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>> Welcome to Committee 6 meeting. We will start in about nine minutes. Before we do that, I would like to do the interpretation channel test. I hope everyone is there. Also, I hope you can hear me very well.

(Interpretation check)

>> Recording in progress.

>> Recording stopped.

>> CHAIR: Good afternoon. Everyone that's here for Committee 6, the room is sort of empty, because we still have working group in Plenary that's running late. So if we could give about five to ten minutes, let's say 4:10. And we will get started.

So I apologize, but I also want to make sure that we have everyone in the room as we look to finalize our documents. Thank you very much.

>> Recording stopped

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Com 6 for your patience.

>> Recording in progress.

>> CHAIR: So we recognize that working group in Plenary is running over, and a number of participants are from Com 6 are participating. But we have to move on with our work. And I'm confident and hoping that there will be other delegates that can speak to the text from the different regions that are not here.

So can I have an update on ‑‑ if we have an update on Resolution 2? Is there a delegate that can tell me if there was progress made on Resolution 2, WTPF, on the date, that's the only outstanding issue? United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. We have continued to have some conversations about this, but I'm not sure we're right at the ‑‑ we have agreement as yet on the date. I think we still feel of the view that WTPF should be an Ad Hoc Group that will be assessed by Council when to have it. We continue to have conversations about possible alternative options for it. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. All right. It looks like we have no movement on that document on Resolution 2.

And so that means we don't really have any movement on Resolution 77. But I would like to inform Com 6 that we did receive a new document contribution 178. And that is from Council that's indicating that the Government of India is proposing to host WTSA 2024, and we would be inserting India in Resolution 77 to host the WTSA. Unfortunately we do not have ‑‑ it's just going to say India for now, because we do not know where in India that will be held. But Council received a letter, and it was forwarded to the conference in contribution 178.

We can't move on Resolution 38 either, Rev. 2. So we can't move on DT/38 Rev. 2 because Resolution 2 and Resolution 77 are linked.

All right. If I could call on ‑‑ can I ask if there was movement on the new resolutions strengthening, mobilization functions. If there was movement on the informal discussions on this proposal as well? I have United States and I have United Kingdom asking for the floor. United States, you have the floor. Thank you.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: So it was just for the financial resources mobilization, I think we did agree ‑‑ I just received a note from Algeria that they were okay with the text we inserted in Decision 5 that I sent to you, which hopefully we can have on the screen. And that would be with the agreement of not having a separate stand alone resolution on that topic. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED KINGDOM: I can say we have made some progress on the discussion of the United States proposal for a resolution on side events. Immediately following the morning session of Committee 6 we had an informal consultation that included representatives from Canada, the United States, Ireland, UK ‑‑ United Kingdom.

>> CHAIR: Can we hold that discussion for now, because we're actually on Decision 5 and DT/59. Please can we park that, and then I will come back to that.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Of course, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any objection to posting on the screen, the text that the US just mentioned that reached agreement via email virtually? Okay. There's no objection to that. So I'll ask Secretariat to post on the screen DT/59, and that would have the text that was discussed between participants. Thank you.

United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I wanted to note that this was language that we had been in discussions with the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group as well as people from organizations, but I know it's probably the first time others have seen it. I wanted to caveat it. I think we should be able to take some discussion. This captures the spirit of the resolution by the ITU and the Arab States.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States, very much. So what I would like to do then, since the agreement had been to include the new resolution on resource mobilization in the text of the Decision 5, which is in DT/59, if we could go through DT/59 page by page. And when we get to the section where we have included the text from ‑‑ on resource mobilization from ITU and the Arab group, if we could pause and take a look at the text early, I think we could reach agreement pretty quickly.

With that, as we've done in the past, let's look at Decision 5 which we had a readout this morning that they met ‑‑ they had three meetings. And this meeting resulted in this document in DT/59.

So any concerns ‑‑ any objections to page 2 of DT/59? All right. No objections.

Any objections to page 3? All right.

Any objections to page 4? Thank you, very much.

And page 5 at the top it was where it starts with 5, to develop an ITU‑wide financial resources mobilization strategy to address the need for additional funding to meet organizational priorities and present to the Council for review and guidance on implementation. That is the text that has been agreed to by ITU and from the ITU contribution and the Arab contribution. Any objection to including this Item Number 5 here? All right. I don't see any objections, to the remainder of page 5?

Page 6?

Page 7?

Page 8?

Page 9?

Page 10?

Page 11?

