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>> CHAIR: Good morning, everyone. I hope everyone had a really good weekend. And welcome to our Committee 6 meeting. We will be meeting for three hours today, starting at 9:30. And so you will find our agenda in document 10 ADM/11. I'll give you a free moment to find that document and then we will get started.

So ADM/10 Revision 11 is where our agenda is. There is one item that's not on the agenda. But I wanted to add to the agenda if you will allow me and that's item ‑‑ it will be item 11, and it will have to do with Resolution 11. There is no document there. So any objections to approving the agenda? Thank you. I don't see anyone objecting to approving the agenda with the new addition. So we have approved ADM/10 Rev 11 with the addition of No. 11 on ITU Telecom. Thank you so much.

So now as we have approved the agenda please turn to item No. 2 on the agenda, and it has to do with Resolution 212, Union feature headquarters premises and that's in DT/11.

What I would like to do with this document as you know there has ‑‑ we have been discussing this document for quite a while on an informal basis. And then on Saturday we had a formal Ad Hoc Group to discuss Resolution 212. And my request is that we take this decision, and we do not open it. It is a carefully crafted compromise. And I would like to take the document as a whole ‑‑ we will start page by page. Starting with ‑‑ if we could have the document on the screen, Page 2. Page 3. Page 4. Page 5. Yep. Thank you.

With that, I put Resolution 212 to the room as a whole. Approved.

Thank you very much. Moving now to item 3 on our agenda and I will actual ‑‑ actually I would like ‑‑ Saudi Arabia, you have the floor. Good morning.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Good morning. Thank you, Madam Chair. It seems that the document has a mistake. We reached an agreement on Saturday to have the numbers in Swiss francs and not in U.S. dollars. That is an error regarding the currency. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Yes. We can fix that in the editorial. We will fix that in the Editorial Committee. I think there is a couple of places. Thank you for that. Secretariat, please take note that we ‑‑ this document needs to be in Swiss francs wherever there are numbers. And I think that's the only editorial change that we need to make. Thank you very much for bringing that to your attention.

All right. Now moving on to our item 3 on your agenda. And I will be taking item 3, 4 and 5 as ‑‑ I would like the ad hoc Chair, Ms. Stella for Resolution 25, 148, 191 to give us a state of play of where we are on these three documents. Thank you very much. Ms. Stella, you have the floor. Please give the floor to Nigeria.

>> NIGERIA: Thank you, Chair. The Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 25, 148 and 191 worked in collaboration and we had consensus in all our documents. We agreed on every point based on the merits of the points, the proposals that were contributed, and I really want to thank the members of the Ad Hoc Group for their cooperation and their exemplary work that was done ensuring collaboration and consensus and cooperation in that group.

Resolution 25 was agreed without square brackets. 148 was agreed without square brackets. In 191 we have one square bracket which actually is an agreed text. The reason why the text is in square brackets is because we are not sure whether that text belongs in the body of that Resolution. So we submit the document for your consideration. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Ms. Stella. I appreciate your team's work. I know that you worked many long hours to get ‑‑ to having a document without square brackets. I understand that the one square bracket is ‑‑ the text is agreed to. And it is whether it should stay in that document or not. Why don't we do this, I would like to go through document ‑‑ sorry. Let's start with Resolution 148, task and functions of the Deputy Secretary‑General. It is in DT/61. Let's ‑‑ Page 2. And as we have done in previous meetings, we will not look at the editorial changes. Those changes will be done by the edit Com 4, the Editorial Committee. Any questions ‑‑ any opposition to approving Page 2? All right. Page 3. All right. Page ‑‑ document 148 as a whole.

Approved. Now agenda item 4, Resolution 191, strategy for the coordination of efforts among the three sectors of the Union, Page 2. Again we're not looking at editorial changes. We're just going to Page 2 is up for your approval. Page 3. Page 4. Page 5. Here's where I believe we have our square brackets on Page 5. And what I would like to propose is that my understanding is that instructs the Secretary‑General 9, instructs ITU Council 2, are both approved concepts and wording is approved. The question was whether it remained in Res 191. I would like to propose that we move from this document because when we are talking about One ITU, we really should have ‑‑ this is a concept that the entire Union should be working together to define.

So it was first ‑‑ what I would propose is that we submit this in the Coms 6 Plenary report and that we request the sector's Advisory Committees as well as Council put forward, that the sector Advisory Committees put forward a report to the Council and the Council then takes those reports, studies them and submits a report to the Plenipotentiary Conference. That's my proposal. Any objection to that? I have China and then I have United States. China, you have the floor.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Madam Chair. And good morning to everyone. China would like to express that that Resolution is ready ‑‑ is the coordination between some sectors of the ITU, including and involving the ITU regional presence. We are of the view that this is a very good Resolution to lead our discussion of the One ITU. So we would like to reflect this concept in this Resolution so that we can demonstrate that administrations are very much concerned about the importance of the One ITU. We have no issue here. We have no issue to have this wording here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China. United States, India and then I would like to close the floor on this point on Page 5. So if you would like to take the floor on Page 5 and in particular instructs the Secretary‑General 9 and instructs Council 2. So far I have United States and India. Anyone else wishing to take the floor? Thank you. Russian Federation has the floor. So I have United States, India, Russian Federation. Russian Federation is the last speaker. The list is closed on this issue. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. And I was wondering if you could perhaps just clarify again, you are proposing to move the text in brackets to a different Resolution? My other question, my understanding of what happened in the Ad Hoc Group meeting this was not necessarily agreed text or the concept was yet agreed. And there was still conversations being undertaken on the concept of having One ITU looked at. I wanted to make sure I understood what was being proposed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. My proposal is that my understanding from discussing with the ad hoc Chair, Ms. Stella, that this was a discussion that there is square brackets as to whether it remained in Resolution 191. But the concept of understanding what One ITU meant was important to the group. I am proposing that we move the text that ‑‑ instructs the Secretary‑General and instructs the ITU Council to the Coms 6 report to the Plenary, instructing the Advisory Groups to study this issue and submit their results to the Council. Council is advised to study this issue as well. And then compile a report and send it to Plenipot 2026. So that the entire Union has an opportunity to weigh in as to the understanding of the One ITU concept. Thank you. I hope that's helpful.

All right. India, you have the floor.

>> INDIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. The concept of One ITU is not something new. This is what we are looking forward to have all the offices working with one. Presently what is being said is that the area offices, regional offices, the work under the BDT and effectively the respective activities by the T sector and the BR sector, Radio Sector are not having the entire visibility in the same place.

So, in fact, it is not a concept. It is just putting the things together to work in all offices irrespective whether it is the regional or the area office. And that sense as a concept I think we all have the same view that we must have One ITU concept. And all the equities should be deliberated. In our view I don't think there is a need to have these brackets. We keep on discussing. We agreed to have the concept built in. But how to move forward is the only question. In our opinion there is no need to wait for the next four years. We can ask this work to be adopted. And we can ask at the next Council meeting, when the things we can start rolling out and what presence should the work be taken. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Russian Federation and then I will make a ruling.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Madam Chair. Our opinion regarding this issue is as follows: The concept of One ITU is set out in the constitution. It has the purposes of the Union in Article 1 and all of the three sectors not including the Secretary‑General are directed towards achieving these purposes. The constitution also sets out the obligation of the sectors to avoid duplication in their work and to engage in close coordination.

