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>> Recording in progress.

>> CHAIR: Good afternoon. Welcome back. I hope we all made some progress during the break. Welcome to the 10th meeting of the Working Group of the Plenary. Our agenda is ADM-42. You may refer to it. We will consider proposals revised Resolution 139, consider proposal for any resolution. Proposal to revise 102. And then proposal 130. And then we will consider the proposal for recommendation from the group on innovation. Then we will get back to the proposal for new Resolution on role on telecommunication ICTs on pandemics.

Is there any objection to the agenda of ADM-42? I see no one asking for the floor, so thank you. We have agenda approved.

May I invite Mr. Abetu to take us to Proposal Resolution 139. We have had it here before and I will give you the opportunity to update us. You have the floor.

>> Thank you, Chair. You gave us the task to revisit the two brackets that were outstanding on recognizing C instructs about DT/14. We had the session yesterday for around three hours and a half, four hours, and we exchanged a lot of views. We tried several alternative texts. But, unfortunately, at the end we still have divergent views.

Just to recall the topic that is contentious up to this plenary is regarding certain groups in the context of digital divide and how to address them and how to support and coordinate efforts for their inclusion. And references to women and girls, youth, disability, elderly, persons with disabilities and persons with specific needs, this list is in the center of the discussions and there are views to not have this list. There are views to keep this only in the operative part. There are views to keep this only in the preamble and there are views to not have this list at all.

So, this is the status that we have. We had a frank and open conversation yesterday. And we tried several times. But we still have these pending items.

And I think colleagues do know where we stand. And we are here to see how we can address this going forward. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for the updates on revision to Resolution 139.

I see Bosnia has a government action for the floor. You have the floor. Is it a mistake? Okay. Thank you for this mistake.

The sense we get from the chair of the BR group that we are undecided on, one, the text, and, two, where we place it.

So, if you can help, if you can go back to it again. We have a recognizing, recognizing C. And then the instructs BDT, director 14. That should be a correct. Let me make an attempt at recognizing C.

Can we end at digital literacy and related skills. Is there any to recognizing C at skills? I see no one asking for the floor? Kenya is, actually, requesting for the floor. Kenya.

>> KENYA: Indeed, we object to any related to skills. The digital content and the rest is included. Thank you.

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

>>

>> UNITED KINGDOM: THANK YOU, CHAIR. AS THE UK: We would like to -- particularly the reference to certain groups. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom. I see Australia and I see Romania and I see United Arab Emirates and I see Russian Federation. I want to close the list on this one.

So, please keep them coming. I have Australia, Romania, UAE, United States, Russian Federation, New Zealand, Argentina, Saudi Arabia, Canada, Thailand, Sweden, Poland. We are less close on Poland. Thank you very much.

Australia, you have the floor.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. I would like to offer Australia's strong support in retaining the text in square brackets. Without us the text, being knowledged is the first step to inclusion. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia.

Romania.

>> ROMANIA: Thank you, Chair. Just to support what was stated by my distinguished colleague from Kenya, UK and Australia and he on behalf of CPT, we support the inclusion of this text and we think it's absolutely necessary in order to close the digital divide, this is what we need to acknowledge, first of all. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Romania.

United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon, everyone. In response to your question about this paragraph and following the numerous discussions that we had within the ad hoc group, the Arab Group had proposals to select an idea around why this paragraph was used, namely, the causes of low utilization when it comes to digital literacy. It mentions certain groups. In our view, this is an overly broad concept and is not clearly defined. This is why we agree with your proposal, namely, stopping at related skills. That is on behalf of the Arab Group. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Arab Emirates.

United States.

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and good afternoon colleagues. To briefly answer your question, we fully support the inclusion of the text in brackets and do not support the deletion of the text in brackets. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon. We fully support your proposal, namely, to stop at the words "And related skills." We are also concerned that the digital dividend is something we understand as a social and technical term. We, therefore, agree with your proposal. And I wish to take this opportunity to ask how will we resolve this issue given that we have a divergence of views and we have spent several hours discussing this at the ad hoc.

If there is no compromise, to my recollection, any text in square brackets is then deleted. That is the procedure. We would like to hear more from you about that, Chair. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation. New Zealand.

>> NEW ZEALAND: Thank you Chair good afternoon to you and to the evening. Wishes to support the colleagues from Kenya, the United States, Australia and CPT in retaining text that is currently within square brackets and highlighted on the screen. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, New Zealand. Argentina.

>> ARGENTINA: Can you hear me? First of all, we wish to thank the Chair of the Working Group of Plenary. Thank you, sir. And we also wish to that I Roberto for heading up the group. Worked a lot on this proposal. We debated it for many hours. And I would like to draw your attention again to the fact that we are at the Plenipotentiary Conference, which is the most important event of the Union where we steer the work of the Union for the next few years. The objectives. And we need to work to ensure that we comply with the objectives of the Union.

And those very objectives that today are reflected in the Strategic Plan from that period and we have objective 2, which is sustainable digital transformation, where we have to encourage the equitable and inclusive use of telecommunications and ICTs, in order to empower people and society for sustainable development. That is the text.

Now, we need to be coherent and consistent with that work. This is a text that already exists in other resolutions. So, we are really struggling to understand why we have to debate this for so many hours, because we are talking about a text that is already reflected in other resolutions. And we often use this argument we don't have to repeat it. We have to streamline text. And that is not correct. Because this is not just any text. This is a text that reflects the fact that we need to achieve the goals that we have set for ourselves. This is a text that we have to repeat.