Thank you. DT/59 as a whole, any objections to approving? Thank you. DT/59 is approved. We will send that to the Com 4. That's awesome. Okay.

Switzerland, you have the floor.

>> Switzerland: Thank you, Madam Chair. A large part of the applause here are addressed to you and the Secretariat for the excellent work. I would just like to draw your attention to the fact that the tables in an neck 1 may need to be updated by the Secretariat following the discussions in the group on the strategic plan and Resolution 71. But I'm very pleased that Committee 6 has approved our document DT/59. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, very much, Switzerland. Yes, you took the words out of my mouth actually. Alassane and I discussed this ‑‑ today's Tuesday? Monday. That whenever the strategic plan is approved, the tables may need to be updated. So it's approved noting that there will be some editorial changes to the tables and DT/59. So thank you for that.

All right. Now, Nabesh in United Kingdom can we talk about the text that was agreed that you were coordinating on side events, please. You have the floor, United Kingdom.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. I got overly excited and started recapping a little too early.

We made some progress. We had an informal consultation. As I said, the informal consultation included representatives from the US, Canada, UK, Ireland, Czech Republic, UAE, and Saudi Arabia. We discussed an alternative text to what we had discussed in the morning of the Committee 6 session. I believe that's up on the screen.

However, the outcome of the informal consultation reads that the potential reference of a side event output document, if any, in the outputs of ITU conferences assemblies or meetings shall be subject to the great or adoption by all Member States.

We concluded that informal consultation with the expectation we would still need to consult with the regions. So I leave it in your hands Chair, for how to proceed. I have had consultations with CEPT and we have proposed amendments to this text that I can either provide now or when you open the floor for more general comments. It's as you please. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, very much. So colleagues, the text is on the screen. Secretariat, can we only have the text that says Committee 6 recommends that the Plenary adopts the following text, because that's the text under discussion. If we can just put that text on the screen please.

I would note that I understand that this text was emailed around. And we need to ‑‑ I would like to have comments on this text that I would request the Chair of the Plenary to include in the Plenary minutes. So the text is open for discussion.

United Kingdom, anyone else, any other delegates wishing to take the floor?

United Kingdom, you have the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. As I said, we had consultations with CEPT, and we returned with concerns regarding the end of the sentence which reads subject to the agreement or adoption from all Member States. We would suggest to change this to subject to the agreement or adoption by, and we would change all Member States to these conferences, assemblies, or meetings. And the reason why we're proposing this change is to actually bring it in line with the rules of procedure for whatever these conferences, assemblies, or meetings may follow.

We believe the wording reflects the consensus‑based processes that is the norm which we seek to uphold like WTSA, WTDC and EPP. On consultation we resides the language all Member States isn't clear, and it may raise a number of questions. Does this imply we need to subject these references to a vote? What happens if a member state is not present at a conference or meeting?

So on consultation we recognized that there are fundamental concerns here, and the changes we're proposing would not have any change to the meaning or the value of the statement, but would bring it in line with the rules of procedure. Thank you.

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

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Madam Chair, good evening, colleagues. When we brought the session and we worked together with the distinguished delegates, we should have as an agreement as to the text. When they said I need to consult with the Arab group, people said, no, this is an agreed text. Let's stick to the agreement. So I would ask my colleague from the UK to keep the agreed text. Otherwise, we cannot agree to this right now. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So the question I have is that the subject to the agreement or adoption by all Member States, is that the agreed text? Okay. All right. I do have a question, and it's the same question that I asked Nabesh. The text by all Member States, does that imply that the Member States that are attending the ITU conferences and assemblies, or is it implying that all Member States of the union have to agree, because I'm not sure if all Member States of the union attend conferences and assemblies. That was a question that I had when I read the text.

So I will ‑‑ that's a question I would like delegates to think about when they're looking at this text.

Secretariat, can you please not cross out all member states and put both in square brackets, please? I would like to close the floor, close the list. I have Algeria, Saudi Arabia, United States, Kenya, United Kingdom. Ireland. All right. So my last speaker will be Ireland. I have Algeria, Saudi Arabia, United States, Kenya, United Kingdom, and Ireland. So my last speaker will be Ireland.

Algeria, you have the floor.

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Madam Chair, and good evening, all colleagues. I have question here on this text. I think as far as I've been engaging with the Arab group in drafting the resolution. I think here we are about mentioning the reference of side event outcome document in the output of ITU assemblies conferences or meetings. I think the intention of the draft resolution as drafted is the output document itself that needs to be agreed by members. But here the text is looking to reference in these output documents. So it's about the reference of these output documents need to be agreeable by all Member States and not the documents themselves, the output document themselves.

