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>> CHAIR: Good morning. Our meeting starts in the next minute. Kindly settle in. Our meeting starts in the next minute.

Good morning. And welcome to the 11th meeting of the Working Group of the Plenary. Hopefully our last meeting. We have the next 90 minutes to consider proposals, to revise three Resolutions, Resolution 130, 132 and 139. As indicated yesterday for those who requested the floor you have the opportunity to do so. After our meeting, there was further discussions among the coordinators on these Resolutions with the Ad Hoc Chairs and there are some updates.

So that will be allowed before the comments are taken.

Let's then go to ADM/44, which is our agenda for today. And I open the floor if there are any comments. I see no one asking for the floor. Is there any objection to the approval of our agenda this morning as in ADM/44? I see no one asking for the floor. Thank you very much.

Our agenda is approved. Let me invite the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group for cyber to update us on discussions on Revision 2 Resolution 130. Mr. Jim Peterson of South Africa, you have the floor.

>> AD HOC GROUP CHAIR: Thank you. Good morning, colleagues. After the Working Group of the Plenary meeting yesterday we met with yourself and regional coordinators. And you requested that we should have further informal discussions to try and address the remaining text that was still in square brackets in DT/81. We did so this morning, Chairperson. And I'm happy to report that we did make some progress. Unfortunately there is still some text remaining in square brackets. This morning we agreed on how to address references to the World Telecommunication Policy Forum. We agreed to delete the specific paragraphs dealing with personally identifiable information under the subject of data protection. And we agreed to amend and move the paragraph on digital certification.

If you would like, Chairperson, we can go through the document and show colleagues the difference now to the document. Because obviously these changes are not reflected in DT/81 as of yet. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you as well for your update with this good news. Let's open up DT/81 and go through. And if you have any comments to reflect these agreements we can move on to take the comments from those requests for the floor yesterday.

Can we open up DT/81? Over to you, Chair of the Ad Hoc. You may take us through the pages where you have agreement. We pause and see if there are any objections. If not, we carry on to the next. Please proceed.

>> AD HOC GROUP CHAIR: Thank you, Chairperson. So the bracketed text referring to gender currently remains under H of Recalling. If we go to the end of Recalling, the relevant WTPF opinions that has been deleted. And then if we proceed to the next part is ‑‑ okay. If we proceed to K of Recognizing, that is also deleted.

>> CHAIR: Just a moment. We have lost you. Please take it slowly.

>> AD HOC GROUP CHAIR: My apologies, Chairperson. The paragraph at the end of Recalling.

>> CHAIR: Which is T, which is T.

>> AD HOC GROUP CHAIR: We get to the end of Recalling. There is a paragraph there which was T. You are correct. Right. This is being moved, this paragraph is going to be moved to under Noting. So it is deleted from this section.

>> CHAIR: So let's get this clearly. It is accepted that it is taken out of the square brackets and moved to Noting?

>> AD HOC GROUP CHAIR: Correct.

>> CHAIR: Right. Thank you.

>> AD HOC GROUP CHAIR: If we move to Considering K.

>> CHAIR: Just a moment. We want to ensure that we have moved and it reflects on the document.

>> AD HOC GROUP CHAIR: Okay.

>> CHAIR: So we come to Noting E. Is that correct? So it becomes Noting E. I hope this is agreed. I see no one asking for the floor. So we have an agreed Noting E. Chair of Ad Hoc Group, kindly proceed. Please proceed. Kindly give South Africa the floor.

>> Technical team, can we give South Africa the floor, please?

>> AD HOC GROUP CHAIR: Sorry about that. I couldn't get the mic to work. I didn't seem to be able to draw the attention of colleagues to help me resolve that. Okay. Then in the section under Considering, I think it is, under Considering, K. Under Considering K.

>> CHAIR: Yes, please go ahead. Considering K.