Sometimes it's good to repeat texts. And this is the only place in this resolution where we are reflecting these types of specific vulnerable groups, women, girls who suffer from the digital gap, in all areas, whether it's connectivity, weaknesses in the use. So, that's the argument.

This resolution is entitled "Use of telecommunications and ICTs to bridge the digital divide and build an inclusive Information Society." Build an inclusive Information Society. So, we are reflecting a reality, which has been studied in the reports of the Union itself that are reports published by the Union itself that reflect the digital gap that exists between these groups and we are simply just reflecting this in an appropriate text that deals with the digital divide. And it already exists in other resolutions.

So, we propose -- rather, we oppose the elimination of the text. We believe it is very important to reflect this text in here. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Argentina.

Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon to everyone. I think to find a solution to this text we need to know what the purpose is. The purpose is to strengthen broadband connectivity for all without going into details which might cause problems when it comes to connectivity. This is why we agree with the UAE and the Russian Federation that the text should stop at "related skills."

We believe we do not need the rest of the text to guarantee broadband connectivity, as broadband connectivity includes all groups. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia.

Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair. To be belief, Canada fully supports our colleagues from the UAE, CPT, Kenya and others in favor of keeping this essential text in this resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Canada.

Thailand.

>> THAILAND: Thank you very much, Chair. I would like to join many speakers before us to support the maintaining of the words in the bracket. We see the name of this resolution and we saw two key words here, which is digital divide and inclusive Information Society. And we think that it is important to highlight the fact that when we talk about digital divide, the inclusive society, we should as well address the vulnerable groups, which, I think, it is what that rest of the world and general people in the world are focusing right now, and it will mislead if we delete the text in the bracket. So, therefore, having said that, Thailand think it is the most important meeting of the ITU and it will be important that we highlight this very important key words in the bracket.

And having said that, Thailand would like to support to maintain all the wording in the bracket. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Thailand.

Sweden.

>> SWEDEN: Thank you, chair. I would like to echo the sentiments from Argentina, UK, U.S. and Thailand and others that Sweden supports the inclusion of this text in brackets in this clause. It is of absolute importance to recognize these groups in order to effectively close the digital divide. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sweden.

Poland.

>> POLAND: Thank you, sir. Good afternoon Distinguished Delegates. The ITU PP is the most important conference of the ITU and we think we should send a clear message to all delegates and all membership. And we strongly support to retain this very inclusive proposal and very inclusive text in this resolution. So, I would like to add my voice that, the voice of Poland's, too, all delegates supporting the text here for the resolution. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. We ended the list on Poland. So, make a summary and then we have a way forward.

Obviously, every proposal to this conference has support. Because they came through us either multicountry proposal or regional proposals. And even if it was from a single country, support is requested and definitely given before we proceed on discussions.

So, these arguments were had by the group. But if you look at recognizing C as a stance now, it looks like a mathematical equation of many brackets. In sessions of disagreements, various.

In this conference, it's about agreements. And at a point in time, it has to be called. At this stage with our limited time, I will encourage you all to direct this meeting, we send our agreements forward.

As for this reason, I will suggest that we strike out from availability to people at C and we move on to instruct BDT14.

I see Qatar and Iran asking for the floor. Is this an objection? Iran, you asked for the floor. Please give Iran the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. If there is agreement by everybody that immediately follow your suggestion to delete that text, we have no difficulty.

But should still there be some difficulty, take into account that we are divided, we should look how we could address the objective of the text which is currently green. In my view, it could be achieved by putting it, in considering document as it is indicated refer to other document, other in the same issue, and you reflect part of that dealing with different groups, with or without the content and local content. Because availability of content in local content, Chairman, content in local content, I don't know what -- whether it is something missing or no. Once again, if everybody agree with the deletion, we have no opposition. If not, it would reflect or capture that part of that in the opportunity and I think everybody now is pushing for its own position but you have to have some sort of agreement. We cannot continue that up to the end of your meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. So, can we go forward? I still see Qatar, Paraguay, United States, Kenya and Bahamas. Is it any different from your position of support for that text, which is to be deleted? If it is -- that is the case, as we have for this meeting, even such a text was not supposed to come to this meeting. So, for us to be able to consider the pass of this resolution, will you accept that we move on? I see Paraguay, United States and Kenya still requesting for the floor. Paraguay, you have the floor.

>> PARAGUAY: Thank you, Chairman. Of course, we could strike out the phrase as you proposed. But we have forgetting Resolution 70-1 of the United Nations. In addition, we would be losing sight of SDG 5, which is to achieve gender equality and to empower all women and girls. Just by way of conclusion, Chairman, I wish to underscore that it's impossible to close the digital divide if we don't focus on the right people. Thank you, Chairman.

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

>> UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We do not wish to question your way forward. However, we would like to reserve our right to revisit this after we discuss the operative clause. We feel that until that time, it would be premature to make a decision as to the deletion of the list in this clause. So, respectfully suggest that, perhaps, we may retain these brackets and, instead, entertain a broader discussion with respect to the operative clause. Thank you very much for your consideration.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United States.

Kenya.

>> KENYA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We respect your decision on the way forward. However, Chair, we would like to request humbly that if you could let us know the basis on which you reach your conclusion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Kenya.

Bahamas.