I'll hand over to my colleague from Saudi Arabia on this. Because I didn't participate in the drafting of this committee. I'm attracting attention first. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Algeria. I would ask while we discuss this, the statement, as I understand it, is a compromise by the proponents of ‑‑ based on our discussion this morning. And the only potential issue here is the last statement all member states. That's what was agreed. I understand after consulting with the CEPT, the question is these countries ‑‑ these conferences, meetings and assemblies. I ask that we not reopen this, and really try to focus on the last part of this text and making sure that we are being consistent with rules of procedure.

So, Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. Just to answer your question, of course, should be subject to the agreement or adoption by those member states attending conferences, assemblies, or meetings. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. But I think we could can find a way forward. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think just in the spirit of the conversation that we had, I think as the intervention with Saudi Arabia, that was the understanding. I think the term all Member States, when we were doing the consultations, it was a little confusing about what that implied when I think the understanding was that when we were going to these conferences, meetings or assemblies, it needs to be agreed by the rules of procedures of those conferences by those attending. Perhaps that proposed fix by the Saudi Arabia could work member states attending the conferences, meetings or assemblies.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. That's what I was going to propose as well, by Member States attending these conferences, meetings and assemblies. That's what Saudi Arabia has included here. I think that fixes the text.

Kenya, you have the floor.

>> KENYA: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I need to apologize in advance, because you guided earlier that we shouldn't open up any other areas other than the last few words of this statement. But Madam Chair, all of us would be involved in implementing this text. And my point is that our understanding is that what needs to be subjected and agreed at the subsequent conferences over output of side events, is the output from the side events that should be subject to, you know, approval? Because the way this sentence is drafted, if we are talking about output from the conferences, those are given anyway. They would be subject to the approval of the various conferences.

So I am a little bit confused as to what exactly we are referring to, if we're talking about output practice the conferences? Those outputs are naturally subject to approval by the conference. I was expecting perhaps input from the side events that the are subject to the conference approvals before they proceed. I thank you. I apologizing in advance for bringing this confusion. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kenya. We will park this. But that comment for now. United Kingdom, you have the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you very much, Chair. I think the way forward as proposed by Saudi Arabia and as echoed or stated by the United States, I think what we're seeing on the screen works as a way forward. Thank you.

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

>> IRELAND: Just to repeat with the UK, we would agree with the approach suggested by Saudi Arabia what was on the screen is fine from our perspective. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Ireland. Just a question back to Kenya. My understanding of the rules of procedure is that if the ‑‑ if a side event ‑‑ it's up to a member state to submit a proposal to the conference with the output of any ‑‑ that could potentially include the side event output. So it couldn't come into the conference unless the member or Member States submitted the document into the meeting. So approved by the conference, assembly, or meeting itself.

So I believe that this covers that possibility. But I'm ‑‑ if it doesn't, please help me to understand. Because I'm not sure I'm following. Thank you.

UAE, Algeria, and if I could actually have Kenya first. Then I would like to close the list on this issue. Thank you.

>> KENYA: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Just to further elaborate the concerns that we have. If we look at the real case example of this is that the side event was held during WTDC. It produced an output document that then went into the conference discussions. And I think that is where concerns were raised, whether those outputs should even be considered by the conference.

So I thought that our ‑‑ the understanding was let the conference look at the output from the side events, first of all, to see whether this outputs should be placed as part of the issues before the conference. Because if wasn't (Audio breaking up) and then we say the output is subject to the, you know, decision of the conference or the Member States, of course that goes without saying. So that means there is no value added in the statement.

So this is where we're coming from in terms of just understanding the proper context of this statement. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Kenya. United Arab Emirates, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: We thank all of the colleagues that engaged in this informal discussion in trying to reach consensus on this very important topic.

We approve ‑‑ we agree on what is in front of us in the text. Once again, thank you, everyone, who was there to help. And we also support what our colleagues from Saudi Arabia mentioned. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE. Algeria, you have the floor.

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. Again, I'm sorry. Coming back to this paragraph, I think the main point is looking to the output document of the side event and not the approval of reference in them or not. So I echo my colleague from Kenya that is the purpose. I don't think the way in which the paragraph is being drafted why the reference in the side event needs approval. The most important is the output document. I echo my colleague from Kenya, Madam Chair. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Leagues, I would really encourage everyone to accept this compromise text and including the reference in the Plenary minutes. I guess I'm still confused, because we are asking to approve side events. I'm not sure that ‑‑ there is no process for approving side events. What I do know is that there is General Rule 17, General Rule Chapter 17, paragraph 82 that if an output of a side event that's coming into the conference, it would need to be submitted to the Conference Chair and then added to the agenda. Therefore, if we ‑‑ if a Conference accepts that output, then the General Rules would apply.