Therefore, for us, Madam, the concept of a single One ITU is understandable. It already exists from the very start of our organization's work. And we have always favored the Union remaining a federal structure. That's to say with three sectors which conduct their activities, independently, but there needs to be a unified policy in the Union ultimately.

This can be not so clear in the regions. It is true we see some issues here with a regional presence very often cannot have representation of all three sectors. In this regard, perhaps we do need to focus our efforts here. Regarding your proposal, Madam Chair, on the whole it is very correct and interesting. But we would shift the focus on to the regions, the regional presence.

So that One ITU is conducted through the regional divisions around the world. Should leave this in the Resolution or should we follow your proposal, this does already exist in the Resolution on One ITU and perhaps it does not change the situation very much at present if we do remove the square brackets.

That would be very good. We would support its adoption but we could do a bit of work on the text in the square brackets. If the meeting takes a decision to follow your proposal, then at the same time we should review item 2 instructs the Council to assess ‑‑ to evaluate rather the outcomes of the work in the Advisory Groups. And so we propose considering your proposal as a package, item 9, and item 2 under instructs the ITU Council so that we understand what's going on in the Advisory Groups and to what instruct the Council. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russian Federation. So after listening to ‑‑ I can tell you that after listening ‑‑ after getting a read out from the ad hoc Chair and I understand that the text in square brackets under instructs Secretary‑General 9 and instructs the ITU Council 2, another two hours was spent on this text. I would say that this ‑‑ having had that two‑hour discussion, that there is still no agreement on what is being asked here. So my proposal is to remove this from 191. And with the understanding that we are going to send a ‑‑ in the Coms 6 report, instruct the Advisory Groups as well as the ‑‑ to submit a report to Council and have the Council evaluate the outcomes of that so that all membership is involved in understanding what the One ITU concept is. I would not like to turn this in to a drafting group for these two square brackets.

If we cannot agree to that, then I'm going to propose that we strike both of these square brackets from this document because they are new text. So that is my proposal. So if ‑‑ we will try this once more. You will have three minutes for each administration that wishes to take the floor. So I have United States, Burundi, Saudi Arabia, China, India, Canada. India will be the last speaker on this point. And please comment only on the proposal that I have made to move this to the Coms 6. And if there is no Com consensus here we will ‑‑ the option is to delete the two square brackets as they are not agreed. United States, you have three minutes, please.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you. Thank you for the clarifications. I would agree with your proposal in terms of removing the text in this Resolution and having a note in your report. But one request I have is based on some of the interventions, there seems to be some different views whether it should be a tasking to the Advisory Groups or have the Secretary‑General do a report and have the work done within the Council and inform to the Advisory Groups. I think we need more discussion. For One ITU as the Russian Federation was saying it is generally understood, it might be too big of a task. So perhaps we can continue to have a small informal conversation about the best approach of how you capture this in your report. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Burundi, you have the floor.

>> BURUNDI: Yes.

>> CHAIR: I believe that was a mistake. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I believe that the concept of One ITU is not a new one. We have item 9 to submit to the 2023 session, et cetera, report and recommendations on the concept of One ITU. This is not a new concept but one that has already been discussed on several occasions. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Saudi Arabia. India, you have the floor. Sorry, China, you have the floor.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Chair. As the Delegates have already said, the One ITU is not a new concept. But the ITU how to realize it, how to implement this concept when we talk about the regional presence and the coordination efforts of the three sectors. I think maybe different authorities have a different understanding. In order to implement the One ITU concept we need more research. If we want to reflect the different discussions, there is no agreement. We are ready to do more drafting work informally. We hope that at this PP we can have a clear guidance on this issue in order to realize the concept of the One ITU in the next four years. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, China. Now I have India. You have the floor.

>> INDIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. What we can think of as far as the point 9 is concerned, we can take forward without putting the square bracket. So that allows us to work from the beginning itself and regarding the text of the clause 2 instructs to the ITU Council, there is the time lag in the four years we need to work. But to begin with, yes, it is right that we do have the concept now. But how we are going to practically make it officialize, that aspect could come out through the study and the work carried out by the ITU Council in the 2023. So we are supporting the views expressed by my previous colleague from the U.S.

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

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just wanted to support your suggestion and to include the text in the report. We are happy to work with the U.S. on improving the text as it goes in to the report. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Australia. Here is what we will do. We are removing the square bracket No. 9 under instruct the Secretary‑General. And we are removing the instructs the ITU Council No. 9 that's in square bracket as well. We will put this ‑‑ these two concepts in the Coms 6 to the Plenary. And I would ask that China, India, United States, Australia and the Russian Federation, as well as Saudi Arabia, to finalize the text that will go in to the Com 6 report. Thank you. Any other issue, objections to the text on Page 5? We are removing the square brackets. The remaining text is up for your approval.

All right. Item 6. Item 6. On Page 6, sorry. Thank you. No objections to Page 6. The Resolution 191 as a whole. Thank you. Res 191 is approved. Thank you very much. Now if we could go to Resolution 25, in DT/13 Rev 5. All right. If we could start with Resolution 25, DT/13 Rev 5, Page 1, any comments on Page 1? Any objections to the text? All right. Page ‑‑ so Page 3. My apologies. Page 3. No objections to Page 3. Page 4. Page 5. Page 6. Page 7. Page 8. Page 9. Page 10. Page 11. Page 12. Thank you very much. The document as a whole.

DT/13 Rev 5 is approved. Thank you very much.

So again I think that we really should give Ms. Stella a round of applause. This was a lot of work and give yourselves a round of applause because I know that this was not an easy group. And you guys ‑‑ I went in one meeting and lots and lots of square brackets and it was like we never reach consensus. I should have bet Allesan but I didn't, I should have got something for it because he is always charging me for something. So thank you so much, Ms. Stella. I appreciate your work. Never doubted you for a moment. And thank you, Delegates, for reaching a consensus on a very difficult issue. I really greatly appreciate you.

All right. Now turning to item 48, Resolution 48. Item ‑‑ agenda item 6, Resolution 48. DT/32. And if you recall, there is square brackets in this document. And we were waiting for the document 25 to be approved on the One ITU ‑‑ hold on one second. Thank you. Sorry. My document closed. So as Noting F in Resolution 48 that we are going to replace with ‑‑ from ‑‑ we're going to replace the One ITU text from Resolution 25. And if ‑‑ since we have just approved the text from Resolution 25, I do think that that is acceptable to everyone.

Any objections? All right. Resolution 48 is approved. Thank you very much.