>> BAHAMAS: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon, colleagues. We do not want to not support the wishes of the Chair. But I think it's important as a representative from a small island development state, these issues magnified and are more difficult to address than in more developed countries.

We strongly urge the reconsideration and at least to keep the focus on the groups that were listed. It is our position that should we take the spotlight off certain vulnerable groups, then we lose the opportunity to fully embrace the ideals and objectives of the ITU, particularly as it relates to bridging the digital divide. And I concur with a lot of the sentiments expressed previously by other member states in support of keeping it specifically the focus on the group's most vulnerable to be disadvantaged when we speak about digital divide. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Bahamas.

So, I see a number of countries asking for the floor. You have already taken the floor. I want us to move to the instruct BDT director 14 and see what we can do with that operative part also in this agreement.

So, this text is to continue to support and coordinate efforts to connect women and girls, youth and vulnerable groups, indigenous peoples, the elderly and persons with disabilities and persons with specific needs.

Can we take off the square brackets and have this new text included in the resolution? Is there any objection to this proposal? I see United Arab Emirates and Russian Federation. United Arab Emirates first.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you very much, Chairman. On behalf of the Arab Group, once again we would like to thank you for your efforts to lead this meeting towards a compromised solution.

Now, as regards the issues in this document, the points that are being debated and, in particular, the square brackets, we have a very precise opinion in the Arab Group on the square brackets. And further we have been able to reach compromises on other issues. We were able to do that last week. We reached delicate compromises.

We have also accepted engaging in an additional negotiation session for several hours and our only objective was, as Mr. Aresteh, to achieve a sense of Bucharest consensus. So we have several proposals in the Arab Group, and, thus, the proposal presented by Russia, too, so that in this text and in the previous text, despite all of the efforts and all of the time devoted to our work, we haven't been able to reach any consensus on this text between the different groups despite all of our efforts.

So, Chairman, we would like to propose that the group moves forward striking out the text we don't agree on. Because, indeed, this resolution covers the essential idea about providing necessary coverage to all of the persons. So taking out this paragraph doesn't imply that we are depriving these people of connectivity and all of their rights. On the contemporary, all of these people can benefit from the impact of this resolution in the different areas concerned. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Arab Emirates.

Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, chair. We would like to second the opinion of our distinguished colleague from the UAE. And we also thank you for your effort to find a compromise as well as the ad hoc group their Mr. Roberto Hariama from Brazil. We did try to develop consensus of many hours. And in our view, we did get close to this. However, we did not achieve it as the key position and key understanding of what the digital divide is varies amongst us. What we understand is duplication in the documents is also different.

There are some resolutions mentioned listing the groups and we also differ in our views here. We, therefore, do not see how we can reach a consensus. And we would ask you, Chair, to remove the square brackets and all of the text contained within them and we cannot see that any consensus has been achieved on the text in the brackets, thank you.

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

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. Proposal to delete that is not supported by everybody. Proposal to retain that is not supported by everybody. So we have to find another solution.

Chairman, may I suggest the following solution? I understand nobody against effort of the director on the BDT to support and coordinate efforts, then efforts to do what? I suggest to inject some general idea in this part, which is right. First of all, we are talking continue to support. It means that there are already some support. Otherwise, there is no continue to support. Nevertheless, I suggest the following:

Coordinate efforts with the view could at least temporarily someone inject that idea, even maybe different color, with a view to connect unconnected, then including. So, nobody is against connecting unconnected. Nobody objects that the right to make every possible efforts because it was mentioned, not only the BDT but also the entire ITU to connect unconnected. That is the -- I'm sorry to refer to this as a slogan, refer to it as objective. Connect unconnected.

So, to connect unconnected, including and then go ahead with that one. And said somewhere as stipulated or indicated in Resolution 70 and so on, so forth.

Chairman, it doesn't seem that either of the retention or deletion would take us anywhere and we cannot continue, Chairman. I know you have very difficult work, always working with plenaries, most difficult task. But, Chairman, I suggest that for your kind consideration. I don't know whether somebody captured what I said. As I think that may be a way we are talking of connect, supporting to connect unconnected and then this will be including and we go ahead with this one. There is no difficulty with this inclusion and so on. Thank you, sir.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran.

I see Jordan. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chairman. We really highly appreciate your efforts to reach a compromise. However, it is obvious that there is no compromise here. There is no agreement on this step. We have, nevertheless, managed to reach an agreement and find compromises on certain amendments that were sensible ones and that managed to improve the text.

So, in the absence of consensus, I would propose that we retain the square brackets and that we send this text to the Plenary.

We don't want to create a precedent in terms of how we deal with absences of compromise. But currently we don't have enough time left to go into new proposals, new draftings and new amendments.

Thank you, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan.

Tunisia.

>> TUNISIA: Thank you, Chairman. Just like the representative of Jordan just underscored, there is, obviously, not any compromise or any agreement here. And according to the established rules at the ITU, in the absence of agreement, the issue is submitted to the Plenary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Tunisia.

Sudan.

>> SUDAN: Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I have been on the ad hoc, and I thank, by the way, Mr. Roberto, for his tremendous work. We have discussed this issue hours and hours. I don't think you have the same amount of time here, Mr. Chairman.

So, obviously, you don't have consensus here, Mr. Chairman. So, I am aligning myself with Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Russia, United Arab Emirates, Tunisia and others to remove the text and we move on, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sudan.

