was agreed. What was left to do really was to go through the text from the proposals submitted by the regions and align the document.

We had the Chair from the IMAC online today to really clarify a point related to cybersecurity. So when you see this document, there are two places in square brackets. That has to do with IT security best practices, or is it best to stay cybersecurity best practices?

Then there is a square bracket around some existing text that says "to the greatest extent possible. But otherwise, this document, other than those two points, the meeting the informal group met agreed to all of the other changes.

So with that, I would like to go through this page by page starting with page 2. Again, with our principle of not looking at editorial changes. Any editorial changes will be made by Com 4. So the document is open. Any comments on page 2? Okay. I don't see anyone asking for the floor.

Any comments on page 3? I don't see anyone asking for the floor. Page 4 ‑‑ this is where we have the first square bracket. And if we can resolve it here, then it will resolve itself in the places below.

So the question ‑‑ in having the discussion with the Chair this morning, we were talking about cybersecurity and cybersecurity is a very broad term. If we're asking the responsibility of the IMAC to have cybersecurity are we asking for a unicorn? Are we asking that ‑‑ do we want to narrow this term so that we are talking about IT and security best practices? It's not very clear on what we mean by cybersecurity best practices.

So that is the question. And this is why this is in square brackets. If we can look at responsibilities B in the square brackets at the end of this text, we will be able to resolve the remainder of this in the document. The floor is open. I have Kuwait, Canada ‑‑ so I just have Kuwait and Canada asking for the floor. I'm closing ‑‑ okay. My screen is not working, so I'm going to do my best to look at the screen on the microphone. And I will call out that I can see right now.

I have Kuwait, Canada, Nigeria, United States of America. Are there other delegates wishing to take the floor? If so, please raise your lollipop flag. All right. Kuwait, Canada, Nigeria, United States of America is the last speaker. I'm closing the list. Thank you.

Kuwait, you have the floor.

>> KUWAIT: Thank you, Madam Chair, Madam Chair, at the outset of Annex 1 we have to change revision Busan 2014 to become Bucharest 2022. And with regards to the brackets regarding cybersecurity, we support to put this within the competencies of the IMAC. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Kuwait. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Yes, I thank you, Madam Chair. Good afternoon to you, colleagues. We have serious concerns with responsibilities 3 b. In Canada's view, the extremely competent members of IMAC are management consultants. They're not IT specialists or cybersecurity specialists. I think that we have to maintain the responsibilities, knowledge, and expertise of IMAC within the purview of what they have learned and the knowledge and experience that they have.

But to my knowledge, the role of the IMAC is not on advising the ITU on the internal IT issues and of course on cybersecurity‑related matters. We have a team of very qualified experts within the ITU that deal with IT. So we would kindly request that issue not be considered in this 3 b responsibilities. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Canada. I have United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: We echo the same considers. It's not clear on cybersecurity best practices. We have serious ‑‑ cybersecurity best practices are better understood. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So we still have to ‑‑ I think we need to continue discussion on the square brackets here. Again, in discussing this with the Chair this morning, it was clear that what we mean by cybersecurity best practices here is not exactly what they had in mind. The ITU has ‑‑ deals with these cybersecurity on a daily basis. And what we're asking the IMAC panel to do here, is they're providing an audit and management function for us.

I know that if this was an FHR standpoint and what is implementable? Are we asking for the ‑‑ are we searching for that unicorn that's so very unique expertise that we will not be able to fill this position? So I think the more precise that we can be here in looking at the audit and management side, that we are going to get the best ‑‑ sorry. The screen just went blank. We're going to get the best possible person to be on the IMAC panel. So we will come back to that.

On page 5 here we have the next square brackets to the extent possible. This is text and there was one delegate that wanted to delete the text. That's why it's in square brackets here. I recognize that this is ‑‑ from the Chair's perspective, this text is consistent with previous resolutions that the Plenipotentiaries have agreed to. And I did not see an issue with the text. So I would ask if we could ‑‑ is there support for deleting to the greatest extent possible? That's the first.

I don't see any support for deleting the text. Nigeria, you have the floor. We're on composition 11 "to the greatest possible" Nigeria and Australia, if you wish to take the floor. I have on my tiny screen, Nigeria, Australia, United States. Canada. All right. The list is closed.

Nigeria, you have the floor.