So if we could take item No. 7, agenda item 7, Resolution 77, DT/38 Rev 2. Okay. Let's go page by page. UAE, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chair. I had asked for the floor but actually on the previous document on Resolution 48. Can we go back to that document, please, on Resolution 48? I believe there is an annex 1 and an annex 2 which have been suppressed. I'd like to make sure that is the case. Where are we with that annex 2 on Page 7 in particular? Under instructs Secretary‑General, the third paragraph.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, sorry. It wasn't showing up on my screen. So I apologize for that. For document Resolution 48, what we've done is that we have moved the annexes to and there will be a comment and instructs in the Com 6 report to Plenary that the FHRs should report this information to the Council Working Group on FHR. So that we're not losing the information. We are just taking it out of this Resolution and become a normative framework from the Council Working Group on the FHR standpoint. Thank you. UAE, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Yes. Thank you. But what I'm saying here it's under instructs the Secretary‑General No. 2, it is still mentioning there see annex 2 of this iteration.

>> CHAIR: UAE, thank you very much for bringing that to our attention. We will be sure when we send it to the Com 4 Committee that we clean up the cross‑references and they have been doing a really good job. So thanks for bringing that to our attention. And we will make sure that that is cleaned up before we send it over to Plenary, if that's acceptable.

Okay. All right. Thank you very much. Resolution 48 is still approved with the note to the Secretariat. And I will make sure that the references are cleaned up. And that the text will reflect this on the Com 6 report to Plenary. Thank you.

Now DT/48 Rev 2 is our next document. And if we could go through and look at Page 2. Any objection to approving Page 2? We are moving to Page 3, there is a set of square brackets. And item 4, the ‑‑ that's Resolves 4. That the ITU position forms High‑Level Events. And suppose you have a worldwide character should be scheduled, we have in square brackets, I have not been able to resolve this square bracket as it is new text. And that it is a concept that is mentioned above.

My recommendation is that we delete it from Resolves 4. And we put a general comment in to our ‑‑ my Committee report Com 6 to the Plenary. That is my suggestion. We delete item ‑‑ the square brackets and we put the comment in the Coms 6 Committee report. Any objection to that way forward?

Russian Federation, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. We fully agree with you that we had lengthy discussions about this new proposal. It does have a basis indeed, but we cannot adopt it today. We would not be prepared to. Once again we thank the authors of this proposal, but we do agree that we should not rush matters. We agree with your proposal, but we would like to see the text that you plan to place in our meeting's report. I would like to explain why we are concerned about this issue. Given that we did not reach agreement within the discussions on the Resolution, we would like to understand what compromised text could be included in the report of the Coms 6 Chair. We cannot just take this text and put it in the Chair's report. There might be a false impression that arises that this is a consensus based approach. But that's not the case.

If you could propose a specific text, then we would be grateful to you for that. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russian Federation. My proposal for this text would ‑‑ for the report if there was general discussion within Coms 6 taking in to account the pandemic that we should study the issue of virtual events. That's my proposal. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think we agree with your way forward. And insist on having the text remain in the decision. But I think there is already well ‑‑ I think there is another resolution that's talking about virtual meetings. And I don't think that it is necessary to imply that it is something that needs to be studied. I think the Council can and has taken decisions on these events if they should be virtual, taking in to account the pandemic and other reasons. I would agree with the Russian Federation I'm not sure we need to put anything in the report for further study.

>> CHAIR: It sounds like this has been resolved. And we can delete the square brackets and doesn't need to be anything in the Coms 6 report. That's what I'm hearing from ‑‑ okay. Thank you. We will delete Resolves 4, taking in to consideration the possibility of virtual events and that text is deleted.

And with that, we have no other comments on Page 3. Page 4. If you recall from the Plenary sessions, we were instructed to include text related to where the WTDC will be held, as the next WTDC will be held in 2025 in Bangkok, Thailand. And we were also instructed by the Plenary to include text that the next Plenipotentiary Conference would be held in Doha, Qatar in 2026. So those two additions were added based on the instructions for Plenary.

With that, any comments on Page 4 of Resolution 77? I have Saudi Arabia. If you would like to take the floor on Page 4 of Resolution 77, please do so now. I'm closing the list. I have Saudi Arabia, United States. I have Canada. So Saudi Arabia, United States, Canada. Canada is the last speaker on Page 4. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. I know that 5/4 is still under discussion concerning the WTPF. Perhaps we could change 2021 to 2025. Thank you. Otherwise we agree with the rest of the text.

>> CHAIR: Sorry. Thank you. You were ‑‑ yes. That is correct. There is ‑‑ I forgot to put it in in yellow in my document. There is ‑‑ that's an additional square bracket on Page 4. So we will come back to that. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Yeah, I think for us we still would not support the WTPF taking place. I think we were talking about whether it should be in 2025. Our preference is that we approve this Resolution without the WTPF in it. And we refer that decision to Council in Resolution 2. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Your proposal is noted. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Yes. Thank you. Good morning to you. Just along the lines of the previous intervention from the United States, this should be deferred to another discussion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Canada. So for item 5.4, so ‑‑ I don't think we can approve Page 4 of this ‑‑ of the Resolution 77. We really need to go and look at Resolution 2. And then come back to this document so that we can resolve the WTPF. United States, I appreciate the proposal. I just ‑‑ in the discussions this past weekend on Saturday we really need to resolve that text first.

So one second, please. All right. If we could go to ‑‑ we're going to set aside DT/38 Rev 2. We're going to look at DT/37 Rev 3. If we could have DT/37 Rev 3 on the screen, please.

So we have two square brackets in Resolution 2, but what I would like to do is to have ‑‑ to go through to see if we can get an agreement on the other pages and come back to the square brackets. Zimbabwe, you have the floor.

>> ZIMBABWE: My apologies, I pressed in error. Sorry.

>> CHAIR: No problem. Thank you. All right. Com 6 we are now looking at Resolution 2, DT/37 Rev 3. Any objections to approving Page 1? Israel, you have the floor.

>> ISRAEL: Thank you, Madam Chair, for giving me the floor. I would like to have this intervention, a general intervention regarding the hosting of the next Plenipot by the Qatar administration. I firstly would like to congratulate the Qatari delegation for their kind invitation towards the Plenipot 26. I personally had the pleasure to visit Doha for the WTDC and to experience the warm hospitality of the Qatarian people.

Secondly, it is important to highlight that every country that takes this responsibility upon should also take upon itself the commitment to ensure international connectivity and international roaming agreements with all Member States.

As Qatar is becoming a hub for major international events like the upcoming World Cup, and the next Plenipot, definitely major global events, we expect that Qatar will allow its operators to engage commercially with all foreign operators. And that the members in the ITU will ‑‑ sorry, will include this terms in the ‑‑ in the contract and obligations taken by the Qatari administration. I would suggest that Qatar will look in to the issue. It is very important for us, for the state of Israel as thousands ‑‑ thousand I would say, a huge number of Israelis will be visiting for the upcoming World Cup. It is important for Member States that the Qatari will enable connectivity and will treat all Delegations as the same way I would say.