Qatar.

>> QATAR: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. So, as this is about connecting the unconnected, while in the above clause we have already defined the factors that can cause low utilization of broadband connectivity. And those factors you have control of and can work on tackling those factors. So, handling those factors will solve the problem of connecting the unconnected.

So, we see here that no need for this clause. I recommend to eliminate it or to move it between two brackets to the Plenary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Qatar.

Argentina.

>> ARGENTINA: Thank you, Chairman. Once again, we would like to insist on the importance of this text. On the importance that it has to achieve our goals. And I also wanted to draw your attention to the fact that today Resolution 205 was approved at this level. Where we invite the members to the second invite the member states.

We have a very similar text. I will read it. To promote awareness raising and public participation in telecommunications and ICT focused initiatives national initiatives to improving ICTs and improving digital skills, especially among marginalized groups and persons with specific needs, such as women and girls, children and youth, elderly persons, persons with disabilities and indigenous peoples in order to encourage digital empowerment and inclusion for all. And this is a text that we approved and invites, too, of Resolution 205. It's the same text. We didn't have any issue with that. And I think we need to keep some coherence between the texts of our resolutions.

So, in terms of your proposal, sir, we -- of maintaining this text, we agree. It should be kept in. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Argentina.

Kuwait, Nigeria and Portugal. Because we have spent many minutes on this, we have other agenda items. So we want to conclude on this. We conclude on Nigeria. Iran. Sorry. Kuwait, you have the floor.

>> KUWAIT: Thank you very much, Chairman. We align with the representatives of Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Jordan and the UAE. In other words, either we delete this paragraph, or we send the text to the Plenary with the square brackets. That's our opinion. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

Nigeria.

>> NIGERIA: Thank you, Chairman. We support the position of the Arab Group and the RCC group. There is no reason to add this .14 in this part. So, we suggest that we remove this paragraph. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Great. So, we have had -- I guess, as I said, every proposal has support. My proposal had support and had objections and had new proposals. One is that this text can be redrafted in a certain way that could be acceptable. One is that this text is elsewhere, that it needs to be repeated here. And one is that this text we prefer go into the Plenary.

Indeed, and to respond to Kenya and to everyone else as to how we work. We had hours committed just as we are locate documents to deal with, so it came where what we get to the Plenary, too. And even to this meeting, we were not expected from the Arab groups any disagreement. It is for this reason why we give the opportunity to the disagreements here, to whether we will reconsider an item. But if there are no agreements, then we have to take them off. That is our way of working.

So, without any further hesitation, this 14 text, as to what you have heard with the recognizing C, we can take it off and then move on to the approval of the revised resolution.

I hope this is clear and acceptable to everyone.

I see a point of order. Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you very much, Chairman. I do apologize for having wrote upon order. Did I hear correctly that you have made the decision that the paragraphs that are not subject to consensus are to be taken out?

So, what is the sense of the absence of consensus and the reason for this decision? Will this lead to making a decision in favor of one group compared to another?

I have to switch to speak in English. I saw that you are making a decision or a ruling that there is no consensus or agreement or a text that is between square bracket, the decision and you said this is our working method to delete this. This can be in favor of some group and the other, which is not acceptable.

I think the fair and appropriate decisions that we should leave this for the Plenary to decide. Taking any decision on this resolution in the same way would be reflected on the other coming resolution which you are setting an order on how we will deal with this as a working group. So, please, Mr. Chairman, reconsider your position and, thus, we cannot support it. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Jordan, for your point on order and your objection.

Is there any support for Jordan? Is there any support to the proposal from Jordan?

Okay. I see a number of countries. But I am asking a specific question. The request from Jordan is for us to keep recognizing C and instructions 14 to the Plenary. Do we have support before transmitting our disagreements to the Plenary?

Iran, you have the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. And I apologize to my very distinguished colleague Mr. Anisari to fail to understand under what provision of the rules raised point of order. It is against the Chairman ruling which is number 96 or it is for 107 closed for debate. Chairman ruling, there is a provision here. But, Chairman, we don't want to go that far. I apologize the point of order from Jordan is valid, but maybe we reconsider that not going to the point further, I have a very, very bitter experience on point of order 2012. I don't want to repeat that.

We have that in 2015 WRC and I helped the Chairman not to be at the point of order, requesting the person raising whether he may kindly reconsider. Anyone could raise point of order. It's their rights. Whether we have that one, Chairman. Let us see the situation. There was two proposals. One to submit the things to the Plenary. That doesn't help, Chairman. That does not help.

What we say at Plenary, we repeating ourselves 10 times. There is no element, there is no new element to be added in Plenary with 2000, I don't know how many. In 300, 400 people, we cannot resolve that we cannot. Let's not put that push to our Chairman, distinguished Chairman.

What I suggest is following, Chairman. The two proposals, deletion or retention in square bracket, send it to Plenary. In the meantime, we make every possible efforts. There are two regions in favor of deletion. There are one or two regions in favor of retention. You called for two of three from each of two and get together to see whether they have a solution. Nevertheless, Plenary, Chairman, is not a good solution, is not. There would be serious difficulties, Chairman, according to my experience to resolve the issue which has not been resolved in the other group, adopted at your level and then go into Plenary. I would say buzzer out, distinguished Chairman although he is ready to consider everything, quite capable. But let's be more fair with respect to him. My suggestion is this point. Two or three from each groups, two from Arab Group, two from RCC, get together to see if they have another solution for that. Along the line of what I mentioned, connect unconnected, including so on, so forth, any other thing before going.