>> AD HOC GROUP CHAIR: I think they are going the wrong direction. Sorry. My apologies, it is under Recognizing. Recognizing K. Not Considering. Yes. The text there, we have agreed to delete that text.

>> CHAIR: Is there any disagreement to the agreement to delete this text? I see no one asking for the floor. So thank you. Please proceed.

>> AD HOC GROUP CHAIR: Thank you, Chairperson. Then if we move to instructs the BDT director and the TSB director, that section. No. 12 of that section. It is a section of instructs the director of TSB and BDT under No. 12.

This paragraph here is deleted. While effectively it is being amended and moved. So you can delete it from here. And we move it to the section invites Member States, sector members and that section. And I'll give you the new language when we get there. And the language then will be to share best practice and information about the digital certificates.

So you take out national and authorities, yes. That's right. Digital certificates, plural.

And then just above, No. 10, on the paragraph on personally identifiable information, that paragraph is also deleted. Thank you kindly, Chairperson. Those were the changes that we managed to agree to this morning. So the paragraphs remaining in square brackets relate to references to gender. They relate to stakeholders in Civil Society and they relate to the GCA framework.

So I hope that is good progress from the group. I would like to just thank colleagues for the time they spent this morning. And for Saudi Arabia for coming with proposals and some flexibility to be able to accommodate those changes as well as the RCC and for the attention that was given to colleagues to accommodate these changes.

And unfortunately we didn't manage to cover everything, Chairperson, or at least we tried, but we could not conclude on the remaining bracketed matters. Thank you kindly, Chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Chair of Ad Hoc Group on cyber for the progress that is made. We would go back to you and we will go page by page on what our understanding after we have taken comments from the countries who requested for the floor and the countries, I will mention if you still need the floor you can take it in the order as was requested.

So just allow the countries, if you still need the floor after these updates you can take it. I mention and you take the request for the floor. Sudan, Canada, Saudi Arabia. Kindly help me, if I have not mentioned your name, please withdraw your request respectfully.

I'm mentioning the names according to the order they requested so that they can help me here. So I start it was Sudan, Canada, Saudi Arabia. Please do not request, ask for the floor if I have not mentioned your name. Thank you very much.

Algeria. Algeria, if you do not insist, that's good. Russian Federation. Russian Federation. Iran. Iran. Australia. Australia. United States. United Kingdom. Ghana. India. That's the end of the list. And after we have listened to their comments we will go back to the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group to take us through the outstanding issues. Thank you. If any of you as your names were mentioned, if you do not need the floor anymore, you could withdraw your request. Thank you. So let's start with Sudan. Sudan, you have the floor.

>> SUDAN: Thank you, so much Mr. Chairman. First we thank my colleague from South Africa, Mr. Jim Peterson for his tremendous efforts on Ad Hoc on cybersecurity. And I need to add my voice to the statement from Brazil yesterday on ECA. The lady, she mentioned no documentation for the process right now. No foundation document. No explanation agreed upon Member States.

So it is 15 years old from work, Mr. Chairman. It needs to be revised. The ITU Global Cybersecurity Agenda provides the general foundation also for the framework of the GCA. We kindly as Developing Countries needed urgently the revision of the GCA since it is a very old now while we are okay with the five pillars of the GCA, but still it is urgently needing the revision. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Sudan. Canada.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Canada expresses its deep appreciation for all colleagues from all Member States that participated on the discussions on Resolution 130. We have spent several days working diligently through this Resolution. It is very clear that we have accomplished so much together. However there remains a small amount of bracketed text. As a path forward Canada continues to support the Union's established working methods. Whether there is no consensus there is no change. Canada encourages all administrations to seize the wins we have made and strike the remaining bracketed text so we can move and send this solid proposal to Plenary to be adopted without debate. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. I applaud all of my colleagues present here. At the outset please allow me to thank Mr. Peterson, the representative of South Africa for all the efforts he has made.