And we expect the Qatari delegation to take all steps needed in the next few weeks to ensure that towards the World Cup, next upcoming World Cup there will be international roaming agreements with all Member States. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So we have set aside Resolution 77 where the Plenary has instructed us to include that Qatar is the next ‑‑ as the next host for the Plenipotentiary 2026. And we could come back to that point at that time. Right now we are looking at Resolution 2. And I would like to go back to when we ‑‑ when we go back to Resolution 77, we can ‑‑ I'm not ‑‑ I have to ask the Secretariat because I'm not sure what our Com 6 can do. Thank you. Resolution 2, any objections to Page 2? Okay. I see no objections to Page 2. Page 3? No objections to Page 3.

Page 4 ‑‑ I'm skipping Page 4. Page 5. All right. Let's come back to Page 4. Resolves 1 and Resolves 2, we've had meetings on Saturday to discuss WTPF and whether to include text that would have a WTPF between two Plenipotentiary Conferences and Resolves 2 inserts a date of 2025.

At present I have ‑‑ there is no agreement in the room on these two bullet points. The only agreement that I have for item 2 is that yes, that the WTPF should be held back to back with WSIS Forum, but not the date of 2025. And then the text preferably convene, I do believe it is because of the date that's inserted in item 2. So the floor is open for discussion on this point ‑‑ these two points. And I would remind everyone that the purpose of the WTPF as outlined in ‑‑ actually there is another square bracket, item 7, that shall be convened on an ad hoc basis, I reviewed ‑‑ I want ‑‑ I was curious ‑‑ curiosity got the best of me.

So I wanted to understand that WTPF was created at the 1994 Plenipotentiary Conference. It was created so that we as Member States and our sector members can have a discussion on these new emerging telecommunication issues. So that there were no prescriptive outcomes. It would be convened on an ad hoc basis. It was not meant to be a regular part of the Union's budget. It was meant to be if there was this pressing issue, similar to when global mobile personal communication satellites, we had a GPS, similar to a county rates issue, similar to right after understanding what the Internet issues ‑‑ Internet Governance issues were. So we just had a WTPF in 2021.

So it would be helpful for everyone to understand what would this next ‑‑ if we're asking to have a Plenary ‑‑ a WTPF in 2025, what's on our agenda. What are those pressing issues that we need to discuss that need outside input as well from outside stakeholders.

So I open the floor. I now have the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia. I have the United States of America. I have Tunisia, United Kingdom, China, Poland, Australia, Brazil. Okay. I'm closing the floor after Brazil. Brazil will be the last speaker on this topic. The list is closed.

So Brazil, so the last speaker everyone will hear will be Brazil. So Russian Federation, you have the floor. Thank you.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. We are of the view that today at the Plenipotentiary Conference we are taking decisions which will affect our activities for the upcoming four years. In this regard paragraph 1 seems to us to contain many possibilities and taking in to account what you said, namely that we need to consider the suitability of whether to convene WTPF or not, in point 1 it mentions the possibility of holding it once in the interval between two Plenipotentiary Conferences. This wording allows the Council to be flexible. It is therefore our view that this point can remain as it is currently worded as it does not give any firm instructions.

Regarding the square brackets in paragraph 2, we are prepared to propose a compromise given that in point 1 it just mentions the possibility of doing this. We could say in point 2 taking in to account item 1 to convene WTPF within the WSIS Forum in 2025. There would be a variation. If the Council decides before 2026 Plenipot will be a WTPF, then point 2 would enter in to force. And it would be clear when to hold the WTPF. In this way, the Council will be able to take a decision on whether or not to hold the WTPF and then these two points would not be activated.

Regarding the square brackets in paragraph 7, here we could support the approach that you mentioned as this creates a basis for assessing the possibility or appropriateness of holding this Forum. And if when we are considering to hold WTPF, there is a need to respond efficiently to certain challenges in terms of telecommunications.

And so our proposal, Madam, is to retain the full text adding to paragraph 2 a slight variation. That is taking in to account paragraph 1 so on and so forth. Thank you.

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

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. On behalf of the Arab group, we agree with your proposal. We have noble objectives in order to ‑‑ with regard to holding WTPF. We have seen clearly the benefits of holding the WTPF, especially since it has facilitated the work of the standardization conference, the development conference and the PPS. You said Madam Chair, the objective of the WTPF is to discuss openly matters without having the pressure of taking obligatory decisions. So we do not have to replicate the previous experience where we had it virtually. We can meet together in order to enhance the benefits of the WTPF. We have great challenges, upcoming great challenges. I do not think that holding this Forum in 2025 simultaneously with the WSIS will come with challenges. I think that we have spoken about these challenges during the Council meeting. And I don't think that we will have financial burdens. In the Arab group we think that it would be beneficial to lift the square brackets so that we can hold the WTPF to benefit all member sectors, including development ones. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. And I think when you look at the revisions together, all the brackets, our concern is that as we were saying the intention of WTPF is to not ‑‑ the same level as the other statutory events that we have at the ITU. It is intended to be an ad hoc meeting. Putting in Resolves 1, plus removing it as an ad hoc event that comes in to address emerging issues, I think that changes considerably what WTPF is meant to do. I think we agree with others that they are a valuable Forum for exchange. In 2021 it was challenging virtually, but it was a successful activity. Our proposal has been more around just taking a realistic look at the past four years. We have all as Member States gone through a challenging time preparing for all these conferences that we're having at once. And we think returning in the next four year cycle to one conference per year approach as well as just deferring this decision to Council on whether ‑‑ how to have a WTPF in the next four years, instead of committing to one right now in 2025 is what we propose.

It is not just the financial resources. It is also human resources. I think the burden on Member States preparing for a lot of these conferences, like we said it has been a challenging past year. So our preference is to have the original text where we are not changing the nature of WTPF. And we would not support having one in 2025. Thank you.

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

>> TUNISIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. My colleague from the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has expressed my feelings about the subject. I wanted to reconfirm the importance of the WTPF, which has the ability to enable exchange of ideas and opinions with regard to emerging and new technologies. As we all know the nature of ICT technologies is fast evolving. Therefore it is important to give ourselves the opportunity to discuss these new and emerging technologies. As my colleagues said, the previous WTPF was a successful one, in spite of the fact that it was held remotely. Therefore, we think that it is very important to hold such a Forum. And it is also important to define the themes according to the way things evolve over the coming years. And we think that this is something that should be discussed and defined in our next meeting. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you very much, Chair. We'd like to align ourselves with the comments made by the United States. As you said, Chair, the original intention or the logic behind convening the WTPF was essentially based on a needs assessment. Putting any kind of preference for some kind of chronological basis for convening WTPF would undermine that needs based logic that we have been using since originally conceiving of the WTPF. So we won't a ‑‑ we wouldn't agree with any of the proposals made in the bracketed text here. Thank you.