But, nevertheless, still you can go to Plenary at the end. But not deciding now. Just putting points, situation until that time we have -- I don't know how many hours. 1, 6 hours, 10 hours, 12 hours. I'm sorry. Consulting our other peoples, someone said, getting together, maybe we are tired a little bit.

So, Chairman, that is my hundred proposal, Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran.

So, we are at a stage where we have to move on. And Jordan has requested that we take our disagreements to the Plenary and our seeking support for that. All those in support of that, it gives me a fair indication of what we have to do.

So, I see United States, Argentina, Saudi Arabia, UAE Jerry ya, Kuwait, Bahamas and Russian Federation, Tunisia, you have all had your say on this particular matter. Please, give way for us to move forward. So, I will humbly request that you withdraw your request for us to move on.

So, Iran is very supportive to the process and very much wouldn't want us to take what may not get enough consideration or time as we may have had with the other groups, and even in this meeting at the Plenary.

But I am very, very much available to you and your preferences, that if it is the wish of this meeting, it will transmit to the Plenary, it goes as such.

Is there any objection to this going to the Plenary? I also see a number of countries, if it is some objection, please, you can keep your request.

I see Argentina, Romania, Russia and Bahamas objection this going to the Plenary. Is that the case? Please, in five seconds, let me know if this is an objection. Romania, you have the floor.

>> ROMANIA: Sorry. I'm sorry. I thought Argentina would get the floor before me.

>> CHAIR: Argentina has withdrawn their request. Romania, you have the floor.

>> ROMANIA: Chairman, first of all, I would like to make a statement on behalf of CPT to express disappointment on the fact that we cannot use this language in our resolution. We use arguments of saying that is duplication, not accepting the fact that the digital divide is where it is because we don't focus on these groups. And this is prohibiting us from, actually, fulfilling the mandate of the union and this is saddening for us.

But, Chair, we do support your working methods. Just please clarify if this is going to be consistent throughout the entire work of Working Group of Plenary, if this is going to be the way we deal with all resolutions. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: This is request for (?). Russia, you have the floor.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chair. As you asked, I will be brief. We are not hearing any new arguments. We are hearing that some regions have a different understanding of the same concepts. Namely, what the digital divide is, what duplication is, and what resolutions we have for specific segments of society, how to focus our work on them as well.

All of our work is about overcoming the digital divide. So, we do not course need this realized solution at all because everything we do is connecting the unconnected, including using special measures and special resolutions for specific social segments.

We have heard no new arguments, Chair. And we see no point in continually repeating the same thing at the plenary meeting on this issue. We have many, many other issues which need to be resolved.

So, Chair, we agree with your initial proposal, which is indicated in the green text. We are very sure there will be the same result if we bring this to Plenary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So, everybody accept that we transmit this to the Plenary?

Okay. So, let me take a step back. Because I see a number of countries. Either way, we have two sides. Or probably 170 sides. Let me use this moment to make an appeal.

We come from various countries. On the subject matter of bridging the digital divide, the factors which may be important to us, may not exist in other places. Certain factors which may be common across countries. But there may be certain factors which are particularly unique to certain situations.

It is up to us to say we are choosing what is common among us, and that was why my initial proposal was to look at what is our agreement. And, indeed, if you take out everything else, everybody will still be connected.

It is also up to us to say we want to be inclusive enough and get a list of thousand factors, 200 factors, 12 factors in this resolution. And you still have to get programmes for this, indeed. Just as Argentina mentioned, there are resolutions, and if you go back to some of them, it tells where ITU has to have programmes to connect this very list of people that are in dispute. These are facts. And this is something which is happening in this conference.

So, things which are happening are Committee 5 and Committee 6 because Romania access to the way we work it. Things which are agreed in Com 5 and com 6 tends to be disagreed in Working Group of Plenary, that we are not being consistent with ourselves.

So, if everybody will be kind, this is the Chairman's proposal. That the 14, if the square bracket is removed, it's removed. Could be one that we can have with the C and end at literacy skills. Am correct that?

I know some of you want to get into packages, so I am trying that for you now.

So, recognizing C, we could end at "related skills" and then we can have the 14. Would this be acceptable to everyone? Do I have objection to this proposal of recognizing C, end at related skills, square brackets removed. And that we have 14 square brackets removed and we have a text? Is there any objection to this proposal?

Okay. I see a number of persons asking for the floor. We have 24 minutes to close this meeting. We have to consider other things.

So, as a way forward, before this meeting closes, I would prefer to see the regional coordinators on this resolution. So, we will all see and consider the others. And then we can decide on a way forward. If this is acceptable to everyone, then we can move on to the next agenda item.

So, my proposal is that for whatever proposal is made, there is enough a position to it. So, I will want to have discussions with the coordinators on this proposal from the regions.

If this is acceptable to you all, we can then move on to the next agenda item, which is to consider the new resolution on open and networks. I advise Brazil to give us the update on this.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair. The consideration of the new resolution on open interoperable networks was considered in the context of Resolution 139. And as long as we have the consideration that all the other texts that are not in brackets inside 139 are not pending, we could agree to have this resolution -- new resolution not adopted going forward.