I guess I'm doing the mental gym gymnastics in trying to understand here. I'm sorry. I continue to look at the General Rules and I think the General Rules here covers what we're trying to do.

I would encourage Com 6 to accept this summary as a path forward. Thank you. Any objection to this text? I don't see anyone objecting, so it is approved. It will be submitted in my report to Com 6 with the request to the Chair to include it in the Plenary minutes ‑‑ minutes of the Plenary. Thank you very much.

Now, I have ‑‑ I ask Kari from China to ‑‑ if you could please introduce the text. China, you have the floor.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Madam Chair. After the meeting this morning, I have coordinated and communicated with other delegates to come to the current text on the screen. First on the suggestion of the United States, we have deleted with input from the Secretary Advisory Group. Second, we have also made modifications to the time of session of counsel for receiving this report.

We have finalized 2024 in order to give more time.

Third, in the last part we have added at the very end of this paragraph inter alia, the activities of regional and area offices. The fourth modification is changing applicability into implementation.

These modifications have duly reflected all the comments from all delegations or administrations. Here I submit this final text to Com 6 for your consideration. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Com 6 colleagues, I put forward this text that was coordinated for your consideration. I would say that it includes all of the interventions that were made this morning. So if we did accept this text, and it will be included into my Com 6 report and the Plenary will implement it into the minutes of the Plenary. So any objection to this text?

All right. I don't see any objection. This one is approved. I'm also approving by gavel, the side event as well. Thank you very much.

All right. We are ‑‑ now we're back to Resolution 71. DT/14 Rev. 7 is the text that we're looking at. So can I turn to Frederick? Frederick, could you give us an update on your lead ‑‑ please give France the floor.

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll briefly report back to you on where we currently are on this Resolution. We organized a new informal meeting this afternoon. From that it clearly came out that none of the options on the table, neither Option 1 or Option 2 were a possible basis for reaching consensus. Therefore, we would have to look for alternative solutions in order to facilitate compromise.

Therefore we used the time that we had in order to Sharafat adopt consultations. That allowed us to make more progress in looking for alternative solutions. Unfortunately, we immediate more time in order to identify which of those proposals would be an acceptable basis to begin a drafting process for contributes. Therefore, I would like there to be an agreement so we can continue our consultations, and as soon as possible launch a drafting process.

I do hope that we will be able to very swiftly be able to submit to this conference a proposal based on consensus. Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Frederick. I think I just have a couple of questions. Of the options that are included in this text, I understand that option A is the closest to the text that was ‑‑ that most likely has general support. I won't say support but has general support. This text and as I understand from talking to colleagues it's closest to the text that was approved by WTDC and it's included in the action plan. Is that my understanding first? Frederick? France?

>> FRANCE: Yes. I would say that proposal, today is probably the most promising. But unfortunately after new consultations which were conducted at the very last minute, it appears that unfortunately not all the regions are on the same page, and that therefore we can't launch a drafting process yet until all of the regions have formally given their agreement to start that drafting work. Because we need to clearly identify the proposal which has the greatest chance of facilitating consensus. As I said, earlier, I do have a hope we will get to that point very quickly. That's why I would like to ask your permission to get a bit more time so that we can identify which of those proposals would be the most acceptable basis to launch the drafting. And then immediately after that, we will be able to launch a drafting process and be able to submit to the conference proposal on this Resolution 71. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Frederick. So, colleagues, we've all document DT ‑‑ Rev. 7 strategic plan included here. I am sure that Com 6 does not want to ‑‑ we all want the next four years with the strategic plan that we can all agree to.

I guess my question here is, which ‑‑ with the understanding that option A may have the best chance of reaching a conclusion or consensus, can we have a discussion here? I'm hesitant to send a document back to the drafting group where there is no clear guidance as to what proposal we should be drafting from.

So my question here is, can we all agree that we're going to go with option A, which is closest to what was approved in Kigali at the WTDC, and work from that basis that we're going to work to come to reach consensus on our strategic plan?