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

>> CHINA: Thank you, Chair. As mentioned by the Chair, WTPF was proposed at the PP‑1994. The U.S. colleague also mentioned the background of the convening of WTPF. However it has been nearly 30 years since its proposal. The ICT technology has been advancing really rapidly. This Forum has provided us with a good opportunity to discuss the challenges and opportunities together. In particular all the intersectorial and cross‑sectorial problems. Many administrations have already had conferences. We also feel that the ITU can play a better role in the rapidly developing landscape. We feel that having the WTPF is a good initiative. We feel that in item 1 Resolves it is a very good wording. It expresses support for WTPF. At the same time it has reclaimed some flexibility of holding the Forum. We hope that relevant administrations can demonstrate a spirit of compromise. We have to stress that all issues can ‑‑ have to be deleted, unless we have consensus. If we adopt this approach, we will not have a good outcome. I hope all of us can demonstrate a spirit of compromise so we can have a good outcome at this PP.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Poland.

>> POLAND: Thank you for giving me the floor. I hope you hear me all right. As CEPT we do support the ‑‑ we do support the WTPF and we offer support to the existing and currently essential thematic priorities that are defined in WSIS outcomes. Although we do support no change on most of the text that is in square brackets, I would say that in the spirit of compromise we would agree to Resolves point 1. Regarding the remaining points, we cannot support them. Although we are depending on your judgment, Madam Chair. Therefore I am looking forward to your approach. Thank you.

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

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. We do agree that WTPF is a valuable Forum for exchange. However, Australia would like ITU to practice on its core quadrennial meetings over the next period. WTPF is not a single meeting. It is quite a lengthy preparatory process that will have impacts on preparations for WTDC and the next Plenipotentiary conference in particular. This is why we do not agree to taking WTPF to a regular meeting at this time. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. And Brazil, you were the last speaker. You have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you very much. Brazil still understands that WTPF has several merits. The last edition of the Forum has proven that already. We had several useful opinions produced in that Forum. We feel we should give a clear idea of the next edition of that Forum, when it is going to take place. We still have several other paragraphs here that states how we are going to decide on agenda items and the themes and everything that is part of what I heard from previous interventions.

It is not that we are agreeing on everything right now, how it is going to work but we should have a clear idea on when are we going to have it. And therefore, we do believe it is very reasonable what we have in the Resolves 1 and 2. We just lift those brackets and leave the text as it is. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. I have listened to all the comments. Here's what I'm going to propose. I'm going to start with item 7, item 7 with the text will remain as is, as it came in to the conference. So I'm going to delete the square brackets and keep the original text. No changes.

Item 1, my proposal is to keep the text with the preferably convene the WTPF once in between the two Plenipotentiary Conferences. And I'm going to propose deleting 2025. And we leave this decision to Council to make that decision. I think that that is enough ‑‑ we have provided enough direction to Council. It's not providing a definitive date. We are leaving the decision to Council. And that is my proposal. Any objections? Saudi Arabia, you are objecting? Saudi Arabia is objecting. You have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. On behalf of the Arab group, I would like to say that we are here contradicting our ‑‑ the practice, the general practice that we have been following so far. The general practice was that the PP would determine and pinpoint the date and the Council would agree on other things such as themes, dates, location. In our opinion, Madam Chair, we could keep the square brackets on 1, 2 and 7. And we can have further discussions or we can defer the text to the Plenary. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: So thank you ‑‑ thank you. Again I would ask ‑‑ we have another session this afternoon. So again Saudi Arabia, I would encourage the Arab group to accept the compromise that I have proposed. I'm happy to show ‑‑ to share with you the ‑‑ all of the Resolutions from the previous seven Plenipots. 2018 was the first time that the dates of the WTPF were ever included in Res 2. For the most part for the decision when to hold the WTPF up until 2018 was decided by Council. So I'm encouraging, strongly encouraging to accept the compromise that we keep preferably convene the WTPF once in the interval between two Plenipotentiary Conferences, delete the date, 2025 and we maintain the text of item 7. That is my proposal.

Saudi Arabia. So on this point I have Saudi Arabia, Russian Federation, Kuwait. I have Cuba. I am closing the list. So the ‑‑ I have ‑‑ sorry. I don't have everyone. All right.

I have Russian Federation, Kuwait, Cuba, Tunisia, United States, Poland. The list is closed. The list is closed after Chile. So please be brief. Poland is the last speaker. Please be brief. And Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you again, Madam Chair. On behalf of the Arab group, we apologize but we cannot accept your proposal. We think that 1, 2 and 7 should be retained within square brackets. And we can continue discussions with regard to these points. Thank you.

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

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. In our first statement we also proposed a compromised version in item 2 following on from item 1. We could add something, if we follow your proposal, then it seems to us that we would be opening up new items for discussion because we were meant to move on to instructs the ITU Council. And then we will need to add something about taking decisions on whether to hold it, and then the length of time, the place, et cetera. So that would force us to amend the section on instructs the Council.

We therefore are prepared if we continue this discussion to take part in it, but perhaps it would be better if we can achieve a consensus here in the room now. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russian Federation. Kuwait, you have the floor.

>> KUWAIT: Thank you, Madam Chair. Good morning, everyone. As I echo the statement of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia on behalf of the Arab group we do not accept your proposal, Madam Chair. We would like to clarify the following. You said that the general practice in the past was that we decided on the date of the WTPF, the Council took that decision. However in Dubai we made the decision during that Plenipotentiary Conference. Therefore, we think that we should continue on to that practice, i.e., to decide on the year in the PP and in the Council we can discuss the rest. I repeat, in 2018 we decided to hold the WTPF in 2021. Thank you, Madam Chair.

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

>> CUBA: Thank you very much, Chair. With regard to all of the comments from the previous speakers, in respecting the use of all participants on this Resolution, which has been under discussion for some time now, Cuba did at a point in time raise that we consider that we could keep as is as was approved in PP‑2018. Considering that we have heard that all of the colleagues speaking before us have explained the importance that this Forum represents for them. We all agree that it is an important Forum for all members of the Union. Therefore, with this relevance and importance that the Forum has I believe that instead of defining a timeline, I think we have to think as a Union that we should be looking at how we can strengthen the Forum. And we believe we should go away from here with a date because we do need to prepare.