As the Delegation of Brazil said yesterday, we fully agree with everything they said yesterday and we share the same concerns. We all know that the GCA program is more than 15 years old today. And I do not think that it is acceptable to not revise a document that is 15 years old. Such a document can be revised. It can be improved. We are all seeing what's happening in cybersecurity currently. There are cyber attacks across the board. And these types of incidents take place on a daily basis and are intensifying. And it is not the same situation it was a few years ago. I'm not sure this document takes count of all these Developing Countries. It could help to improve the cybersecurity capacities.

Chair, we were witness to the long discussions that took place in previous meetings on the issue of cybersecurity. Thus, we agree about the need to update the global cybersecurity program. So I think, Chairman, that we cannot allow another four years to go by to ignoring the needs of developing and emerging countries on this issue. Eight years have gone by and we are talking about a 15‑year‑old document. And the solution proposed is not acceptable. It would be appropriate to revise this global program and to improve it.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Russian Federation.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Chairman. I'd also like to thank Mr. Peterson for the work he has done and his constant attempts to help us reach consensus. Nonetheless, and despite the points which he dealt with where he indicated there were problems which had not been resolved, we hope one of the problems referred to including I think at the Plenary meeting due to the fact that we need to treat everyone equally, not leaving anybody out and recognizing the quality among all of us. We hope all that means that in Resolution 130, which is dealing with cybersecurity, not with groups with a disability, women, young people or Indigenous People as such. Because there are Resolutions focused on those groups, we won't include such things specifically in this Resolution. We think we have reached a recent level of agreement in the Ad Hoc. We have managed to remove some of the square brackets. We suggested removing all of them. That wasn't possible which is why this document has been brought to this Working Group of the Plenary.

We've heard evidence put forward here that have been put forward with respect to other Resolutions. But I don't think we should pick a mix between different Resolutions. In this Resolution, and in other Resolutions that we have to discuss today we are going to support the same approach because as I said, when we are talking about specific groups there aren't specific Resolutions focused on them and their needs. We welcome all of the efforts that have been put in to this text, including by Brazil on the global cybersecurity agenda. We have had quite a detailed and thorough discussion here I think. And decided that reflecting that work in the bit version is essential for this Resolution.

Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Russian Federation. United States.

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We also join the thanks of colleagues to our Chair, Jim Peterson for his tireless work on this issue here. The United States is delivering this intervention on behalf of CITEL. CITEL and its Developing States in the region cannot support inclusion of the proposal on the proposed text on the GCA. The GCA framework is an organizational principle to provide for a well‑rounded cybersecurity practice. The GCA and its five pillars have been reaffirmed and adopted countless times by the Member States of the Union in Resolution, WTSA's views also and the work of the Union itself. But the GCA is not the basis of the work of the Union on cybersecurity. It is Resolution 130 that is developed by our consensus process, beginning in 2002 before the GCA was even conceived and which delivers on cybersecurity for the membership.

We are unsure as to how a new piece of paper for the Union benefits anyone compared to the work that ITU already does on developing technical standards, developing national cybersecurity strategies, building CIRTs and linking the ITU membership as a whole. This conference should be proud of the great strides made in Resolution 130 this year where there is new language and new mandates to focus ITU's attention on building strong, resilient and competent cybersecurity workforces to make it more relevant. And to provide Developing Countries and others with the tools to build resilient networks that can cope with the strain they faced when so much of the world we all lived in moved online during the COVID‑19 pandemic and may it face again in the future.

And finally, to address the main issue of cybersecurity that all members of the Union developing and developing alike face, a lack of skilled cybersecurity experts to defend their networks and give peace of mind to their citizens as many connect to the Internet for the first time. Identifying incentives for the people to join the profession, access to studies, training resources, and encouraging their professional development are all new concepts identified in the Resolution this year.

This builds on the existing things that Resolution 130 provides the ITU membership a platform member sharing enabling an easy point of access for all, the products security lifecycle, and the development of infrastructure that is secure across the lifecycle by design to underpin the global transition to the digital economy and to ensure nondiscriminatory access to ICTs for all nations.

