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>> CHAIR: Good morning to you all. Welcome to the Ninth Meeting of the Working Group of the Plenary. Today we have our time from now until 12:30 where we take a break for two hours and resume for another hour and a half, and that will be our final version. We received 89 proposals from the Plenary, and I am happy that we have on our agenda today, with everything that was worked on reporting back.

We will take the opportunities of today to make the most to the plenary, and I very much ask for your kind cooperation. Let me draw your mind to ADM/40, agenda for this morning. As we have on our screen. And now I open the floor for comments. I see Russian Federation asking for the floor. Russian Federation, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman, and good morning to my colleagues. My statement is going to be on the agenda and document 72. Yesterday there were informal consultations in the course of which we once again had an exchange of opinion and attempted to reach consensus. As you know, however, if there is no agreement in informal consultations, the informal consultations cannot conclude with any one‑sided agreement.

We have seen document 72 this morning and we see that it does not actively reflect yesterday's discussion. There seems to have been some odd changes made to it. We would like to ask the Secretariats either to bring it in line with the decisions taken yesterday ‑‑ in other words, the text currently in square brackets should not be taken out ‑‑ or we suggest that the document be removed from the agenda for this morning and that it be deferred for consideration at the next session of the meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation. Any other comments? I see no one. Czech Republic, you want to react to this as our Chair for the informal consultation. You have the floor.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Yeah, good morning, everyone, and thank you, Mr. Chair, for the floor. And thanks to the Russian Federation for raising this issue as the first one before it could have been reached following the agenda of the meeting as proposed, because the document as provided to the Working Group of Plenary actually does fully follow the outcomes of yesterday's meeting.

The informal group was not able to achieve consensus. And if I were allowed to start presenting the document as promised yesterday to the informal group, it would be included in my report to the Working Group of Plenary and its distinguished Chair. Because the document is at the moment unfortunately not presented as an agreed document by the informal group, but as its Chair proposal on the way forward.

We were required to, as much as possible, not have square‑bracketed text in the document. This task has been done, not by consensus in the informal group, but at the last point as a decision of the Informal Group Chair and I promise that every region upon ‑‑ (Zoom video frozen) ‑‑ it was not possible to decide.

So, to sum up and not to consume more time, the document as put forward reflects fully the outcome of the meeting yesterday. It's not an agreed group proposal; it's the Chair's proposal for the way forward. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Czech Republic, for your response to this. I see Russian Federation, Jordan, and Iran asking for the floor. We are asking for comments on the agenda. Russian Federation, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. And I'd like to thank my colleague from the Czech Republic as well. He's done a great deal of very hard work on this. However, he may have tried a bit too hard, I think. We would insist that the text in square brackets remain, because it was there at the end of the meeting.

Informal consultations are held only in order to try and take decisions by consensus. Yesterday, no consensus was reached, and therefore, removing or leaving that text is something that simply can't be done. We can't take this text out. That is our position, and we would very much insist that the text we're talking about not be removed, that it be in the text in square brackets. This is no more practice of Plenipotentiary Conferences. I've never seen before a document where there's been text in square brackets and it's suddenly disappeared and been removed. This is the first time I've seen this happen at the Plenipotentiary Conference. I don't think we should be doing this kind of thing. I think we should be following our normal established practice.

If the Chairman of the Informal Consultations wanted to present this version, then our practice says that should be done in another separate document and it should be entitled "Chairman's Proposal." Then, with general agreement, we could discuss that document. At the moment, we are asking that this document be put in order. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation, for your comments. I want to propose something, and then I don't know if the others will withdraw your requests. Our Chair for Informal Consultation, you indicated that there was no agreement at the informal consultation, but a document which has been posted now is the Chair's proposal. Can we also have from you the text which reflects where you were on the consideration of the New Resolution for Pandemics? We have time to go through the agenda, so, hopefully, we will have the two documents, and when we get to that end, we can discuss this together. Is this acceptable to the meeting? And would this allow everyone else to withdraw their requests? I see Iran asking for the floor. Iran, you have the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. You have seen our position, it conforms to help everybody. Distinguished Chair of the Informal Group from Czech Republic is close friend of mine. We have worked together for years. And I think that he is a very logical person.

Chairman, my experience in the ITU is the following: Normally, the views of the Chair would be submitted to the higher level when the document is presented, but not changing the content of it. There was no agreement when the Chair proposed that, with no agreement.

If the Chair has a solution for that, they could submit the solution to you. But normally, the views of the Chair is not in the output document. The views of the meeting would be in the output document, Chairman. This is the way that ITU works, and this is the way that I have worked 50 or 51 years in ITU, Chairman.

 I am not saying that something was done wrongly, but I think that the proper course of action is that the document with disagreement be submitted to yourself ‑‑ or your committee, not yourself, but your committee of Working Group. However, the Chairman may propose solution or solutions for that, within that solution or solutions is agreed by everybody, so far, so good. If not, I don't believe the views of the Chairman would be the vector for discussions. It would be a view of the Chairman submitted to the Committee asking guidance of what to do: Continue without any results or accepting the views of the Chairman. But it is not the output of the meeting. It just reflects the views of the Chairman. And normally, the committee or group does not deal with the views of an individual and so on and so forth, whether it's the Chairman or so on. That is the way.

I'm sure there has been no, I would say, negative connotation on that. Perhaps there was some sort of understanding. But if you put it in this way, I think it works better. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. And with your purpose of helping everyone, the Chair would need your help the most and from everyone with time. Everyone has very limited time. I want to give the opportunity for everybody to take the floor, but I want you to be very succinct. So, I will give the floor to Czech Republic for a response on my proposed way forward. Czech, you have the floor.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. And many thanks to our distinguished colleague from Iran, whom we know of course for a long time, and we have been through a lot of discussions. Every help will be appreciated, of course.

Just very briefly. If the question was, what is the last version of text agreed by the Informal Group, it very clearly is 87/52 without revision, the version without scrap records as presented to the Working Group of Plenary yesterday. And I understand if for some reasons, the revised version is not accepted by some and that we were asked to think out of the box, so this was an attempt to think out of the box. And if the Working Group of Plenary cannot accept it, my apologies, and I can draw it back and we come back to document DT/72 without revision, as for further discussion at the Working Group at Plenary. Thank you very much. And thanks, everyone, for all efforts put into preparing the text.