It is inside brackets, all the resolutions inside brackets, and this was the consensus of the group, to retain the text in 139 and not have this and not have this go forward. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So, from Brazil, we will have to consider this after we have agreed on 139. So, let's move on to the next agenda item.

I see United Arab Emirates asking for the floor. United Arab Emirates.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chair. I asked for the floor before, just to mention 139 in green, what we had in green. There are also further square brackets.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Arab Emirates. We have a decision going forward in 139 that's the regional coordinators.

Let's move to agenda item 5, which is proposal to revise solution 102. Let me invite Madam Chair to take us through the report. Kenya, you have the floor.

>> KENYA: Chair, once again, I would like to thank all my colleagues who worked through this tirelessly. I think being that this might be my last report to your meeting, I would like to mention that we did meet for, I think, all together should be about 43 hours over the last two weeks on discussions internet. Chair, this is the last of the resolutions out of the five that you bestowed upon myself and the greater team. Of course, with the great help of Secretariat, we did put a great fight and now we bring to you Resolution 102 out of the five that you gave me, this is the only one with square brackets.

I would like to mention to you, Chair, that we also did have a number of green text, and there was -- there was demonstrated a spirit of compromises and consensus. However, when it came to some of the texts in this resolution, colleagues agreed to disagree on some aspects, and I present to you Resolution 102 with some square brackets.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Kenya, for your work. This will not be the last of you. As the conference is not over yet.

But let me give this proposal so that we are efficient with the time. We have left with eight minutes. And to be fair to other considerations. That, again, I want to meet the coordinators, the regional coordinators on Resolution 102 on the way forward on this. Various disagreements we have had with 209. I hope no one has an objection to this.

Okay. Thank you very much. Let's move on to the next agenda item, which is proposals revise Resolution 130. Strengthen the role of the ITU in building confidence and security in the use of information and communication technologies.

Let me invite Mr. Chairperson to take us through his report. You have the floor.

>> CHAIRPERSON: Good afternoon, colleagues. Unfortunately, I don't have very good news for you, chairperson. We did try, I think that was our colleague from Kenya was there, we work on the internet. We put in a lot of hours. And the colleagues showed a lot of dedication. There was quite a lot of creativity in trying to find solutions, and a lot of efforts were made at compromise around a large number of issues.

But I think in our meeting today at lunchtime we also realized that there are some issues that are really quite difficult to resolve at this stage.

We began with nearly 90 pages of proposals. The resolution is now down to 17 pages. And I think the document has been greatly improved with the proposals that we have been able to agree or the amendments we have been able to agree. We have had to deal with duplications. We have had to deal with structural issues in the document, as well as the content.

Some of the solutions that had worked or seemed to work elsewhere in the Plenipotentiary Conference did not work in our group. For example, we couldn't agree to text around the World Telecommunications Policy Forum. That was one issue.

We could not agree to the references to -- or most of the references to gender in our document. So, some of that text remains in brackets. We could not agree on the global cybersecurity agenda, although there was quite a lot of efforts around trying to find softer language.

We could not agree on data protection or personally identifiable information. We could not agree on references to stakeholders, the role of stakeholders or the new additional language around that.

And there was also challenges with digital certification of (?). Those were the outstanding areas where we were unable to resolve.

But we do have a DT for the first time, in fact, you have seen a DT, Chairperson. I'm sorry it's taken us so long to give you a document. And in that document you will see that there has been a lot of new text added. But, at the same time, there are some remaining square brackets.

I would like to give a very special thanks to -- well, many of the colleagues, all of the colleagues, in fact, but I do have to single out Brazil. Because they led a number of informal discussions on various issues, often very successfully. And even when they weren't asked, they still did similar work. So, I think I should acknowledge them for that.

So, with that, Chairperson, I think I would like to submit our DT. I'm trying to remember the number correctly. It's 81. For your consideration, Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Arab Chair. I really admire you for the reduction of the number of pages because that was one of your objectives when this text was given to us. And we all asked for this. And I am happy that you are now 17 pages, you said, and I calculated the number of pages of disagreement. Just about two pages.

We can, actually, take out these two pages that we go further down to 15 pages of agreement.

But that is not my proposal for now. With the help that we have had from Brazil, I want to give Brazil the floor as they have requested the floor. Brazil, you have the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair and Brazil would like to especially thank Jim Patterson for its major efforts, leadership, guidance and also good humor during the many hours of our assignment, as well as the Secretariat.

Brazil would like to make a statement and we kindly request that the statement to be reflected in the Chairman's report of the Working Group of the Plenary to be delivered to the Plenary.

First of all, Brazil would like to reaffirm its commitment to the Union and to this conference. At the same time and before going through our technical arguments, Brazil wants to recall why there is a concern with cybersecurity. Use of security ICTs and access to security networks is not a futile request. It ensures protection of citizens, including vulnerable groups as children. It provides the groundwork for the digital transformation of our societies and economies.

Moreover, it fosters development and peace. Citizens, businesses, civil society and governments worldwide rely on telecommunications to lead their lives and activities. And, therefore, they need and demand basic secured access of end use of these technologies.

ITU is the only global agency that can deliver what is demanded and needed in some cybersecurity dimensions. Brazil is aware that ITU is not responsible for addressing every aspect related to cybersecurity. Is not what many countries are asking for. But ITU has an important role to play in this agenda. And, as we know, in telecommunications, ICTs, local and regional solutions are never enough. In cybersecurity the vulnerability of one is the vulnerability of all.