CITEL has listened carefully to Brazil as they explained the proposal. We have asked questions and listened to their answers. We have listened to the questions from others, from other regional groups and the answers they in turn received. We are not convinced. As a region CITEL has had the privilege of considering this proposal for some time now. And we were and remain unconvinced that this proposal would likely achieve a consensus outcome that would benefit the Union at the end of its process due to the irrevocable differences between the regional groups. We were concerned that this will take away from the focus of the Union on supporting members on real and immediate cybersecurity needs. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. I'm speaking on behalf of CEPT. We would like to extend our warmest thanks to the Chair of the Ad Hoc to all of his support and encouragement and wisdom. And to thank all the participants in that group.

We have done a huge amount of work in the Ad Hoc and we have achieved a lot in the draft Resolution 130 that we are looking at today. We have new instructions on cybersecurity skills. We have new instructions on the basic security measures people can take that can achieve the biggest impact on cybersecurity.

We have new Resolves on SMEs, new action on Spam, including new instructions on the repository for Spam. We have new language on encouraging people to join the profession, to help meet the gap that so many countries face.

We have new instructions on how we use the global cybersecurity index, new instructions on global resiliency. And new language on national infrastructure and many other additional resolves and instructions.

We have agreed a lot that will further strengthen the ITU's work in cybersecurity. There are differences of view on revising the GCA. And we would support Canada's comments about how to move forward given the lack of consensus.

The GCA is a general framework. And we support it as such. It is future proof. It is flexible and it provides a framework to support a very wide range of work by the ITU. And we have only a few months ago agreed guidelines on how to use it.

The ITU's role in cybersecurity we believe is set out very clearly in the official documents of the Union. We have Resolution 130 of the Plenipotentiary, each sector has its own Resolution. We have Strategic Plans. We have study questions. It is the Resolves and the instructions that we give in our Resolutions that drive the work of the ITU on cybersecurity. CEPT will continue to support efforts to strengthen the ITU's work on cybersecurity. And we will continue to discuss cybersecurity in future meetings in a positive and a cooperative spirit. We do not support reviewing the GCA. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom, on behalf of CEPT. Ghana, you have the floor.

>> GHANA: We want to thank the Chairman, Jim Peterson and all others who have participated in the various Ad Hoc sessions and discussions. The work we do is going to guide us for a while to come, including the next four years. In that time the GCA is old enough. We are happy to see the GCA in use. But we also believe that in adding to the affirmation we have to build confidence and trust in its use. It is not only about the people who are directly using ICTs or the networks. If we think through everyone who is affected by the work of the ITU, it is almost everyone.

And I do believe cybersecurity is important. And given the GCA's importance we have to do our best to understand it and this can be done through periodic reviews such as others are recommending. And we do support doing these reviews as well. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Ghana. I had Algeria, Iran and India who were on the list. But you withdrew the request and now you are back on. I will give you the opportunity. Algeria, you have the floor.

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Chairman. I would like for us to thank Mr. Peterson for his excellent work. And also would like to thank all colleagues that have been participating and sharing their views.

Chairman, I'm speaking on behalf of the African Group. We support the principle of revising the GCA. And we do acknowledge all the concerns that have been shared with us during the different discussions, specifically this morning. Chairman, I think we provided some alternatives on this topic and the ‑‑ hopefully an agreeable way forward. If we do not consider this aspect in (?). So we suggested that the recommendation needs to be developed to Council where the WG‑PL recommended to the Plenipotentiary Council that the ITU Council initiate a GCA review. We thought that this aspect is a review process prior to revision might be interesting way forward.

And we also suggested that based on contribution by Member States criteria and principles agreed by Council in the spirit to review the GCA need also to be established.