We have to look in to the financial situation and other preparations. And if this is something that was done in 2018 and worked, why should we change this now? We know that our Union is always marked by trying to achieve consensus. Yet if there is no consensus, I don't believe we should take the square brackets out before we do arrive at that consensus.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

>> TUNISIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. It goes without saying that we support our colleagues from the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and other colleagues with regard to determining the year for that WTPF. As you said, the WTPF will be held within an interval, and the interval between the two PPs. So it could be in 2023, 2024 or 2025. In 2025 we have the WRC. Therefore, I think we can hold it in 2024 or 2025. What is the problem if we agree on a year, 2025 as a date for holding the WTPF? I do not think that this is difficult for our conference. As we said previously, the agenda and the themes could be agreed upon by the Council. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you for helping ‑‑ trying to find a compromised way forward. Again for us, I know ‑‑ I think with ‑‑ with No. 7 going back to the original text, I think still having preferably a ‑‑ it changes the nature of the WTPF but I think in listening to others as well, I think trying to find a way forward where we defer the decision to Council and have this be a question about what year instead of agreeing on 2025 or 2026 or 2024, having this be something that we refer to Council, I think our points have been in terms of the financial and human resources. And the preparatory process is especially related to this next four‑year period, and I think as we have done in some of the other Resolutions, no change is the way forward if we can't find a consensus path. I think there is no agreement here on having a WTPF in the next four years. So if we can't find a compromise then I don't see how we can agree on a date here.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

>> POLAND: Thank you. First of all, thank you for your proposal. And I just wanted to express our gratitude and acceptance. We could ‑‑ some colleagues find it unacceptable. CEPT is looking forward to getting back to discussions. We are going to present in the spirit of consensus, although we do see ‑‑ by listening to some of the colleagues I want to sympathize that CEPT is offering no change to paragraph 7. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you. I think your proposal on a way forward is very reasonable. And Brazil can go along those lines. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So colleagues, there is no agreement. So what I'm going to propose is that we have ‑‑ we have another meeting tomorrow morning. We continue with trying to find a compromise tonight. And I would then propose that this will be on our agenda for tomorrow. But it would be the last time Resolution 77 and Resolution 2. So with that, we will ‑‑ that is what we will do. We will move this. So I have UAE and Chile. Chile.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. If I understand your proposal, Madam Chair, it is to keep No. 7 as it is, no change. Okay. And delete No. 1?

>> CHAIR: No, it is not. We would delete the square brackets around No. 1 and delete ‑‑

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Maybe we can go for it. If we keep No. 7 as it is, no change, delete No. 1. And keep the date because already the date has been approved the last time the conference 2012. And already we have for similar Resolution, other for different conferences. So this is another alternative that no change to No. 7. Maybe proposal delete No. 1. And No. 2 it's WSIS Forum 2025. Look at it, please. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So colleagues, I would please take in to account the proposal that was just put on the table was UAE, delete No. 1 and we leave the date in 2025. And keep item 7 as it is. With that, I would ‑‑ we will bring this back to tomorrow to our agenda. But I strongly encourage you to talk among yourselves to find a way forward. I would like to keep our ‑‑ I have a ‑‑ kind of a bet with Kwame in Committee 5 that we will have no square brackets from our Working Group. So if we could win that streak, that would be great.

With that, I would like to call a coffee break for 15 minutes. 11:15 please come back and we will continue with our agenda. We will go with 162 and Decision 11 and Res 11. Thank you.

(Coffee break).

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We can get started. I hope you enjoyed your coffee break. We are now on ‑‑ if everyone could take their seats, please. If we could start now with item 9, Resolution 162. And document DT/16 Rev 1. So if you recall in DT/16 Rev 1, the issue that we have here is we have a number of square brackets in 162 ‑‑ so the entire document we have discussed. And the square bracket first appears on Page 4. And it has to do with the IT security best practices, cybersecurity best practices. The ‑‑ the text at the ‑‑ that's the only text we have in square brackets. I open the floor to the proposal ‑‑ my proposal would be to ‑‑ I won't make a proposal because I have spoken with a couple of Delegations. And my proposal was not the path forward.

So I would like to hear from the rest of the Coms 6 on how do we resolve these square brackets. It starts on Page 4, responsibilities B. I see IT security best practices it is in square brackets. Cybersecurity best practices in square brackets. The question is what are we asking the IMAC as a form of responsibility related to IT security or cybersecurity. The floor is open. I have Algeria. I have Algeria asking for the floor. And I am going to close. Algeria, Canada, Switzerland, United States, UK, Saudi Arabia. Okay. Saudi Arabia will be the last speaker on this. Thank you. Algeria, you have the floor.

>> ALGERIA: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. So I'm speaking on behalf of the African region. So I think we have made this proposal to be in line with the current best practices that have been reflected in the GIU report on the changing of oversight function in the United Nations system. And, of course, the ‑‑ we have tried to enhance the work of the IMAC in the overall governance and oversight aspect of the ‑‑ of this body in terms of looking for cybersecurity auditing situation for the Union. And this is in line with the current project that the ITU is envisioning to undertake in the coming future. Internal digital transformation and the existing business continuity framework and policies when it comes to the ORMS, for example, organization or resilience management system. So I think the ‑‑ this proposal might be relevant considering all the aspects mentioned earlier. And it is in line with the current ‑‑ new consideration for organizations on the United Nations system.

But Madam Chair, we are also open to any proposal that may be useful to the Union. And for any better way forward as I said for IMAC on this aspect. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Algeria, speaking on behalf of Africa. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Yes. Thank you. I believe we mentioned yesterday we have to be particularly careful in assigning the Independent Management Advisory Committee's responsibility beyond their competence. These are management consultants and auditors. They are not IT specialists. They are not security specialists. They don't work on cybersecurity related matters. In the unlikely event that we open the terms of reference for the Independent Management Advisory Committee to address these matters, what would then prevent them from addressing let's say quantum computing or Big Data or artificial intelligence. I think we have to continue allowing the IMAC to do what they have done for so long without the necessary remit activities because it really, Madam Chair, it ‑‑ this doesn't belong in the work.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Switzerland.

>> SWITZERLAND: Thank you, Madam Chair, for giving me the floor. I believe that we should refocus our debate here, this is about the Independent Management Advisory Committee. It is up to these Committee members to give advice to management of our organization on how best to manage the organization. It does not deal with public policy issues. And its focus is on improving the management of the organization. Our opinion is as a Committee with such functions, that is giving advice and recommendations to the management of an organization cannot be competent for IT security in an organization.

In all of our organizations, cybersecurity is crucial to allow the organization to conduct its work. Therefore, in our view, it makes full sense for IMAC also to consider IT security issues at ITU.

We understand to what extent the term cybersecurity is sensitive within ITU. And so in our view, IT security is a better compromised term. Thank you, Madam Chair.

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

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. The United States would like to align our position with Canada. We appreciate the continuing conversation on how to ensure that IT security best practices are adopted at ITU, the scope and implementation of the proposed text is still ambiguous in our view. The U.S. would prefer to keep the original text which is sufficiently broad and inclusive, and not incorporate the proposal at this time. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Madam Chair. Like Canada and U.S. UK believes that IT security and cybersecurity are not within the permit or remit of IMAC. Thank you.

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

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. In all of the organizations there are internal teams that consider the internal situation, including cybersecurity risks and IT security risks. That's the case within all organizations.

I believe that the functions of IMAC include that. Here we must not introduce Resolutions that deal with cybersecurity policies. This is rather internal work concerning the ITU for function areas for the organization, ensuring that the ITU is able to manage any cyber attack if such a scenario were to arise. We therefore do hope that CICG could address recommendations on this issue including Resolution 148 and 130. Thank you.