>> NIGERIA: Thank you, many dam Chair. If you scroll up to the main part of this text, it clearly states that members of IMAC must be from the six geographical regions. So this new text in number 11 in the annex is actually in conflict with that. Because this is saying to the greatest extent possible whereas the main text is actually saying it should be from the six regions. That's why we need to delete this to be in consistency with the main text. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

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

>> AUSTRALIA: I must admit I'm not as familiar with this as my colleagues. I'm not sure which text he's referring to it's in conflict with. But the concerns I had were two fold. Firstly, this was not in any Com proposal. So members haven't had a chance to consider the implications of the proposal. It was just put forward this morning.

Secondly, I'm not sure what problem the deletion of this text is trying to solve. I sympathize with the African delegate being from IPF, one of the regions with the most countries. But the ITU has a very good record of doing its absolute utmost to assure fair distribution of positions across and Vice Chairs, et cetera, across geographic regions. I'm not convinced the deletion is necessary or adds anything in this case.

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

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. Pardon, there we are. Thank you, Chair. We would prefer to keep the original text noting that the IMAC is important to identify candidates based on their qualifications with due consideration to the items that are listed in A and B additionally noting that removing the original text would make the appointment process very prescriptive and could be difficult to implement. Thank you.

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

>> CANADA: Thank you, Madam Chair. That was going to be Canada's comment. We have to give flexibility because the removal would make the whole (Audio breaking up) a little bit restrict the. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So I close the list. And I now have a Member State asking to take the floor. I would like to stay consistent with our general practice from previous meetings. So Nigeria, what I would like to ask is that we keep the text. The text in square brackets, it's not new text. Was approved ‑‑ it's been in the Resolution since we adopted Resolution 162. And a major improvement in this text is that we're expanding the IMAC to stick to members. I think this is common practice in ITU from the standpoint of the greatest extent possible. And we have always done a very good job, our leadership has done a very good job of making sure that we have equitable geographic distribution when we are nominating for Chairs and Vice Chairs as well as for discussions.

So I would like to take the square brackets off and keep the text. Thank you.

Nigeria?

>> NIGERIA: Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So I would ask (Audio breaking up) I think there's something wrong with the screen. So we're going now to page 5? Or were we on 5? On page 5 there's a square bracket. We will come back to that. Page 6? Page 7? Page 8? Page 9? Actually the remaining pages there were no comments until we get to appendix C where we have the ITU security (Audio breaking up) and we will ‑‑ we will work with the delegates and see what is the best course of action for square brackets. I don't think we're going to resolve them in Com 6 today.

Kuwait, you have the floor.

>> KUWAIT: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have an intervention with regards to cybersecurity. On page 5 I have a general understanding of telecommunications ICT industry. We gave the committee the prerogative to have (?) the IT industry as with the case with ITU security. It's the same thing. Why are we objecting now to adding something that is of importance to developing countries? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So, Kuwait, the question here, we're not objecting to the text. We want to make sure that we are providing clarity to the IMAC panel as in the text here is cybersecurity is a broad term. And as this text is under composition and responsibilities of the IMAC, I do not think that we're asking the IMAC to have the responsibility to look at all things cybersecurity. Cybersecurity ‑‑ in the IMAC meeting two to three times a year, I do not think that that is what we are asking the IMAC to do. I would like to take this offline. I now have a long list asking to take the floor on this point.

I would not like to open the discussions. What I will do is convene a small meeting to discuss. So if we could proceed in that matter, I would appreciate it.

Canada, are you insisting? Yes. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Not that I am insisting. I just want to make use of my right to take the floor specifically to make a point P. Madam Chair, as we mentioned previously, the members of IMAC are highly qualified management consultants with an expertise in auditing. No one is denying that these issues are important, but that is not the role or the task of IMAC.

Secondly, if I may, this is not an issue of developing, developed, under developed countries, small island developed states or landlocked countries. This pertains to all of us in the ITU. The question is, if I was one of the IMAC members I would feel a little constrained, what is my responsibility, cybersecurity, data protection? Are we going to go into quantum computing? What else are you going to ask the IMAC to deal with? So the previous text is sufficient enough. A general understanding of telecommunications and the ICT industry to facilitate the role and tasks as management and consultants advising the ITU. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. With that, I would like Com 6 to please think about this text and the impact. We still psychiatry square brackets. The remaining text is approved. We just need to work on IT and IT security and cybersecurity. Thank you.

With that, if we could go to Resolution 212, and I will turn now to DT/11. We did not send this to ‑‑ so we're just going to look at this one. I would like to have an update from the United States and UAE on where we are. Thank you. I'm not sure who's first. United States?