>> CHAIR: Right, thank you, Chair of the Informal Consultation. So, indeed, what we have in our agenda is DT/72 without a revision, as we have on our screen. So, with this, is there any objection to the approval of the agenda for today? I see no one asking for the floor, so thank you very much.

We can go to our agenda item number 3, which are proposals to revise Resolution 101. Internet Protocol‑Based Networks. I want to give the floor to Chair for the group on Internet for revision to Resolution 101.

>> KENYA: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, Chair, good morning, colleagues. Chair, we present Resolution 101 as you advised. I would like to thank our colleagues at the Ad hoc on Internet for the extensive discussions that we had. We did have quite a number of compromises that were reached. And following the discussions, Chair, we would like to report to you that we do not have any square brackets in this resolution, and the same is presented to your meeting for consideration. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your work and the output that we have so, we may want to reflect DT/77. Is there any comments on this document? Does it reflect the agreements that we had at the ad hoc meetings? Iran is asking for the floor. Iran, you have the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I congratulate the Chairman of the group. As far as I know, 101, 102, 130, 180 are among the difficult and sensitive resolutions. If the Chair agreed or succeeded to have something without a square bracket, congratulations. What else we can do? Chairman, Internet is a very, very sensitive issue, and the role of ITU, I'm very sorry, is almost limited to collaboration, cooperation, and so on and so forth. We are not decision‑making on those very issues, and thousands of the people voting outside the ITU. But since we have the resolution without, I congratulate. And I said that Mr. Bigi left this group and give it to a young person, very ably and competently did that, and the only thing that wants approved, we have to give a big round of applause to this distinguished lady. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Very well, Iran. You are kind. Sudan is asking for the floor. Sudan.

>> SUDAN: Thank you, Chairman. I should also like to pay tribute to the Chairman of the Ad hoc group that has dealt with these issues relating to the Internet. I'd like to pay tribute to her for the enormous efforts she's put in. At the same time, I'd like to draw the attention of all of us to the need to keep monitoring these issues related to Internet. I don't think they should any longer be separated from the other issues with which we deal in ITU. We've managed to agree on Resolution 101, but in our opinion, it would need to be revisited at future conferences. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sudan, for your comments and tributes. So, let me ask at this stage, is there any objection to the approval of Resolution 101? I see no one asking for the floor, so to everyone who contributed to this agreement, this is approved. I wish this continues to the end.

With such great feelings, let me call Madam Sharon again to take us on to the fourth agenda item and proposals to revise Resolution 133, role of administrations of Member States in the management of internationalized multilingual domain names. Kindly, your report.

>> KENYA: Thank you, Chair and colleagues. Once again, I would like to thank you all who participated in the Ad hoc group of Internet, and particularly in the discussions related to Resolution 133. We did have a wonderful discussion. It was long. It was also with a lot of spirit of compromise. I would most especially want to thank Ms. Dominique from the UK who did a wonderful job coordinating the informal discussions on this one and, of course, helped cut our time in half when it came to discussions in the Ad hoc group. Most certainly I would also not want to forget the great assistance we received not only through these discussions of this resolution, but also the rest of the work that gave us Chair with the help of the wonderful Secretariat who did a wonderful job guiding us as well. So, I would like to present you meeting Resolution 133 without any square brackets for your consideration.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. 133 as in DT/75. Any comments? On whether it reflects the agreements at the ad hoc meeting. I see no one asking for the floor. Is there any objection to the approval of the revision of Resolution 133, as in DT/75? I see no one asking for the floor, so thank you very much. Thank you.

We knew this would be very difficult, and just as Ms. Sharon said, we thank Ms. Dominique for the head start in some of these informal consultations, right from the very informal meeting, had the challenge to consult on some of these Internet‑related resolutions, and we are happy with that; it brings us these results which is acceptable to everyone.

Now we move from the Internet to the fifth agenda item that is to revise Resolution 205, ITU's role in fostering telecommunication/information and communication technology‑centric innovation to support the digital economy and society. I want to give the floor to my Vice Chair, Ms. Inga, to give us updates on the outcome.

>> Vice CHAIR: Good morning, colleagues. I'm sorry, this is a virus of ad hocs, so I'm really sorry for my voice, but I will try to be as loud as possible. Just to remind you that yesterday our distinguished Chair asked once again to go to the informal discussion as proposed by our colleague from Iran. Unfortunately, we couldn't get any substantial new arguments and couldn't find any new way, so the decision was taken in the group that we delete all of the square brackets that were left.

And also, we agreed that regarding the two mentioning of the same document, the resolution of WTDC in Kigali, we will just leave the first mentioning recalling C. So, as regards to this work that submit you DT/55 Revision 1 without square brackets ‑‑ there were eight cases ‑‑ and also with deleted additional reference to the document I just mentioned. So, this is the main outcome of our work.

And also, one more option was discussed at the informal ‑‑ at our informal group ‑‑ is the possibility of having recommendation of Working Group Plenary and the initial text is presented to you as DT/79. So, also, there are some discussions on the text, so Mr. Chairman, we managed to work without eight square brackets, but I still present you one document with square brackets. So, with this, I finish my report. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your work and the outcomes. Those will help for us together. Let me invite Vietnam for a response on this. Vietnam, you have the floor.

>> VIETNAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning to you and to colleagues. And thank you, Madam Chair of the Informal Group discussion. Yesterday we have intensive discussion again to find the best way forward regarding the remaining square brackets, particularly on the digital platform.

So, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to highlight that the importance of new, emerging telecom, ICT, and digital technologies and services for time being, particularly for developing countries. It is very, very substantive need for those developing countries. So, we also find the best way forward, and we would appreciate the distinguished colleagues from CTEL and CPT to kindly consider to provide the draft of recommendation. So, the IPT also have some internal consultation, and we could go along with the proposed draft recommendation. So, with that, I would like to highlight that our best way forward is that we can go along with the draft recommendation for further consultation so that we can, how to say, to move forward with your guidance how we can clear the square brackets. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Vietnam, for your response. I see Iran asking for the floor. Iran, you have the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I admire the pursuance and elements put behind this work by our distinguished colleague from Vietnam. Everybody appreciates what Vietnam is doing. However, Chairman, let me share with you my experience. The recommendation, Chairman, of the committee or Plenary, very real in the output of the Plenipotentiary Conference. However, if there is agreement by everybody for the recommendation with the soft language ‑‑ soft language ‑‑ which satisfies everybody, that today there is no clear understanding of digital platform, but the consideration of that, any type of recommendation with soft language, does not have any difficulty under provisions that everybody agrees with the very short, I would say, very short recommendation; or, Chairman, something that we may be appearing in the minute of your group, but we are open for both of them if everybody agrees. I don't know, your distinguished Vice Chair, whether she has already prepared agreed draft recommendation with soft language that everybody agreed.

Chairman, we are also in the business of telecommunication for years but this digital platform ‑‑ I have seen many platforms, but a platform for launching a satellite, platform and so on and so forth, digital ‑‑ it's good. Two words. But we have to see, Chairman. I'm sorry, I gave you an example. When you say "salt," salt in (?) language is (word in non‑English language). The color and the combination has nothing to do with salt. So, we have to be very careful. But once again, we are working on consensus.

If we agree with that without any difficulty, we have no problem, but maybe I don't know whether there is a draft recommendation with soft language and everybody agrees. But Chairman, you don't have time. Just you don't have time. I'm sorry, I said your committee because they send it back ‑‑ I said, "No, Mr. Chairman, don't send it back." We should do it editorially and so on and so forth. That thing about the so on and so forth, so, I am just seeking favor. Chairman, I'm very sorry, this is my personal view. We are proud of you, Chairman. You are a fantastic Chair, really, and you have fantastic collaborators and so on and so forth, Ms. Sharon and distinguished Vice Chair and so on. I'm very happy to see. And I continue to see this consensus continue to the Chairman. Do we have an agreed recommendation with soft language that we could agree, I would say as soon as possible or not? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your kind words. Indeed, you are within three minutes, which is the way to go, and for your kind words of encouragement. Yes, our Vice Chair has DT/79 proposed as a recommendation as part of the document submitted. We may want to reflect on that.

I see India asking for the floor. Then we will get back to the conversation on this. India, you have the floor.

>> INDIA: Thank you, Chair. Let me congratulate the very hard work done by our colleague from Vietnam. He's constantly putting his arguments put forth. It does have merits in what he is presenting. Of course, we could not come to the consensus, so we support the views that in whatever the possible soft language we can put to make a consensus so the work item can have some sense even after our PP. So, I think that would be a way forward. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: All right, thank you, India. So, having listened to Vietnam, Iran, and India, and the request to look at what text we have for the recommendation, can we open up DT/79 for the Vice Chair to take us through the text? DT/79. Please take us through.

>> Vice Chair: You see this is very short, short recommendation, just inviting the proponents of multi-country and Asia‑Pacific contributions. This Working Group Plenary recommends to the Plenipotentiary Conference to address this in the study groups, relevant study groups; so, namely, ITU‑D Study Group where the additional platforms may be considered further. So, this is general initial text, as I said. This is not also agreed by all of us, but I think that the colleagues that participated in the group meet also have some text, but this is what came from our discussion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I see Iran asking for the floor. Iran, you have the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Can I proceed?

>> CHAIR: Yes, please go ahead.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Thanks to the Vice Chair. Thanks to everybody. But I think from the format does not fit that you're referring to the multi-country, specific country. The issue is quite simple. I have seen that similar topics in many conferences, whether treaty‑making conference, like Plenipotentiary, or a report conference like WTSA, WTC, RA. Simply, Chairman, we need one sentence in the middle of Plenipotentiary Study Group. Why is instructed, not to say instructions, that's all. We cannot refer to multi-country. We cannot refer to specific country. This is not in the form of the Plenipotentiary procedural aspect and so on and so forth, but the soft sense is valued. I can show you several examples of that, that the Plenipotentiary Conference invite or instructs, whatever you put ‑‑ perhaps instructs because it's higher level ‑‑ whether you put it a specific Study Group or whether you instruct the ITU‑D, the relevant Study Group of that sector study the matter and I think there is nothing wrong with that. This is, Chairman, the practical way to do that. It is not difficult to do that. It is very simple. Just editorial. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. Are there any other comments before I make a summary and a way forward on this? United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, colleagues. We have much appreciate, and in fact, we were involved in the last‑minute efforts yesterday to come up with this proposed text. However, as indicated by the complete square brackets, we ultimately cannot support any text that would imply endorsement of ITU activities with respect to digital platforms. As we've seen extensively throughout the informals and ad hocs on this subject, there is a complete lack of consensus as to what we mean by "digital platforms" within the ITU. There is no clear shared understanding what this means in the context of the ITU's scope and mandate.

The main justification we've heard is that digital platforms help foster innovation in the digital economy, but this is already the entire purpose of Resolution 205, and clearly included in the existing text. And so, we believe that the revision of Resolution 205 as agreed in DT/55 Revision 1, has already successfully resolved this issue in the only way that could achieve consensus, and we do not agree with the inclusion of this recommendation in your report. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Any other comments I want to take? All comments, I want to close this list. I see South Africa, Niger, United Kingdom, Iran. Any more before I close the list? India. Any more? Vietnam. Algeria. Any more before I close the lists? The list is closed on Vietnam.

South Africa, you have the floor.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, Chairperson, and good morning, colleagues. I think we would just like to support the suggestion from Iran for simple inclusion that speaks to the proposal from Vietnam. I'll keep that intervention short, Chairperson. I think this would be the easiest way to go forward. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, South Africa. Niger.