The floor is open. Saudi Arabia, you have the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Madam Chair. On behalf of the Ad Hoc Group, we thank Mr. Frederick again on his effort plus Dr. Sharafat. The proposal was (?) by Dr. Sharafat a few days ago. Did not enjoy the full support of more than one regional group. So we didn't believe that starting from the Sharafat proposal is a good starting point, even taking with what was agreed in the WTDC something different than what should be agreed to by the Plenipotentiary Conference. At the bigger conference deciding on the strategic plan for the whole Union. What was in Kigali with more focused eyes on development aspects. Where here we're looking at a wider angle.

Therefore, the Arab group made a compromise yesterday to avoid using such language which is not, I would say, in line with other colleagues. And we suggested to use the wording building confidence and security of WTDC in cybersecurity. I believe this is common language that we used in the ITU and we continue the work that we started with Mr. Frederick and the Council working group.

We want to avoid last minute changing last minute amendment to a very structured document. So let's not break that document. Let's replace the wording cybersecurity with building confidence in security and call it a day. Let's not start a new process, a new rush in a strategy document. Thank you, Madam Chair. I remain at your disposal. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED KINGDOM: I think the intervention we've just heard demonstrates that we're not quite in the right place yet for moving forward on a single option. So I do think, Chair, we probably do need more time in informal consultations as my colleague from France says. So I would support not trying to do this now on the screen but rather having more offline discussions. I think we can move forward hopefully quite soon. Thanks, Chair.

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

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I want to support the intervention just made by the UK and also just noting I think as Saudi Arabia was saying, we've had some informal conversations, but I don't think we've landed quite yet on a single way forward to use as a base. But I do think the conversations that have been had are getting us a little closer. I think we all do believe that there is ‑‑ we know that the strategic plan is an essential outcome in the Plenipotentiary Conference and believe that continuing through some of our informal discussions will allow us to make sure we wind up with a consensus way forward. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I would like to close the floor on this discussion. So I have Algeria, Iran, if you would like to be in the queue on Resolution 71, please do so now. I have Algeria, Iran, UAE, Canada. The queue is closed. My last speaker on this will be from Canada to make a way forward. Algeria, you have the floor.

>> ALGERIA: Yes, Madam Chair, thank you. So we would like to thank Dr. Sharafat's efforts in trying to bring the views in this very important exercise. I think, Madam Chair, for the time being, yesterday we had Vice Chairs of the conference meeting. And we have tried to look to the regions on what we can do in terms of the current situation, specifically for the square bracket around the thematic priority on cybersecurity.

I think through you, Madam Chair, I think there is a need for regions to talk to each other on this particular aspect and including in considering the all remaining issues, because there are other aspects that need consideration along with strategic plan. And we are counting on their willingness and cooperation through the remaining days in looking how we can really achieve consensus, not only on strategic plan but all aspects.

And we are happy to do the engagement, Madam Chair, in the remaining few ‑‑ today and this evening we will talk with other regions and look for further Cadillac raising, Madam Chair. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I want to intervene here for one second. I'm hearing a lot about packages and I'm hearing a lot about compromise and consensus. I would like to say that Com 6 we have worked together collegially, we have reached consensus on very difficult issues. I don't see our resolutions as part of a package. So I'm really concerned when I start hearing that our documents or resolutions are part of a bigger package. Because I don't look at it that way. I look at it as one single ‑‑ we have a job to do in Committee 6. And I would encourage all administrations, all delegations here to look at it that way as well. We have different committees. We have Committee 5, we have the Plenary. We have working group 6. Working group 6 ‑‑ Committee 6 has a job to do. Our job is to approve a strategic plan, as others have stated, in what represents the entire Union. I would encourage and I am asking that we look at our resolutions that we have to get through in our Committee as separate documents, separate tasks, separate objectives, not as a package.

So that is my request. Iran, you have the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Allow me to thank all distinguished colleagues for their utmost accommodation on trying to achieve consensus.

Madam Chair, a few days ago in order to find a solution, of course in the Ad Hoc Group we had discussions. It was clear to me that the house was divided. And the proposals on the table at that time that were submitted to the Conference were not really ‑‑ could be considered as a basis for compromise.

In order to bridge the gap, I put on the table a third proposal which in my judgment included important elements in both proposals. However, that proposal was not accepted by all administrations, by all regions.

And today, after your guidance, Madam Chair, we reconvened, we had other meetings. I have floated their ideas to bridge their gap and move forward on this.

My understanding is that some regions need more time for consultations. As such, my request to you is that maybe it would be better if you grant us more time for further consultations. And as my distinguished colleague from France who is chairing the Ad Hoc Group said, we hope to be able to move closer to a consensus and bridge the gaps.