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I first of all appreciate to have the time and go behind the scenes and talk to other delegations. It's been very helpful.

So in our consultations what has become clear is that many delegations have concerns about us reopening 212. There were concerns of, I'll quote one delegate to use an American phrase, if it ain't broke, don't fix it. Though we're not fully on board we recognition there are delegates concerned with opening a can of worms. I can read language if you're ready for it. But we would like to propose that in the minutes of Com 6 we have a recommendation that we give to Plenaries. So that would be the way forward.

And if you approve, I would like to read language now which is what we would suggest for that.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Thank you for that update. I also received edits to 212 that we're going to have to resolve. So my proposal is that we start looking at the DT/11 and go through the text to see ‑‑ we can do one of two things actually. We have been having a number of discussions. We can take this offline once more. I will convene a small informal group and have that discussion tomorrow for one hour and see where we are and whether we can reconcile or we can go through the text here in Plenary. I'm in our hands.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: We don't want to waste people's time and recognize many people in this room will make their day longer. I'm open to having informals. I know you've offered (Audio breaking up) but I'm open to yours and I understand others ‑‑ either option is fine with me. I recognize informals are probably best. The one thing I would say is there is a second proposal opening up 212 that's not the US proposal, and I recognize an interest in discussing that too. So I just put that on the floor. I have no objections to ‑‑ I'm very sorry to do this to others but to have a discussion tomorrow.

>> CHAIR: All right. So I have Canada, UAE, Brazil, and ‑‑ I'm not sure if this includes the revised text that I received from the Russian Federation. I'm closing the list actually. Canada, UAE, Brazil, Russian Federation. If you would like to take the floor on this, please do so now, otherwise the list is closed. The list is closed. The Russian Federation will be the last speaker. Thank you.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Madam Chair. The informal, we may have some time right now. I wonder if it is more useful for the floor to take a look at that contribution that the United States mentioned which I believe is no longer than two or three very short paragraphs. At least for the members in this room to be aware of the topic that we can bring to their attention when we have this informal. But, again, we're in your hands. Again, reiterate their willingness to join this informal group at any time. Madam Chair, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. By that, it sounds like you're supporting the discussion of the contribution that I received from UAE. I will give UAE the floor. UAE, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to thank our colleague, US. Maybe we can also hear the statement that is raised. We would like to discuss also informally ‑‑ there is time right now. Maybe the document I have sent to you is based on the discussion has been done informally with the concerned parties, but also go through the ‑‑ I did it very quick and send it. So this is basically the proposal that I made. I took it from the Arab group which has been ‑‑ especially for Kuwait. I tried to add some other parts which was submitted by the Member States to the conference. Madam Chair, as you mentioned in your remarks, that we ‑‑ no need to reopen again for the discussion about committee or others. We need to move forward. I fully support also for the statement that will be raised by our colleague, US. I'm in your hands, Chair, if you would like to have it now or later. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So there is support to discussing it now. Before we do that, I have Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just to support the discussion right now. Thank you.

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

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. First of all, we would like to thank the USA, Canada, and the Arab states for their efforts and flexibility of the oh work on the document. We too would like to support discussing this document now if we have the time. But we also are ready to continue work in an informal setting as well. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So why don't we do this? Let's go to ‑‑ the document's not that long. I do think we can get through it, and there has been support for (?) the document by the UAE. We will do that. And that is on the screen.

So if we could go to page 2, and as previous, those edits that are related to editorial, we will not discuss.

So the first change that we have is related to recalling d, and if we look at the text ‑‑ actually it's recalling e, not D. Let's take a look at recalling e). Any objections to adding in text? Discussion is open to recalling e). Right now I have the United States. Any other delegate wishing to take the floor? Okay. The floor list is closed.

United States, you have the floor. Thank you.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. To be very honest, while I'm confident in my colleague's ability to reflect previous decisions, A, I would want more time to be able to go over this to be able to determine if this is something we can accept. I have bigger issues just in terms of process of having huge chunks of new language added in.

So I just don't believe, to be honest, we have the time. I know part of this is because I have spent a lot of time going behind the scenes to try to get agreement. That does not make the process easy. But I just don't see how we would be in a place right now where we could go back and essentially take chunks of text that we have not previously seen and get agreement. Not just in this room but in general. We are not in a place where we can accept this.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States. So we will ‑‑ it looks like we will be meeting tomorrow.

But let's move on to the next square brackets, it looks like, I'm noting d) is in green. It appears that text ‑‑ I will turn to UAE to confirm that the text in green (Audio breaking up) thank you. UAE?