>> NIGERIA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I want to say that we have participated in the ad hoc groups, and I believe, or we strongly believe that Vietnam has compromised significantly when it comes to this resolution. They came with a draft new resolution. We attempted to have this draft new resolution in Resolution 205. We couldn't have it in Resolution 205, and now we are left with a draft recommendation. In the spirit of compromise and in the spirit of, in order to encourage what Vietnam has been doing, and because there is also a Study Group that already has digital platform as part of its mandate, I would encourage colleagues to please look at this and allow us to have this draft new recommendation. Thank you very much, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I heard the voice of Nigeria over Niger, so that's for the record. I suppose because the seats are limited, you took the Niger microphone. United Kingdom, you have the floor.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair, and thank you, colleagues, for the comments that we've just heard. For CPT, we also have some concerns about the current text that's on the screen, but in the interest of compromise, we have a suggested edited version of this, which we can propose. And if that meets with approval in the room, then that would be a good outcome. If any edits are proposed to it, I fear that we will be back to square one without the ability to agree on a text here. So, with your permission, I'll read, or ‑‑ the Secretariat has a copy of this.

>> CHAIR: No, for now, United Kingdom, I'll get back to you later. All right, thank you. Iran.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Asking listened to other colleagues that might have difficulty, but I tried to put something in a soft language. Either, preferably in the minute of the group in plenary or elsewhere, instruct, and then you instruct which sector. I understand people want to instruct ITU‑D, but the issue would be to consider the topic of an inverted, comma, digital platform, closing bracket, comma, in its relevant Study Group with a view to address its meaning and scope of application in the activity of, whether it is ITU‑D sector or other sector, Chairman.

This, I think it fits with the ITU activities, does not discourage Vietnam and any other people, does not have any harm. We want to understand, what does it mean. We want to know the scope of application. And we extract relevant ITU‑D understood from the people of the Study Group, Chairman. If that text that I put that I suggested, I don't know whether someone could put it on the screen or not, satisfy also the United States and others and satisfy Vietnam that the topic is not totally rejected, but people need to embark on that to understand, what does it mean, what is the scope of application, and what is the duration with activities of the ITU, Chairman. This is just by way of suggestion to finish this work and not to have any deadlock on the situation. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. Before I give the floor to India and others, I want to explain, because United Kingdom attempted to give us a text, and then Iran as well. I haven't had the opportunity to have lunch with my Vice Chair, and probably the time is this one, in that we all sit together with the various text that has come in on this draft recommendation. We could do that at lunchtime together. So, this could be a proposed way forward, that we take our lunch break and work on this particular text, so that for the various versions that we came and we can consider without taking much time of this Working Group of the Plenary. And I give the floor to India to proceed. India, you have the floor.

>> INDIA: Thank you, Chair. I think we support your way forward, so I don't want to take further time.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, India. You're kind. Algeria.

>> ALGERIA: Yes, Chairman, thank you. Again, we support your way forward. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Algeria. Vietnam.

>> VIETNAM: We do support your guidance. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, again. So, the list we had ended on Vietnam. Thank you very much. And any others who are requesting the floor will withdraw. So, the way forward for us on agenda item 5 is for us to take our lunch break to consider what we can have for the recommendation on this particular matter. Thank you very much. So, this is deferred for the tenth meeting of the Working Group of the Plenary.

I see Papua New Guinea asking for the floor. Papua New Guinea, you have the floor.

>> PAPUA NEW GUINEA: Thank you, Chair. This isn't to delay consideration at all, just to clarify a misunderstanding or mishearing that I had yesterday and to confirm that the contribution on Resolution 205 was, indeed, an APTACP. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I see, United States, you want the floor. United States. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a question for clarification. And of course, we respect your way forward to have a lunchtime discussion with respect to DT/79. Will we still be moving forward with approval of DT/55 Revision 1 at this stage? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States. Usually I ask the questions, but today you're asking the question. My response will be an example for us all. I will say, yes. So, I bring it to the meeting that, can we go to DT/55? And consider it for approval. Is there any objection to the approval of the text as we have in DT/55, revising Resolution 205? I see Vietnam asking for the floor. Vietnam, you have the floor.

>> VIETNAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't have the objection to go with your guidance, but I would like to seek your clarification that we do have the majority to support. We will have the recommendation of your Working Group, together with the adoption of Resolution 205. Thank you. Just seek your further clarification on this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Vietnam. May get to your point. Iran, you have the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thanks to Vietnam for his comment and pursuance of his. But Chairman, I don't think that it is appropriate to link them together. If you want that the people have a little bit more flexibility on the text of recommendation, let's just approve the document as you propose. Once it is approved, we are not rejecting the proposals of Vietnam, but in fact, everyone supports the Chair, whether you spend much of your lunchtime on this or not, that is up to you, but I think that we should disconnect these together. We are not taking the approval of this document as a hostage of the other one, Chairman. I don't think that is a good approach. I don't believe that. We had that in ITU and we did not agree with that, and we tell them, please, kindly, don't leave them together. Let us see what we can do for you.

We all have a good feel to what extent we can agree with the text of that recommendation, whether UK wanted to propose, I don't know, or whether they are proposed or the Chair propose, but let the Chairman. I strongly suggest you proceed with the approval of this document and then spend much of your lunchtime with your Vice Chair and any other person you may need to involve. Maybe you don't ‑‑ maybe you want to involve someone else or you don't. That is up to you. But let us separate that, Chairman. They are independent. This is not a good way, because that would put a bad practice in ITU, Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. Indeed, that lunchtime you are heavily involved because you have the text, just as United Kingdom and others who are interested. So, I will ask the question again: Is there any objection to the approval of Resolution 205 as containing DT/55? I see no one asking for the floor, so Resolution 205 as revised DT/55. Thank you very much.

We move on to the next agenda item, and that is proposal for a new resolution, role of telecommunications/ICTs in mitigating global pandemics. We had quite some comments on it before the approval of this agenda, but let me invite the Chair for our Informal Consultation from Czech Republic to take us through one more time on this. You have the floor.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. And as presented already at yesterday's Working Group of Plenary, the document has been discussed quite a lot of times at the level of the Informal Group. The starting point was with four initial contributions, and a lot has been put into merging these contributions to provide a compact and concise draft new resolution on the role of telecommunications and ICTs in mitigating global pandemics. I think that generally, the outcome is of high quality, and I would like to thank all of the members of the Informal Group, as well as our support from the ITU Secretariat for all of the work done.