Madam Chair, as you know, this is a sensitive topic. Discussions have been ongoing for more than a year on the topic. And we are at this stage.

So my request to you, Madam Chair, is that if you can grant us a little bit more time so that if regions can have thorough internal consultations and get back to us with their positions, we hope to be able to move to consensus.

Madam Chair, I think we have ‑‑ at least I have a procedural question to you which is this is your last Committee 6 meeting. Further, drafting on Resolution 71 would have to commence after your meeting today. So could you please elaborate on what would be your way forward? Do we expect to have another meeting of Committee 6, or are we going to report to the Plenary? So your clarification on this could be very helpful. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Iran, Dr. Sharafat. So, yes, I have asked the Chair of the Conference if we could have an additional meeting. However, I've asked this request. What I want to make sure that we are making progress. And I don't feel like this afternoon that we made progress.

I feel like we are still in our separate corners of a boxing ring, and we are not moving. So I am happy to grant an additional time to the Ad Hoc Group, but I want to make sure that the instructions that we give to the Ad Hoc Group that we're focusing on one proposal. I've heard ‑‑ we have three different proposals. I heard another proposal.

So as Frederick has indicated, it is very difficult to draft text when we don't ‑‑ we can't agree on what we are drafting.

So before we move to that point, I would like colleagues to think about that.

So I have United Arab Emirates, and then Canada, you have the floor.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: We would like to thank Dr. Air fat and those that worked on this Resolution. We know this is an important Resolution for the conference for the ITU, because it is giving to the ITU for the coming four years for their work and starting their KPIs.

We know about the importance of this Resolution. And we will support all upon way to approve this Resolution and your committee. In that regard, Madam Chair, we would really like to get the approval here in the meeting by today and support whatever that my colleague from Saudi Arabia has mentioned, especially that if we know that cybersecurity word has already been used in this Resolution 71 and the existing one. So we're not coming with something new.

And we hope that the Conference can agree, and we can move forward. Thank you, Madam Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, UAE, for that. Canada, the last speaker on my list, Canada, you have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I won't take too much of your time. I want to echo what our colleagues from UK and the US had said as well as Mr. Frederick Sauvage and Dr. Sharafat. We've had numerous conversations and informals, a variety of options on this. But still no optimal consensus. So we would kindly like to request additional time. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada. So what I would like to do is ‑‑ what I'm hearing is there needs to be additional time. As someone who once said to me, don't try to force a circle into a square peg. I'm willing to grant additional time for the Ad Hoc Group to meet tonight. I would request that you meet tonight and come back to the next ‑‑ I received approval for another Com 6 meeting. You come back to the Com 6 meeting with a document that has been agreed to by all regions.

Also please take into account some of the comments that have been made today regarding cybersecurity. I'm guessing the title of Resolution 130 as well. Frederick ‑‑ you're not leaving the Conference, right? So you're good to continue to Chair? Okay. France?

>> FRANCE: Thank you, Madam Chair, yes, I can continue and put all my energy along with those in ensuring that we achieve a compromise. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So please look to the screens for the monitors for the next meeting of the ad hoc on Resolution 71. I will assume that ‑‑ I'm not sure when Plenary is going to meet. And we may have a Plenary meeting, and then we may have a meeting of Com 6. But I would recommend that you have a meeting tonight. And then you take the 8:00 slot and have a meeting then, so we can at least have something to discuss in Committee 6 tomorrow.

With that, that is my proposed way forward. And if that is accepted, that's what we will do. Thank you.

We are going to find a room starting at 7:00. That means that you can all get some time to get dinner and meet at 7:00.

All right. And then we started Com 6. I know that the working group of the Plenary was continuing. The only other outstanding document is ‑‑ documents are Resolution 2 and Resolution 77. So I would like to ask is there any movement on Resolution 2 and Resolution 77?

I've heard some rumors, but I'm hoping that there's movement. All right. Colleagues, let's try to get some movement on Resolution 2 and Resolution 77. I will reach out to the different regional groups to try to understand what the issue is and see if we can find a solution here. All right.

Well, again, please have a good evening. The Ad Hoc Group on Resolution 71 will be starting at 7:00 and will also take the 8:00 slot tomorrow morning. I look forward to seeing you all bright and happy tomorrow morning or tomorrow afternoon. Thank you very much. I appreciate you all. Have a good evening. Bye‑bye.

(Event concluded at 17:10 EEST)
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