At this point this conference has shown opposite positions regarding the proposals for further developments on the global cybersecurity agenda. One side with huge number of member states of three regions, plus Brazil, supports the effort to improve the global security agenda. Those countries do not have their particular fora to work on the team.

On the other side, we also have three regions that don't support any new effort related to GCA. It's important to put little bit ground on this matter. Launched by ITU Secretary-General back in 2007. To implement, ITU mandate as facilitator, Moderator of action line C5 following the World Summit on Information Society.

This initiative was established as an international framework viewed upon five (?) as well as working areas, legal measure, technical procedure measures, organization structures, capacity building, international cooperation.

Right after its launch, a high-level experts group HLEG was created. More than 100 experts were involved in this discussion until the end of 2009. The group didn't reach a consensus in making recommendations for the five work areas of GCA. So, the outcome of this effort was a report by the Chairman that contained several recommendations, some of which raises strong concerns and oppositions.

This work, with all sensitivities and concerns, is one of the only documents that ITU has on GCA. Besides the age led report, the only written document on GCA is a 2009 brochure paper of 46 pages Brazil happen to have and it's not available on digital format.

This brochure was published before the end of the HLEG. In the sense, Brazil would like to clarify that apart from this very general idea of the agenda and its five pillars, there is no documentation, no foundation document, no explanation agreed upon by membership on what the global cybersecurity agenda is and how it relates to ITU mandate.

To demonstrate how this is problematic, the GCA brochure of legal measures mentioned ITU actions related to cybercrime, which is a topic that membership already agreed that ITU that's a limited role to play in the terms approved by Resolution 130.

This is the fact. We have a framework which no foundation document, no context and no explanation agreed upon by membership. What exists is a report by the Chairman of the HLEG, which is something that many administrations are not comfortable with.

The agenda is mentioned it five times in Resolution 130, approved in the last PP and we increase with the modifications of this conference. The Global Cybersecurity Index is based on the commitment of countries based on GCA framework and we recently approved guidelines for the utilization of the framework.

But a fundamental question remains. What is the framework? There is a general agreement that the GCA pillars continue to be valid and our flexible enough. And Brazil also a strong support of this structure. What is missing is the description, definition, explanation of what constitute each pillar and what is the mandate of ITU in which one of these work areas.

Brazil plus three regions have agreed on a common ground reflecting the need to development -- to develop a baseline for each one of the pillars and also to contextualize each pillar within ITU's mandate.

We propose to listen and to give space to accommodate concerns from all sides. But the other regions didn't even want to consider it. They don't accept any effort on GCA.

There is a recurring problem regarding GCA and every conference and also Brazil doesn't -- don't understand the decision to not address this fundamental issue.

There is a problem to be fixed and avoiding the conversation won't make the problem go away. The problem remains. And it does haunt us every conference.

Sometimes to move forward there is a need to take a step back, and this is clearly the case. In the internet-related discussions, many time is repeated the same, if it ain't broke, don't fix it. In this case, GCA is broken, Brazil needs to strongly and respectfully express disagreement with any position that leads to not fixing it.

As said in the beginning, if ITU does not deliver what is being asked for, the lack of capacities will remain a challenge in the following years, especially in developing countries. It is not a coincidence that Brazil thinks that the majority of developing countries support the effort on the GCA. And it's precisely these countries that can mostly benefit from this framework. Since the developing ones already have their cybersecurity capabilities established to face this challenge.

Some countries argue that is not a useful effort and it is a waste of time and resources. But ITU should prioritize what could be useful for all membership, in particularly for developing countries.

Let's recall our number one commitment, leaving no one behind. Building confidence and security in the use of ICTs must be a part of this commitment. And, therefore, it should also be one of our major goals in ITU.

We would like to thank the regions that were available to discuss, negotiate and achieve a middle ground on this matter. Brazil remains available for any further developments. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. If you want to clap, you can clap. Why not?

Thank you for your statement. Indeed, it will be included in our report to the Plenary.

I see a number of countries asking for the floor. Let's remember that this particular resolution has not really had the consideration in this meeting. Every time we told them to go back and work and we have not really had any opportunity for them to air their disagreements.

We have just about three minutes for our meeting to close. Our agenda is not exhausted. We still have enough agreements, but we have a number of disagreements which we may need another three weeks of the conference to resolve.

The way the plenary works is not something that I will say I am hesitant to transmit our disagreements to the plenary.

Rather, my approach is to -- actual, the conference, the sharing committee, we will be granted some time tomorrow to consider the rest of our agenda so that just as I ask of the coordinators, we could really go together as to what our agreement -- our agreements are and what could be our disagreements, we could take news out of it and come back to another conference and probably we could get an agreement. We have learners of this, EI, spend many nights of disagreements. We have to follow the procedure. It was not agreed. It came back to this conference, three pages, loud applause all around.

So, sometimes I hear I insist. With your proposal, you can only sell for people to buy it. You cannot force somebody to accept your resolution. I wish that you all keep this in mind. You have to convince everyone else to accept your idea. You cannot force your idea on anyone. Because it is the resolve that you have to take home. They have to resort to their capital and say this is the idea which is different from ours. Can we accept this?

So, please, let's move from our positions as we brought initially and see how well we can move our way from where we initially came from. And with no biased or supports whatsoever, the example of Brazil is bright. We are coming from a region which may not be agreeing or do not have a position like Brazil, but they have moved across to other regions.