As mentioned in the beginning of today's meeting, there remain some square brackets around some pieces of text, which is proposed to be put in the resolution as a reference to the language used at the level of WTDC and/or WTPF and/or ITU‑D Study Groups. This proposal comes mainly from one region with support by another one. There are three regional organizations which strictly oppose including this text, but as the agreement was not possible to be reached at the level of Informal Group, I would kindly like to ask the Working Group of the Plenary to lead that discussion because as per interventions made by the Informal Group members, the proposal flows from instructions of higher levels of their delegations and their regional organizations. So once again, many thanks to everyone contributing to the work of the Informal Group, and I would like to go, and I'm happy to follow the discussion happening here on this proposal, on a draft new resolution, which is meant to reflect the need of further ITU activities in this field. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Chair, for informal consultations, kindly take us through the specifics and what happened. I see that considering, as in square bracket, what was the consideration, and for the other places where there were disagreements, so that we could know what the situation is to address them. Please go ahead.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. As you say very precisely, the first pair of square brackets is in the proposed considering paragraph. According to yesterday's discussion, it seems to me that this photograph can be agreed upon. And if there is no further opposition, the square brackets here can be removed very easily. And then ‑‑

>> CHAIR: So, can we ‑‑

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: And then all the other ‑‑ oh, pardon.

>> CHAIR: Please go ahead.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Then all the other, and I believe it's six times through the text ‑‑ it's in the preamble and then also in the executive part of the resolution, namely, the part resolves and then further in the instructions ‑‑ there is a broadly accepted language in terms of telecommunications/ICTs. But with further request, to additional wording, saying mainly, new existing and emerging services and technologies, and in several parts, including also digital services. And this is a point which could not be broadly accepted within the Informal Group.

So, with all trust in you, I would like to ask ‑‑ I mean, in you, the Working Group of the Plenary ‑‑ I would like to ask you to provide your opinions on these additions. So, to sum up, considering, to my understanding, can be accepted very quickly, and then it's six times throughout the text with the new additional wording which needs to be considered by the Working Group of the Plenary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So, just for our reconciliation, beyond considering, I see recognizing D, recognizing further B, resolves 2, resolves 3, invites the Secretary‑General, and then invites Member States. So, yes, we are aligned. I see India asking for the floor. India, you have the floor.

>> INDIA: Thank you, Chair. In the considering part, I have a very small editable change, if permitted here. If we go with the language, typically when we deal with the pandemic, we already have very bad experience, and putting the word like "future pandemics" gives an impression that, okay, we are sure and we are going to have the similar results. The future word could be striked out and we may write "other pandemics" in place of the "future." It's just a suggestion, chair. "Future" replaced by "other" pandemics. Because "future" gives a fear in the mind of the people. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, India. I know why you don't want any pandemic. If it was not for a pandemic, you would have hosted the WTSA. So, yes, definitely we don't wish for another pandemic after surviving this one. So, we want to consider for difficulties with this particular text as we have. The Chair is saying that we are amenable to accept the removal of the square brackets around "considering." Is there any objection to this? I see Romania asking for the floor. Romania, you have the floor.

>> ROMANIA: Thank you, Chair. I believe that the work of the ad hoc has been with great results, and we don't need this additional text in the square brackets, so what we would propose is to delete the text in the square brackets. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Your proposal, we don't consider Opinion 5 of WTPF. Okay, thank you. My question was quite different. My question is, is there any objection to we removing the square bracket to consider Opinion 5, which is on pandemics, from WTPF? I see no one asking for the floor, so can we remove this? Thank you very much for your understanding.

This work is not done. Six places that we have other square brackets. If you are considering Opinion 5 from WTPF, how well can we contextualize it at the various sessions of this draft new resolution, as to whether we are using WTPF text of new emergent technologies and services, or we are keeping telecommunications/ICTs. That is where I see the differences are.

So, I will plead again with you, please, take it as a lunchtime to our further consultation that because we've considered WTPF Opinion 5, what else can we miss, and it is very relevant to be included from many of the square brackets? And I suppose that this would be our very last attempt on this going forward.

I see United States, Russian Federation, Brazil asking for the floor. United States, you have the floor.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you, Chair. And I'd like to thank the other delegates for the discussions that we've had in the Informal Group on Pandemics. I would note, however, that in the discussions within the Informal, there is not such a connection between the language of the WTPF or the inclusion of "considering" on the WTPF opinion and the remaining parts that are in square brackets, so it's not clear to me that including the "considering" within the draft resolution would then reopen or create a different space for us to have further conversations. We've had several hours of discussion on these points already, and I'm not sure what further discussion will yield. Obviously, we are in your hands, but I just wanted to make sure that was clear. Thank you.

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

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. And thank you for giving us the floor. We are also grateful for the proposal to work a little further on this document in the course of our lunch break. However, it does seem to us taking into account how much time has already been spent on discussing this particular draft resolution, that those lunchtime consultations are probably going to be superfluous.

The issue of terminology we already dealt with at the first session, I think, of the Informal Consultations, and the question still has not been settled. The reason for this situation, I think, lies, basically, in the fact that in the Working Group on the document have not been able to reach consensus on the inclusion or the reflection somewhere in the text of technology. We've tried various types of wording, whether we're talking about emerging technologies or technology in general, but despite the fact that we've had editorial proposals, despite the fact that those proposals are in square brackets, we have to follow the approach with references, et cetera, with working groups in the development sector as we did, indeed, in Kigali.

And there's also the references to the results of other conferences. These references and the fact that this work is part of ITU work was not sufficient to reflect the aspect of the ITU's work on technology. I would like to understand, what is the basis for a considerable part of the work being done in ITU not being reflected in the document? Without reflecting the aspect of the use of digital technology, emerging technologies, et cetera, it seems to me that further work on this resolution is simply not possible. We cannot set aside or not refer to the amount of work being done on emerging digital technologies, particularly in the context of discussing the question of a pandemic. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation. Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair. I want to point out the group to one specific aspect of Opinion 5 of WTPF in that it invites Member States one. I remember these discussions on new and emerging technologies, and we ended up in the process of discussions crafting a term, which is "new and emerging telecommunications ICTs services and technologies," which is in invites Member States 1 of Opinion 5. Just as information for the group and to the consideration of these discussions that will happen. This somehow was discussed in the WTPF and this could be something to consider in that context. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil, for your help. I see sector member. Who could this be? Okay. We can go to South Africa? Sector member ‑‑

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you.