And, of course, this criteria would be the baseline for the review process. So I think we can consult with colleagues in drafting such recommendation. To your Committee, Chairman, and I think the Council for its next session in 2025 ‑‑ next year 2023 would be open to this discussion prior to the recommendation that our Working Group of the Plenary need to submit. Finally, Chairman, I think again we support the principle of revising the GCA. Thank you, Chairman.

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

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. I came a little bit late to your meeting. I don't know whether this GCA is the only element in the Resolution that you have difficulty. I suggest that if there are any other square brackets, you treat them and for some little time you park on the GCA. Treat all those square brackets clear document on that one. And then come back to GCA which has been subject to many, many discussions. By the way I fully appreciate the effort of Chairman Peterson has been dealing with the same subject in WTSA, WTDC and so on and so forth.

If you remove the square brackets and you have the GCA, you come back and see how you can treat that. Under No. 70 of the constitution, it mentions the Council shall consider World Telecommunication policy issues in accordance with the Guidelines given by the Plenipotentiary Conference. So that works, if everyone agrees with that. There are other suggestions also to put more light language in the GCA, not in the operative part. Not in the recognizing part. But maybe in the Noting part in more I would say lighter language along the lines of taking note or noting the ongoing activities of the GCA in the Union.

There might be some other solution. If none of them are agreed, then Chairman, you will be left with no options but not to proceed further on the matter.

Chairman, are you dealing ‑‑ you have been dealing with this issue in Plenipotentiary 2018. Your revision, Resolution 130 went to nine revisions and you made a lot of efforts and so on and so forth. What happened during these four years that happened to facilitate the GCA, then we continue. If not, we consider other things. Maybe you consider my suggestion that you remove or clear all other square brackets and just remain one relating to GCA and to agree to any of the proposal, either proposal of Algeria on behalf of the African country or proposal I made to move that to another part of the Resolution in a more lighter language than taking note of the ongoing activities in the Union with respect to the GCA.

This is something that you need to consider, Chairman, otherwise we can go back and forth between various paragraphs. So maybe you kindly consider whether you can remove all other square brackets and clear everything except GCA and come back to that if time permits. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. And our last country on the list is India.

>> INDIA: Thank you, Chair. It is a matter of fact that nowadays all the ICT equipment services are vulnerable to the cyber threats. So the views expressed by the different countries in one manner or another, indicates the draft ‑‑ how much cybersecurity is important to all of us. In the aspect that cybersecurity is one of the pillars and need for each and every nation, not only in the field of ICT, but also in the field of other sectors, whether it is a forward sector aviation sector, finance sector. Nowadays the ICT is the most critical sector in the development of the nations.

And this most critical sector does have cybersecurity related issues which need to be handled. Considering these aspects, it would have been wonderful to come out with the Resolution 130 in agreed manner. All the small brackets are left. All possible efforts have been made as suggested by my colleague from Iran, we can still work out to deal with some of the brackets and come out with solutions that are acceptable to all of us. Shall we wait for the four years to make a decision again.

Considering that aspect that we cannot wait for the four years to make the decisions primarily what we should proceed with, it is an honest request to all the extremist colleagues here, that we may consider to have the revision in the GCA as proposed by some of our distinguished colleagues.

And also in parallel to go ahead with the directions in the Resolution 130 which has been worked out together with enormous efforts. With some compromised text which gives us the new security to the ICT infrastructure which we are all planning, especially when we have cybersecurity as one of the pillars in the WTDC Declaration. We do have the similar concern in the WTSA. Not something, something decisive in this Plenipotentiary. Thank you.

Our essential thanks to the Chair converting this document in to the 17, I think we should not only appreciate this but take it forward in a final Resolution. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We had Australia on the list and now they have come back. You have the floor.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. And good day to everyone. I would like to thank all Delegates participating in the Ad Hoc Group, the Chair and Secretariat for their tireless efforts. Speaking on behalf of the APT I would like to commend the efforts to resolve substantive issues on Resolution 130 which is a challenging issue for all those involved. We appreciate many hours spent on the Resolution. We are pleased to see that many of the agreed changes to Resolution 130 are practical and positive.