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

>> KUWAIT: Thank you, Madam Chair. As explained by my colleague from Saudi Arabia, we would not like for IMAC to consider cybersecurity issues. However, experts within IMAC should have knowledge when it comes to cybersecurity. When it comes to reviewing cybersecurity practices. We do not want them to focus only on this aspect. But rather they need to have some kind of expertise to tackle any problems the organization might encounter to tackle any risks as expressed by my colleague from Saudi Arabia.

We are speaking of best practices. Here we just need to clarify what is listed in the previous paragraph. We could look at different wording if you do not accept the definition here of cybersecurity best practices. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, everyone. So when we had a meeting on this on Saturday ‑‑ maybe it wasn't Saturday. The days are running together. We met with the Chair of the IMAC. And we wanted to make sure that we were having an understanding of the edits proposed from 2018 that were picked up by a number of ‑‑ by all of the proposals in to this conference. The one difference that was pointed out was the issue of cybersecurity best practices. As ‑‑ cybersecurity. And that is where you see the square brackets. So I do think that Switzerland has given us a good path forward here. And the proposed path forward is to delete cybersecurity best practices. Because we ‑‑ all of the input agreed on the NIT. So we just say IT and IT best practices and end the sentence there. That's my proposal. That we would delete cybersecurity best practices and we will include IT and IT security best practices.

That's my proposal. And I want to thank Switzerland for helping reach that compromise. Any objection to IT security best practices? Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Yes. Thank you. I just don't want to direct this conversation any further. Thank you for your very good efforts. But when we talk about IMAC advising IT security best practices, isn't that already the competence of the IT department within ITU to study what is the best practice ‑‑ what are the best practices around? And take the necessary measures internally to ensure the resilience and security of the ITU IT systems? So I don't know if the Secretariat could provide any further advice. But bearing in mind that this is an alternative compromised text with a caveat that we have made this intervention, we can probably move ahead. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Canada. I would thank you for agreeing to that compromise. I would like to think that the IMAC and as are management and advisor look at the processes that have been put in place. And I do think that that would be something as Switzerland has indicated something that we can all support. With that I would like to close the list. I have United States, Algeria. My proposal is we would keep IT security best practices and that will flow throughout the document. And then we would move to go page by page to approve this document.

United States, you have the floor ‑‑ I have the United States, Algeria, the United Kingdom. Any other colleagues wishing to take the floor please do so now. Otherwise the list is closed. The list is closed. The last speaker will be UK. You have the floor, United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you. Given that the United States and a number of other Delegations would prefer to keep the original text without incorporating the proposal, if we cannot identify a compromise to go forward, then we would request that this move forward in brackets. And U.S.' preference would be to rely solely on the original text. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: You want to revert back to the text that was agreed to from Resolution 162 adopted in Busan? Is that your request? Because I don't think that supports your CITEL contribution. The CITEL contribution picked up the edits from the PP‑18 from the IMAC. The only issue here was the inclusion of IT. I'm trying to understand IT security and best practices. Thank you. Algeria, you have the floor.

>> ALGERIA: Thank you. We are happy with this compromise. And I think it would be also interesting from the Secretariat. I think we ‑‑ in Council we didn't have the opportunity to see the report from the GIU on the change in oversight function of the United Nations. So there are a number of recommendations inside this report. And, of course, the introduction of cybersecurity or IT security for compromising is one of the things that have been attractive. And I think this is not only the matter of ITU but all the United Nations system organizations. And, of course, we are under risk management and internal controls. I think that organizations have several internal security controls in order to enhance their management and their governance. And this is for the benefit of the Union. I think we can add something for the Secretariat for the next so they have an idea of and visibility of new requirement of oversight functioning bodies. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. The UK agrees with Canada that IT security has a remit for IT security best practices. The UK can agree with this compromised text. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just to clarify we are not saying to go back to the original text. We are saying the compromised language proposed, we have a concern. It should end with IT. That's our recommendation.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I would ask that you accept the compromise that we have agreed to IT and IT best practices. And we will remove the square brackets and this will flow down to the remaining places where we have highlighted text. This is accepted by the colleagues in Com 6 and that's what we will do. I would like to go start on Page 1. We don't need to go to the top of the text. We just need to ‑‑ if you trust the Secretariat, we've already agreed to this document. We just had to agree to the ‑‑ to that square bracket of IT security best practices. Thank you.

So 162 is approved. Thank you very much. The next document is Decision 11. DT/28 Rev 1. So I understand that in talking with the Member States, the Delegates that were negotiating this text, that there is an agreement to go back to the only square bracket that's open is in Decides 7, I believe. We have agreed to Considering E. We agreed to that at the last ‑‑ at our last meeting. So those square brackets are an accident. They should be removed. If folks take a look we agreed to this shortened sentence here, Considering E. And the next square bracket has to do with the terms. And my understanding is that we're going to agree with the original text. U.S., you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. And yes, we just wanted to confirm that we have done a lot of investigation in to No. 8 on the terms and the extension of two terms. And our preference is to leave it as the original text. I think we had taken a decision quite recently in terms of ‑‑ with this language. This language aligns with Decision 1333. And for the United States, we prefer for No. 8 is to not add the language about two terms. And we would keep the original language in No. 8. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, United States. So we are ‑‑ if there is no objection to returning to keeping the original text that's in decision ‑‑ Decides 8. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Regarding Considering E, Madam Chair, we believe that this might run counter to the work of the Working Groups. And the advice regarding some activities I believe that the Working Groups cover a lot of work, a lot more than just giving advice. And therefore, perhaps the legal advisor might help us to understand this point better. Regarding Decides 8, I believe that might have appeared, the two terms of office might have appeared in other places. Regarding the mandates they might have a role here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Russian Federation, you have the floor. If you would like to take the floor on this ‑‑

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you. Could you explain the proposal by the U.S. on 8? The two terms of office were supported in the terminology. In the U.S. proposal ‑‑ would we keep the text on the screen or is there a different proposal? I'm asking for clarification.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So for Decides 8, the proposal is to go back to the original text that was adopted in Dubai. So there would be no ‑‑ we would delete two terms of reference and we would just leave the text as it is. No change. Any objection to that going back to the original text? Yep. That would be deleted. Russian Federation, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Madam Chair. As we reached an agreement in the Ad Hoc Groups, this would be two terms. Has something changed? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So Russian Federation, of understanding of where we were, there was an issue the Russian text was correct and understood and that the English text was not. So now the proposal is just to stay with the text that we agreed to regarding this text from Dubai with no changes.

That is understood that the Council Chairman would ‑‑ this would be also with the Council 1331, 1331 I believe. Thank you.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Madam Chair, may I take the floor?