>> CHAIR: CPT? I wanted to be sure that that position is being taken by a Member State. So, if you could kindly get to a member state position to ask for the floor. Let me propose a way forward for those who are requesting for the floor. In the feedback I get is that you want to consider this on the Working Group of the Plenary and not go back to any further informal consultation. So, I want us to quickly go through the document, if that is acceptable to you, and we see how best we can do this. We would allow everyone else to withdraw so that we can go through the document. I see Iran and I see Czech Republic. And I see Russian Federation as well. Iran, you have the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, chairman. I almost always support the Chair. Always. But if at some time you want to also listen how a previous outcome of any ITU activities could be reflected in the resolution, I have a proposal. I come to that later on. But ‑‑ there is one "but." Decision 5 of Plenipotentiary 2018, Decision 5, in annex to that, the first item is, we should avoid duplication of works. We should not start something new and so on and so forth. That is another issue. I am not saying included, but another issue. Once you get to that, then you come to the referencing, I have a suggestion for referencing. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. Czech Republic.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I'm very sorry that I was not sitting at the right place before, but I would like to speak for CPT and come back to some of the previous comments regarding the resolution in general and then the references.

First of all, we had a long debate in the Informal Group, and we had one real consensus there, and that was the consensus that we want to have this new resolution touching this important topic. And this is something we think that this group should also consider when trying to go forward.

Another thing was that ‑‑ and there, we couldn't find a real consensus, but we still hope we can come to it, and this was the very well agreed language at the Plenipotential level, and this is the telecommunications/ICTs, where we think this reflects perfectly the ITU's remit and mandate, and talking about the role of telecommunications and ICTs to help mitigating the global pandemics. We really know what we are talking about, all of us, and that's why we wanted to stick to this language, not because we couldn't talk otherwise, but because we are at the Plenipotential level here. And that's why as CPT, we wanted to delete all of the remaining square brackets, while accepting to keep the text in "considering" where the square brackets have already been removed. So, this was what our clear proposal, and we think that it would help us to have this very important new resolution. Thank you.

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

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Once again, thank you for giving us the floor. Yes, all the participants in the informal consultations, which were held under provision of coordinators agreed that we need such a revision. I also confirm that is the coordinator of the ICC, because we prepared proposals for the development conference, too. Some of them were not discussed there but brought to the Plenipotentiary Conference. This shows what we think, that this is a very, very important topic. Experts from our region have also spoken frequently on this issue. Like the colleague speaking on behalf of the CEPT, I would like this text to go forward without square brackets.

Now, on the issue of terminology, this is always difficult, as we know, for ITU, because sometimes we don't always have definitions for the key topics we are talking about, and sometimes there are disagreements about working documents. We had experience in the Telecommunications Development Conference and we came up against terminology there also, and terminology issues, if you remember our experience there and the practice that we've had in the WTPF over years has, however, helped us usually to reach consensus.

On future work on this particular resolution, it seems to us that we can use in the text the term which was agreed by consensus for the Kigali Declaration and which was referred to by the distinguished colleague from Brazil, who has been coordinating a lot of our work in this area. So, our proposal, where we have square brackets, is that we do not look at each of the provisions individually, but that throughout the text, we replace the text in square brackets with new and emerging services and technologies, telecoms and ICTs. I'll repeat this in English so that you can understand. New and emerging telecommunications, ICT services and technologies. I think that is a way of moving forward, and I think it would help us to agree this text here, if possible, in the Working Group of Plenary. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation. My apologies. I want us to move forward. So, we will go to the text, and then we can consider.

We go to “recognizing,” D. And here I'm asking questions. Is there any objection to recognize the promotion of the adoption of digital technologies in helping to mitigate the effects of COVID‑19 pandemic, as well as future pandemics? Is there any objection to this? I see Czech Republic and United States. Czech Republic, you have the floor.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm sorry, I wanted to come back to my previous intervention and make it absolutely ‑‑

>> CHAIR: Czech Republic, I will plead with you. You had your ten. Let us move forward. We heard you. And my question is very clear: Is there any objection to recognizing the promotion of adoption of digital technologies in helping mitigate the effects of COVID‑19 pandemic, as well as future pandemics? Please give Czech Republic the floor, if they want to answer.

>> CZECH REPUBLIC: Yes, thank you. We object for CPT to keep this text. We clearly want to delete this text and all other text in square brackets. We wish to delete it throughout the text.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: To keep it short, I would join the previous speaker in saying, yes. And we also would like to see the remaining text in brackets deleted. Thank you.

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

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. Australia would also like to support the comments from colleagues from Czech and the U.S., and that we don't support the additional text in square brackets. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia. Iran.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chair. I would need to be kindly informed whether it is objection to this term which has been used after two years of discussions and the outcome of that was applauded at WTSA Geneva, or the place of that. Chairman, we have to understand that sometimes putting something "recognizing" may be too strong. We could address the same issue with other part of resolution, which is not in "recognizing," Chairman. Recognizing is the most strongest before operative part. So, we should be careful when we should recognize something. I have no difficulty with it, but I said that whether moving the entire "recognizing" D to other parts of the resolution make a difficulty.

Distinguished Delegate of the United States was one of the vocal point in the WTPF, very kindly advised and commented to everybody. We appreciate the distinguished from the Czech Republic, although the distinguished lady I don't remember. But my question is, is it a problem to remove this to the other part of the resolution, Chairman? We cannot continue this discussion. This was agreed in Kigali. This was agreed in WTPF, and we don't want to come back to something that we have already agreed.

And Chairman, the problem is that putting in the preamble part, if it is not in the results part, the same text does not make any hard, Chairman. Let's not continue our disagreement with this other, Chairman. Once again, we have to respect the consensus and we have to continue to do that. So, my question is that for those three delegations, on other they come to that, whether they could agree to move this text from as well the “recognizing” part to the other part of the resolution, except if the “recalling” should not be in the “recalling” part, but other part. Maybe considering, noting, and so on and so forth. But the removal of that totally, Chairman, is not a good thing. If some country for them is not important, for us it is important, Chairman. We have suffered a lot because of from the pandemic. We have various problems and difficulties and indicated the sanction. Various problems. Millions of the people suffered, where other people were sitting quietly, Chairman. So, we should be very careful to each other. We should understand each other. So, my humble question is, while I maintain my neutrality, that whether that is a possibility, to move that to the other part of the resolution? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. I now plead with everyone. We have 12 minutes to close this meeting. We have a number of agenda items to consider. I would prefer that we go through all of them. So, if you can help me. So far, if there is enough objection to the proposal to include this text in square brackets, that's why there is no consensus, so we will strike that out. And indeed, what I got from the submissions was that anything left in square brackets we can agree to it. There is enough objection to this. So, as we can report to the Plenary everything else which is in square brackets now should be struck out.