With new work such as the repository on qualifications in relation to cybersecurity, to assist those looking to pursue a career in cyber and basic steps on achieving cybersecurity which although may seem benign will greatly assist in a magnitude of cybersecurity issues. While it is unfortunate that support for APT's proposal on references to Resolution 170 and women and girls was not supported, we sought to encourage females to choose a career in cybersecurity. Yesterday marked the tenth anniversary International Day of girl and child. In regard to the text in square brackets, APT is of the view that all bracketed text in Resolution 130 should be struck out and removed for no consensus no change to occur. So that no bracketed text is submitted to the Plenary.

This will ensure an effective process and confidence of the Working Group Plenary and the Ad Hoc Group processes. In regard to the GCA we appreciate the efforts by Brazil and others and some of the good discussions that we had on the issue. And we have listened carefully. However the APT does not support any review changes or updates to the GCA framework. We note that the process and work on the guidelines for the utilization of the GCA over the past four years was resource intensive and only led to divergent views among Member States. This is to occur again if we seek to update the GCA. While the framework has remained flexible throughout the years, despite the fact that it is 15 years, any changes my limit the work on cybersecurity. The GCI can continue to operate without the GCA or any updates to.

The Genesis of the GCA was formed in the absence of Member State consensus. It would not be prudent to review or revise the framework. Again I would like to thank Brazil's intervention that was made yesterday. The APT recognizes there are a number of other ITU cybersecurity activities already in place, such as the work of the ITU‑D Study Group which provides the membership to assist with policies and strategies of the issues that were addressed by my colleagues and other proponents. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I want to do a summary here and just as necessary we will go to the Chair of the Ad Hoc Group for countries asking for the floor. If you may you withdraw the request.

Yesterday after the report and after our meeting the coordinators for the various regions on the subject of the Ad Hoc Chair and myself met informally. We discussed a lot but what I say is thank you very much for some of your statements this morning. Because this is about you leaning forward towards each other.

The summary that we have is that there are concerns on gender, the use of the technologies, stakeholders, and whether we revise the GCA framework. But most of the comments were focused on the revision of the GCA. As to the way we work, no consensus, no change was also mentioned. And all the text in square brackets are new text which we do not have any agreements on.

I heard from APT in that for the topic of gender, which is also in square brackets, somewhere, I'm trying to locate it because it is a 17‑page document. It is something that they are willing to step down. And have it deleted. I also heard it from the African Group that the matter of the revision of GCA is one that they will want it to step out of the Resolution to become a recommendation of this Working Group of the Plenary to Council to start a GCA review process of which they are available to others to consult on the text.

What is said I propose as follows: One, can we accept to have the GCA review as a recommendation out of the Resolution to Council. And two, delete everything in square brackets now as in the Resolution. I open the floor for answers to these two sample questions.

The floor is open. I see Brazil asking for the floor.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair. And good morning to all colleagues. We thank you, Algeria, for proposing this way forward. As a recommendation we have this informal consultation this morning. And we are prepared as Brazil to compromise in this regard and accept that the GCA revision process should be moved to a recommendation in this very compromised and as a way forward to resolve the question.

And, of course, we are going ‑‑ only to accept the deletion of the GCA in the document if we have approved a recommendation. And we are just ‑‑ would like also to thank all the comments made by our colleagues supporting the GCA revision process. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Brazil. Iran, you have the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you. I understand that you are proposing to remove all square brackets with the content. All. But not to spend any more time on that. If my understanding is right, then you propose this, this Committee invites Plenary to assign the task to Council.

Chairman, from the very beginning, I had some difficulty to see what you mean by the recommendation. Has to be invited to do something. And that should be not beyond that work. However, it depends on what language we use in order to assign the work to the Council.