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. The proposal in e) I know it wasn't submitted as a proposal here. I told you in the beginning I made it quick before the meeting. However, we also don't have any strong feel to keep it. If the meeting agrees, we don't have any issues.

With regard to the second one which is the green, it's just denoting it came from Russia also about noting for the Council in 2019.

But this is also, again, it was there in the Council meeting and it's already known. My proposal also is that we agreed, e in recalling and d in noting, if not required, we can delete it. I leave it ‑‑

>> CHAIR: Thank you for your flexibility, UAE. So the question here, any objection to including this record for Council 2019 in this text? I have one ‑‑ United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: So, no, I don't think there's an objection. To be very honest I would like to see the summary meeting, but I think that would be fine. Let me do a little back channel work.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So in general there's no objection to the summary meeting of the Plenary from Council 2019. So they will check. In principle, we will agree to that. Okay.

In looking at ‑‑ in conferring with the Secretariat, one of the questions that comes immediately to mind in item c) with new text with the response of 2.5 million is that when we start talking about sponsor ships there, are a number of other administration ‑‑ Member States that has made contributions. The question is, do we need to include item c)? I'm making a radical proposal that we delete all of item c) or we need to find a way to identify maybe in an annex all of the Member States that have contributed to this. That is the question. There are multiple ‑‑ there are several Member States that have contributed to this fund. And we need to be consistent.

I'm in your hands here. I would propose we delete c). I know that that will be ‑‑ I'm being radical, but I am in your hands.

So on item c) I would like to close the list. Right now I have Canada, Kuwait, UAE, Saudi Arabia. Are there any other delegates wishing to take the floor? The list is closed on item c). Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Madam Chair. With my sincere apologies, taking you back to a previous item just for clarification because it says that the Popov room be maintained. It begs the question, should the tower be sold, how do you say popoff room. So the question is and rightly so, in the new building whichever that is, there's going to be a new meeting room and what we're talking about here in recognition to the preservation of the contributions made by Member States including the Russian Federation that the new room could keep the name Popov. Is this understanding correct, Madam Chair?

>> CHAIR: Canada, I will need to pull c 19/120 to be sure that I read that as that the Popov room be maintained not necessarily in the tower, but a room. But you raise a good point.

So let me ask the Secretariat to pull that. And I will return to this meeting with that question.

Kuwait, you have the floor.

>> KUWAIT: Thank you very much Madam Chair. We're not in agreement pertaining to c. C is an exact idea of the Member States have generously contributed to the new ITU facilities. So, Madam Chair, I would like us to retain c) where Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates and sponsored 10 million and 5 million. So we're not in agreement with the suppression of paragraph c). Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kuwait. UAE, you have the Chair.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: To my colleague UAE, we cannot support to delete item c), and we would like to keep it.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you very much, many dam Chair. Would it be possible to review the proposal that is being put forward by the delegate of the UAE? Can we have a look at that proposal, please?

>> CHAIR: Thank you. The document is on the screen. And so there was support to discuss the document that was submitted. So that is the document on the screen. It has not been submitted to the ‑‑ to our system to upload. So we're discussing it here.

But we will need to have a meeting tomorrow. The issues here are not being resolved. And I understand that there is no support for deleting, suppressing item c). So then the question becomes how do we articulate the other significant contributions submitted by other Member States. So that's the question. And I will speak with Mr. Ba about that. We'll look at the records of pop off room and c 19/120. We will go back to that as well.

Then there's the new text in noting d). Here this text ‑‑ can I have Com 6 views on this text, item d)? I have Saudi Arabia, United States. If you would like to take the floor and provide your views on item d), please do so now. Otherwise, I'm closing the list. I have Saudi Arabia, the United States, and Kuwait. Thank you. Kuwait is the last on item d). Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: I believe the text in d) answers the key (?) raised by Canada. In the new building there will be a room called Popov, and this will make us the tower or whatever with the tower and not for ‑‑ thank you.

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

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you. Just to state, I do think that these two things have to be treated ‑‑ by that, I mean, the Kuwaiti edits have to be treated in c and d essentially a package to me. On the additional edits about the Popov room, we are going back to our point of not wanting to bring new things in that have not been previously seen. We can not accept that.