So, we go to recognizing D, further, B. We go to resolves 2 and 3. Those two, yes. Invites SG, Secretary‑General. And invites Member States. Thank you very much.

Russian Federation, you are asking for the floor. You have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Chairman, thank you. I've actually been seeking the floor for quite some time. I was getting a little bit worried you wouldn't want to listen to my comments anymore. Anyway, if I understand correctly the approach which we are following now is that all the text in square brackets is to be removed, that, despite the fact that a lot of it has already been used before and been included in official documents of the UN and including the Kigali Declaration, including mandates for Study Groups, et cetera, we're going to remove this text, and that is going to, I think, deny the work done and the contribution that we might want to consider when we're working against a pandemic. Have I understood your approach correctly and could you clarify me in my understanding? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation. Let me take Vietnam and South Africa, and Vietnam, you have the floor.

>> VIETNAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sorry, I'm very young in the union, so I would like to refer one of the most experienced, distinguished, Mr. Arasteh. He already talked about the merging issues, with the critical issue of the pandemic the last two years. In global situation, we faced a lot of difficulties in working, in learning, in recovery. So, for the technical and ICT, I think there is a very long history.

ICTs also have not defined yet, but now we have the new emerging technologies, like AI, IoT. It's not defined under the ICT or telecom technologies. So, in terms of the critical pandemic issue, I strongly support that we should not eliminate the term telecommunication/ICT itself, would not be clearly identify all of the technology support, the members in recovering, in mitigating the issue of the pandemic. So, with that, I would like to support on the term that the ITU should also have further consideration for the time being. This also refer that Mr. Arasteh mentioned that the digital technologies is not the new in our union. So, I would like to seek your consensus to move forward for the important and critical issue of the pandemic. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Vietnam. South Africa.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Just following on to the comments of Vietnam. I just wanted to check if consideration was going to be given to the alternative proposal, referring to new and emerging telecommunications/ICT services and technologies? That's the first question I wanted to raise. But I also wanted to just request the opportunity, with your permission, Chairperson, to make an announcement on the subject of lunchtime meetings, because I didn't want our colleagues who have been working very hard on cybersecurity to feel left out.

>> CHAIR: All right. Thank you very much.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: With your permission, I'd make that announcement, Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We will consider that. I see a number of other countries requesting for the floor. To respond to Russia and to everyone ‑‑ when we are given proposals to consider, you recognize that some proposals, we present them here. Others, we refer them to ad hoc group meetings. Our expectation was that the reports from these ad hoc meetings come were agreements and not disagreements. We've had a good number of them coming with agreements. We are on our last day and due to constraints, we have to deal with what is not agreed.

It is decision time for us at this Working Group of the Plenary, and decision‑making is by consensus. And then people ask, what is consensus at ITU? In a situation where, if there is enough support, what will then be enough support, I gaze any proposition. That is the lack of consensus. So, we've had that in this room.

When I asked the question for us to help in the decision‑making, and it is a standard to comment, because I ask for comments, and then I note these comments, and I give opportunity for these comments to be addressed. We don't go back to comments when we are at decision‑making. From the submissions made so far, any other thing in square brackets in DT/72, from "recognizing" onwards, it's not something that can be upset by CPT. I go from United States and Australia, which is enough support that there is no consensus on the text. And for this reason, it is reflected as such on the document.

So, we, again, we are limited by time. We have three minutes to close this particular meeting. So, if everyone will accept, we can move ahead with the agreement on the text as we have now to the Working Group of the Plenary. Is this acceptable to everyone? I see Cuba, India, Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Korea, Czech Republic asking for the floor. And this is supposed to be done in two minutes. Cuba, you have the floor.

>> CUBA: Thank you, Chair. Given the time that we have left remaining, I'm not going to be lengthy. In the ad hoc group, we had the opportunity to present our criteria. This is not only a drafting issue at play here; but I think that the resolution should remain "emerging technologies." And the services for technologies within the resolution do not address all the hopes and expectations that we're looking for. Therefore, we would say, it's not a question of technology, including in the Ad hoc group when we discussed at the beginning, we were addressing to find solutions to the terminology in that we didn't accept technology in the end. Cuba would like to reiterate, once again, in the interests in the resolution that emerging services and technologies, which is really what is required and not just use telecommunications/ICTs. Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Cuba. We have less than a minute. And interpreters, I wouldn't want to ask. I want you to offer.

>> INTERPRETER: Yes, of course, Chairman, we can give ‑‑

>> CHAIR: To be able to listen to India, Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Korea, so that when you run out of the time, it is not because the Chair refused to call you. But it's because others before you denied you any minutes to speak.

>> INTERPRETER: Chairman, we can give you ten further minutes, certainly, with pleasure.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. You are very kind with ten further minutes, but that means half a minute for everyone. India, you have the floor.

>> INDIA: Thank you, Chair. Our submission in the whole case is, first thing we should not disregard the already taken decisions, unless there is a reasoning valid to counter it. We had been using, as discussed by South Africa that they had the terminology, WTC had the terminology, so there's no reason why it can't get repeated. Otherwise, it looks like we want to move in a direction wherein our earlier decisions are going to be concerted, so all the decisions we taken in the document becomes invalid, or we take them valid. So, privately, we can go with the balance that wherever necessary, we can have the references there. Yes, if all the places are not suitable, at least for the two or three places I feel that putting emerging and the new technologies is very much important, especially related to the access and connectivity. Because otherwise, the ICT and the telecommunications are inclusive in a generic difference. But whenever the difference is specific to providing the access and a connectivity, and we are not talking of the new and emerging technology that I'm not sure whether the telecommunication or the ITU has the feature at all. Because ultimately, the union is working for fostering of the interoperability standards, development in the telecommunications. So, which development we want to forget by missing these terminologies? Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, India. You're speaking for four countries. Iran, you have the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I won't repeat what my distinguished colleagues from India and previous mentioned. Chairman, it was mentioned that one region and two countries opposed to the retention because there is no consensus, but the others are opposing the revision. It is not also consensus. Why not we soften the language? Use another language? And that would be in the view, comma, to the extent practice, comma, take into account. Chairman, we have to find something to satisfy everybody. You said one meaning of consensus. I have another meaning, from African countries I mention that consensus means that sometimes I don't agree, but I can live with that. Thank you.