>> CHAIR: Yes, you may.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Madam Chair. The old Dubai text referred to a preliminary decision by the Council, Council Resolution on which the Dubai text was based. And here we seem to have agreed on two terms of office. So if we return to the old text, we are returning to one term. And so I'm asking has our decision changed. And if we look at the Russian text, I would very much urge our English speaking colleagues to ensure the text is correct. How do we express this, election and re‑election. In Russia, I do understand in Russian and I do more or less in English. But I would like clarity, if we remove all of it, nothing would be clear anymore. One term or two? Thank you.

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

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Madam Chair. And thank you for the question from the Russian Federation. So when we had been talking about the change to the two terms of office, part of it was that the language to us was somewhat confusing about what the current rules were. We were not clear on whether there was a single term required now or whether there were no term requirements in the current decisions of Council. When we had looked in to the Council decision, I think it is 1333, what we had realized is that there was very recently to be one term. Our preference is not to change it to two terms. We just recently have made this change to have the one term requirement. And that we should stay with that decision as opposed to changing it to two terms. So it is ‑‑ when we were having some discussion about how to improve the language we think it shall not exceed the interval and that should be one term. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So U.S. and Russian Federation, I do think that we need to take this off and have further conversations. My understanding is that this was discussed. So let's take this off ‑‑ let's go have an internal ‑‑ an informal conversation as I think the text is between the two administrations. And we can try to find a path forward.

Is there any ‑‑ so I have Algeria, Saudi Arabia and Russian Federation. Russian Federation is the last speaker here. Thank you. The list is closed. Algeria, you have the floor.

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. So I think the ‑‑ we have Constitution Article 59a which is on the Plenipotentiary Conferences. We have extraordinary Plenipotentiary Conference. So the ordinary Plenipotentiary Conference shall be held every four years. But we have extraordinary Plenipot conference. And I think this No. 8 needs to consider that in which we may be precise in the interval between effective Plenipot. Maybe we can add consecutive ordinary Plenipotentiary Conference for being accurate and considering the paragraph of 59a. And then I agree with my colleague from Saudi Arabia, I think it was under considering or the roles of the Council Working Groups were being created not only to Council, but there are a number of other aspects that we need to consider. Therefore the paragraph needs to be reviewed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, I will ask the legal advisor. But I do think that maybe there is a misunderstanding about this Considering E. Council Working Groups are created to help facilitate the work of Council. The Council Working Group cannot make decisions. The Council Working Group can propose recommendations to the Council for them to decide. So that is what that text is trying to say. The direct Working Groups cannot take a decision. The decision is taken in Council.

And I will ask ‑‑ I'm not sure if the legal advisor is here. But we will see if he will be able to come down to the Plenary. Yes. He is not available. So we will take this offline. So can we put E, Considering E back in square brackets, please? Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I apologize for asking for the floor again. I do not think it is logical to meet in Council just for one term bearing in mind that all of those elected are elected to two terms. I do not think that one single term is in keeping with the two terms for all of these elected, all of the directors, managers, Chairs of Study Groups. Therefore, there needs to be compatibility with the terms. This is why we requested this amendment. What was decided in Dubai in 2018 was a mistake. There needs to be consistency, continuity between the managers. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Saudi Arabia. Last speaker is the Russian Federation. You have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Madam Chair. If we look back at the history of this issue, it began six years ago when it was proposed in Council to set terms for the Advisory Groups at two years.

A compromise was adopted in Council and a Council Resolution for four years. The result of this Resolution came before Dubai, not during Dubai. Before. And one term was adopted. Experience showed and I support what was said by our distinguished Saudi colleague that this is a restriction that is not necessary at all as one could be elected for Council twice. And limiting this to one term, in isolation from all other appointments doesn't make much sense. Everyone agreed with this in the Ad Hoc Groups. The reason for which our Distinguished Colleagues decided not to support was adopted at the ad hoc is not very clear to me.

And the reference to the Council Resolution doesn't work because there was a decision before Dubai. And this doesn't involve just the U.S. and Russia. This was discussed by everyone in the group. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Russian Federation. What I would like to do with DT on Decision 11 I would like to take this offline and have a discussion with everyone that has spoken and consult with the regions on this text. And bring it back for our agenda for tomorrow. Thank you.

All right. The next ‑‑ the final agenda we added was Resolution 11. And so where we are with Resolution 11? We held an informal meeting to discuss Resolution 11 on Saturday. ITU Telecom events. The proposals that were submitted from the regions, we were ‑‑ were found not to be implementible. Considering the reports coming from the external auditor as well as the external consultancy that we hired to look at the telecom events.

So in the ‑‑ during the discussion CEPT, CITEL, the Arab group and I believe Africa agreed to ‑‑ we would suppress this Resolution. So the proposal will be that we will suppress this Resolution. The remaining funds in the exposition working capital fund would be moved to the ICT fund to support development projects. That will be included in the Com 6 report for going to Plenary. Any questions on that? The floor is open. I see no one asking for the floor. That will be done.

We are finishing our work early. I have one more statement from the host country I would like to read to you regarding the tent. The weather forecast for this week includes some periods of robust winds. During the winds the structural Plenary room may produce specific noise and rolling of the equipment which is normal and which have been designed from the beginning as ways of strengthening the construction. Furthermore, we have been assured by both the contractor and the host country that the construction was designed to face strong winds. It is perfectly safe for hosting PP‑22. The host country staff is at your disposal and Delegates to provide information. Thank you so much.

That was a question regarding the tent of the moving. So it is all part of the structure. So thank you. With that, we have a few minutes left. I would like to consult with ‑‑ on the side with ‑‑ on Decision 11. And I also would like to consult on Res 2 and Res 77. Let's have Decision 11 would be ‑‑ we can do Decision 11 first. And then we could work on Decision 2.

Other than that, I thank you very much. On our agenda for tomorrow we will have Decision 5, Resolution 71 and I believe we will be finished with our agenda. Congratulations. Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you. Can you scroll, there are other issues pending under Committee 6, like status of documents? If you scroll. Is there anything, for example, on theme 5, T2.7? Anything that has been agreed? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, we will have the theme ‑‑ sorry. You are correct. So on theme 4, financial management issues, the ‑‑ new Resolution strengthening IT financial resources that's going to be on our agenda tomorrow. It will be part of moving text, not the entire new Resolution, but it will be included in Decision 5 and that will be discussed at that time. There is still discussions ongoing regarding the new Resolution on side events. That I understand is still being discussed and will be on our agenda for tomorrow as well. So look for a revised agenda tomorrow that will include new Resolution strengthening IT financial resources and mobilization that's connected to Decision 5.

The new Resolution on side events, Decision 11. And Resolution 2 and Resolution 77, and Resolution 71. So I'm hoping that we can get through the ‑‑ our agenda with those issues. And that will be the completion of all the documents assigned to Committee 6. And I will also have the text that we will include in the Committee report on ‑‑ from Res 191. Okay?

Any questions? All right. Thank you very much. If we could meet somewhere in the front to discuss Decision 11, that would be great. And then we will discuss Res 2. Thank you. Have a great day. Bye‑bye.

(Event concluded at 12:09 EEST)
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