Sometime we come into this conference with original positions. But it is time that at the ITU we move to multiregional positions, rather than insisting on regional positions. We are different. We are diverse. Yet we have to seek common good, inclusiveness. It is very important. We have to be considerate.

Interpreters, my apologies. I see a number of countries asking for the floor. We are a minute past our time. I will want to plead for another 10 minutes.

>> Yes, Chairman. Of course, that's fine.

>> CHAIR: Yes. And Committee 5, the Chair is around. So, if these countries you have 30 seconds. Sudan, Canada, united -- Saudi Arabia. Now the list cannot be one that we can even do 10 seconds against.

Because we have another meeting tomorrow, we can pause here, take an update on the agenda of the rest of the agenda and then we continue from tomorrow from this point.

Will this be acceptable to everyone? Because the number of countries I see now is not possible within that 10 minutes.

Okay. I want to take the list and tomorrow I want to start those countries. I will want to give you the floor tomorrow. So, Canada -- Sudan, Canada, Saudi Arabia, Algeria, Russia, Iran, Australia, United States, United Kingdom, Ghana, India.

Tomorrow we will start with you, with your comments. Thank you very much.

So, we move to our next agenda item, which is to get an update on the recommendation, the recommendation.

Any updates, Ms. Inga.

>> INGA RIMKEVICIENE: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you kindly arranged our lunch, so already used the time for work and I hope that that was the last discussion on the topic. After exploring all possibilities and all possible texts, we came up with a proposal that is presented now in DT/79, Rev 1. And the main idea of the proposal is that Working Group plenary recommends that the Plenipotentiary Conference invite those member states who contributed to the proposal and draft resolution to make relevant contributions to ITU D Study Group 2 on digital transformation in the context of the mandates of the relevant study questions.

So, I really hope that there will be no opposition to this proposal and we will be able to close this matter. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, my Vice Chair. Let me ask from Vietnam if this is acceptable to you on behalf of the three countries. Vietnam.

>> VIETNAM: Thank you, Chairman. This was not the story for my first BT and from an expected new Resolution on this platform, development. Then moving to integrating into the existing resolution and now we have entered table, the draft recommendation. It was challenging task. Platform (?) to support digital transformation and we don't think that ITU is the right platform that to support and to seek -- to foster and support the member needs.

Indeed, the recommendation has maximum consensus after a long and intensive discussion, provide us the opportunities to continue contributing to the work of ITU Study Group.

So, with that, I would like to thank for all who have involved and made the recommendation available so we can go along with the draft that you see on the screen. And we look forward to your approval. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your kind understanding. This is probably our first agreement this afternoon.

I see Saudi Arabia and Iran asking for the floor. Because of our time, kindly, Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. I apologize for insisting on taking the floor. We wanted to support what was said by the Chair regarding Resolution 130. It's regrettable that following such long discussions on Resolution 130 at the Dubai PP we are back here in Bucharest repeating the same discussions.

For a noble objective, which is --

>> CHAIR: Saudi Arabia, we are on borrowed time. This issue, we have been noted to take the floor tomorrow when we reconvene. You will be the third on our list. So, we will go back to 130 and you can make your comments, kindly. So, that with the time left we can go to the rest of the agenda items.

Iran. Thank you very much, Iran, for also understanding. And thank you, sincerely. I see that is a party for you tonight. Congratulations for taking us through this finally, your ad hoc group on innovation has completed the resolution and also a recommendation. Thank you very much.

Right. Thank you. So, now let's get the update on the pandemics. I go to check and quickly. Do we have bright lights from Czech Republic on pandemics.

Czech Republic: Thank you very much for the floor, in Chair. Another and hopefully last and final meeting of the informal group happened over the lunchtime today. And thanks to really hard cooperation and collaboration among everyone present in the room.

I can inform you that DT/72, Revision 2, if not applauded yet, is going to be applauded very soon. We see it in front of us. So, it's on the screen. And I am happy to inform you that the text as stands for the moment was agreed by the informal group. And, thus, we proceed towards the Working Group of the Plenary for general approval. Thank you. And thanks to all the colleagues and thanks to the Secretariat for all assistance.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the report, which is bright news. Is there any objection to DT/72, Rev 2? To give us a new resolution on pandemics.

I see Togo, is that an objection? We are asking for objection, please. Togo, is it an objection? Togo, you have the floor.

>> TOGO: Thank you, Chairman. Togo didn't well understand the question. Objection to the document. And we were wondering about -- firstly, we didn't understand the question. Could you say it again so we can better understand? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So, we considering DT/72, Rev 2, which has given us a new resolution under rule of telecommunication/ICTs in mitigating global pandemics. Is there any objection to the approval of this new resolution?

I see no one asking for the floor. So, go tell the world that ITU has a new resolution! Thank you very much to you, Czech Republic, for giving us one of the good news.

Our time is up. Thank you very much, our interpreters, for helping us be in this very crucial moment.

What is outstanding resolution 139 with its attachments of a draft new resolution on Open RAN, Resolution 102, Resolution 130. For all coordinators involved, kindly, original coordinators involved, kindly I want to see you at our meeting possibly tomorrow at 11:00 a.m. will be announced pending the agreement of this chair and committee. Thank you very much for your indulgence and we will get ourselves updated. Thank you very much. The meeting is closed.

>> Recording stopped.

(Session was concluded at 1612 EEST)
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