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

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. I'll be very brief. I think that the best way forward would be to strike a compromise, not using "digital technologies," but we could use the term "new and emerging technologies," as we have done in other documents. And we are not in agreement to strike out the text within square brackets. Thank you, Chair.

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

>> DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and good morning to all colleagues. On behalf of the republic of Korea and APT countries, we would like to align ourselves with the previous colleagues from Australia, CPT, and CTO. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Korea. I see Japan, Russia, and Brazil now. To close the list on Brazil. Japan, you have the floor.

>> JAPAN: Thank you. We also join in Korea, with Korea and Czech Republic and so on. We believe that a simple solution that just remove the text in square brackets and keep it short and simple would be the best way in the situation in order to move forward. Thank you.

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

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you for giving us the floor again, Chairman. Having listened to the discussion this morning, I get the impression that a way of moving ahead would be to use the terminology agreement on which we've already reached. Can we then make a request to the Secretariat, perhaps? Could you reissue the document using "new and emerging technologies, ICT services and technologies" in square brackets throughout the text, and that way, we could review it at the next session under your leadership and see whether we can agree with the text using that term? We can have an exchange of opinions on that. And if we can't reach agreement, then I imagine we're going to have to leave it there with the discussion of this document.

I do have also another question, if I may, on the way in which we're working. We've seen in the timetable and ad hoc on 130 there has been no indication that that has been removed from the agenda of this meeting. So, could somebody explain to me, please, what are we doing with that particular document? Are we looking at it during the Working Group of Plenary, or are we sending it to an ad hoc? If the answer to the latter is yes, then that should perhaps have been mentioned when we agreed the agenda of this meeting earlier this morning. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation. Let me take Brazil where we ended off. Brazil, you have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chairman, for giving me the floor. And good morning, everybody. Good afternoon, in fact. So, maybe, I believe we should try to use language of WTPF would be a good way forward and maybe put this on record so we can decide. We see that we have the promise that right now the brackets talk about digital technologies. This is very wide. And the current task with records is only communications ICTs, the current technologies. So, maybe a way forward would be to use "current, new, and emerging technologies," so we can cover what is already reflected without the brackets but also some language from WTPF.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. So, to respond to the request from the Arab Group Chair on Cyber for additional time and also to Russia, we had the rest, the remaining resolutions to consider on this particular agenda with the hope in that we would conclude our meeting by now. That was very optimistic. But our fallback plan was that for every resolution where there are still disagreements, that we had the lunchtime as an opportunity for each of them to go back to work at discussions and to come back here in the second session with agreements, ultimately. So, we started with that. And kindly, my Vice Chair has agreed to work further on the recommendations when it comes to digital platform.

When a similar approach was proposed for the consideration of the pandemics, what I got from the floor was, no, you want to consider that in this meeting, and it has taken more than half an hour of our time, because now we say we want to reconsider the text, moving things around. That we cannot do here, unfortunately. So, I will bring it back to you again and request that, would you want to take this up during the lunch break? DT/72. Our Chair for Informal Consultation is ready and has given me a very good sign. Would there be any objection to continuation of discussions on DT/72 and for it to come back to the next meeting? I'm asking for objections. And in fact, if I get more than a country objecting, there is no consensus, and so, we have to make a decision here. So, I'm asking for objection for continuation of the discussion during the break. I see China and I see Iran and I see Russia. China, you have the floor.

>> CHINA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I listened to attentively to many delegates' intervention. We move that "emerging technologies" is the most inclusive term. We believe that in this resolution, the discussion concentrated on emerging technologies.

>> CHAIR: I'm asking if there is objection for the continuation of discussions on DT/72 during the break?

>> CHINA: We agree with continuation of discussions.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Iran.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Certainly, we support the continuation. But in the last proposal from Saudi Arabia, "new and emerging technology" ‑‑

>> CHAIR: Iran, I will beg your time. Because we've borrowed time, we have been over a minute. My apologies to the interpreters. They are now on a standup priority, offered us ten minutes and we are 11 minutes into that. So, I'm asking if there is any objection for the continuation of discussions on DT/72? Russian Federation. Is this an objection?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. Thank you for giving me the floor. We have no objection to the discussion of this document. However, that is a discussion which we think should carry on in the Working Group of the Plenary, because the format of informal consultations has already, I think, been exhausted. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So, so far, I have only had the Russian Federation saying they would prefer the consultation ‑‑ or the discussions in the Working Group of the Plenary. That is noted. But for all others, they were ready to continue. So, I will speak with our Chair for informal consultation. Please carry on, and I hope that you can get some agreements. And if there are any words to change, digital technologies to new and emerging technologies, whichever way, into ours, we will definitely consider this document in the next session. So, I hope this is acceptable by everyone.

We have run out of time. I see a number of countries. I want to close this meeting by giving guidance on the way forward on what we have left and possibly for the next session. We will consider revision to Resolution 139, the new resolution, revision of Resolution 102, and then proposals to revise Resolution 130, who is starting work, continuing their work during the break. I still see South Africa asking for the floor. I hope it's on 130. Please go ahead.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Yes. Thank you, Chairperson. Just to briefly state that we are meeting in Avram at 1:00 on cybersecurity Resolution 130, until the resumption of the Work Group of Plenary. Thank you, Chairman and colleagues.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I don't know if the Secretariat has any announcement? Right, no announcement. So, to thank our interpreters. My apologies again. Thank you all for your kind progress that we've made. We hope to come back at 2:30 to continue. Thank you very much. The meeting is closed.

(Session concluded at 1244 EEST)
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