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

>> KUWAIT: Thank you, Madam Chair. As we have already said, we are not in agreement pertaining to the suppression of these two, c and d. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Kuwait. So moving to recognizing Com ‑‑ sorry, resolves 1. Any objection to Council decision 619 that was modified in 2021? Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I believe we have an issue in our working method. We cannot continue like this. So either we establish a formal ad hoc group to finalize this resolution or we are now in informal discussion. Because nothing is agreed on the screen. So my suggestion is we stop the discussion on this Resolution and either form an ad hoc or informal drafting group to finish up this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Let me take you back ‑‑ I want to take Com 6 back to Monday when we started our work. I tried to create an ad hoc group for this, and it was rejected. Member States were to go and speak informally. We have ‑‑ it's now Friday of the second week, and Member States have been discussing this informally.

The request in the room supported by a number of Member States was to discuss this text. So that's what we're doing.

I recognize that we will need an informal ad hoc group. I am happy to stop this discussion now and with the ad hoc group tomorrow have a discussion on this text. I would request that all that are interested in this please come to the ad hoc meeting and informal discussion tomorrow.

Perhaps I will ‑‑ the Secretariat. I know that there is a resolution 71 and there's a Resolution 25 tomorrow. And I'm going to apologize in advance if this overlaps with those two groups.

We have only until tomorrow at 8:00 PM to finalize our work. So I am sure that I'm going to propose we start this working group at 9:00 AM tomorrow from 9:00 to 10:00. And I will make sure that the Secretariat has placed this on the screens for our informal discussion. And we will stop the discussion right now. Thank you for that suggestion. Any objection to that? Russian Federation?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Madam Chair. We simply wanted to react slightly on the working methods. As soon as you announced informal consultations, we responded immediately and sent our proposals to you and to the Secretariat and to the colleagues of USA.

We would like to ask you to at least not to ‑‑ people not to say that the proposals that they've seen it for the first time. Let's have our dialogue. Let's continue our dialogue and take into consideration the opinions of Member States. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russian Federation. That is exactly what I am attempting to do. We will have a discussion tomorrow. I've asked the Secretariat to schedule this informal discussion at 9:00 AM. And we will announce on the screen. We will place this document in a DL unofficially for our discussion. Thank you very much.

Saudi Arabia, you're asking for the floor. Saudi Arabia?

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I believe what will happen tomorrow should be a formal discussion. Because in the past two weeks we've had so many informal discussions, and we changed our position here in the room. So I believe that tomorrow's discussion could be formal, and whatever agreement in that meeting would be binding to everyone. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: No problem. We can change that to a drafting group. It will be a drafting group on Resolution 212. You are going to spend a lot of time with me tomorrow. So I'm happy to be do that.

So tomorrow 9:00 AM, drafting group on Resolution 212. Thank you.

Moving now to document DT/20 Rev. 2, that's Resolution 30. If we could have that on the screen, please. This was Resolution 30 and Rev. 2 is on the screen for approval. So let's go page by page. We're not going to worry about editorial changes. So page 2. Page 3. Page 4. Page 5. I see no others. Resolution, it's approve the. So we can send this to the Editorial Committee. Thank you very much.

We have completed our agenda for today. And I know I indicated this morning that we would come back to Res. 2. I'm concerned that Res. 2 there are still a number of red lines in that document. And we are on Res. 3. So I would like to propose that we are going to meet tomorrow starting at 9:00 on Resolution 212 from 9:00 to 10:00 and then from 10:30 to 11:30 I propose that we Res. 2 to see if we can get through those edits. And we also have a drafting group tomorrow and formal discussion tomorrow on the new proposed Resolution on side events from 3:30 to 4:30 or 3:30 to 5:00. That is my proposal for the work tomorrow. Any questions or concerns on how we're going to proceed?

Thank you very much. I would like to close the meeting now, and this will give time to do consultations on 162 as well as delegates will have time to confer on 212 as well as Resolution 2 and 162. Excuse me.

So before we close, the Secretariat has informed me that Resolution 72 Rev. 2 is now available. And if we can turn to that document ‑‑ but I suspect there's one square bracket we're not going to be able to resolve until we discuss Resolution 2. So if we go through this document, please.

We have agreed to all of the text except for taking into consideration the possibility of virtual events and resolves 4 as well as the date for the telecom policy forum and Item 5.4. I don't believe that there has been discussions, but I could be wrong, on the text take into consideration the possibility of virtual events. US, any movement on this sentence, please? This edition. I didn't think so. Okay. Thank you. I don't think we can approve this. This will shift to Monday. Thank you very much. All right. Thank you very much, everyone. I look forward to seeing you all tomorrow and have a good evening. Bye‑bye.

(Event concluded at 7:36 a.m. CT)
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