If the language is soft, saying that explores ways and means to consider any possible review of GCA, that is among one of the options that may work. But we have to work on the language that they are proposing but not simply asking Council to do. Otherwise we come back to us again. We have to see if everyone, first of all, agrees to remove all square brackets with their contents including GCA and put something such as invitation of the Plenary to assign the work to the Council. Then we need before that to work out on the language we use to that.

It is also again critical when we say consider the review. We have to see ‑‑ we have to mention that consider in the light of the discussion that occurred or held at Plenipotentiary 2022 take necessary actions to explore ways and means, if any, to review the GCA. So we have to work out on the language if the principle of the proposal be agreed by everyone. Deletion of all the square brackets, including GCA and any revision to Plenary. Then we have to work out on the language. Otherwise we cannot discuss that language in the Plenary. That would be very, very difficult. Because the devil is in the details, what we ask the Council to do. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Iran. I will do a summary here before I call for the next country. So far we have support for having the recommendation on the GCA and Iran is proposing to assess soft acceptable language onward as well. We invite the Plenary to have Council consider. We will take on the other comments as we have others requesting for the floor and I want to close the list now.

So Jordan, I want to close the list. So I will give five seconds for those who want to request for the floor. Just a moment, Jordan. My apologies. So we have Jordan, United States, United Kingdom, Saudi Arabia, China, Algeria, Russian Federation. And it is the question that we step down GCA to become a recommendation, soft language which will led the conversation continue our Council. And then for everything in square brackets in this Resolution we will strike it out.

Jordan, you have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chairman. Of course, we support your proposal as long as there is consensus on this proposal. But I would be grateful if you could specify that in other paragraphs, take out the square brackets and present a recommendation to the Plenipotentiary Conference to update the GCA. But in the absence of consensus I would propose that we close the debate and that we refer to Plenary. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Mr. Chair. On behalf of CITEL I think your proposed way forward, half of it is a good thing that we can agree to. I agree, we agree with your proposal No. 2 that we should uphold the working methods of this body with no consensus, no change.

With regard to ‑‑ with regard to the remaining square brackets and they should be removed from this text so that way we can forward a clean Resolution 130 to the Plenary. Regarding your first proposal, we find it interesting, we have a clarification question to you, that would this be ‑‑ that this would be a recommendation from the Chair of the Working Group of the Plenary in your report. And then additionally, you know, we would need some time to consult amongst experts on both our Delegation and within our region regarding this new novel idea. And would need some time to work out specific text that we might find agreeable with your proposal regarding No. 1.

So Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

>> UZBEKISTAN: Thank you. We want to express our appreciation to the Ad Hoc Chair for his tremendous work. We want to thank our distinguished colleagues from around the world for their work. Speaking on behalf of RCC we support our colleagues from Brazil regarding the GCA process. The initiative of updating the framework is very crucial for all Member States. Utilizing the framework. Especially it would be very beneficial for Developing Countries such as Uzbekistan in coordinating their action aimed at receiving their cybersecurity objectives. As mentioned in the previous meeting, there is a fundamental issue with the framework. It is outdated and it clearly needs an update. Finally, considering the latest comments, we support moving the GCA revision process to the recommendation section. Thank you very much.

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

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. CEPT strongly supports the language on Civil Society and on women and girls. But we recognize that there is no consensus on this language. And that no consensus means no change. And at this late stage we could agree that all the text in square brackets should be deleted.

The role of the Council is a new idea and we would need a little time to consider it. We would need to be clear that we are not instructing the Council to conduct a review of the GCA. But it may be possible to consider some softer language on the role of the Council here. And, of course, we are very willing to discuss this further.

And consider whether it will find a way forward. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, United Kingdom, on behalf of CEPT. Let's have another united. Saudi Arabia.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chairman. I don't think in the constitution or the rules of procedure there is any text stating that absence of ‑‑ in absence of consensus, what is in square brackets should be deleted. That's new to us. Is that a new working method that I wasn't aware of? The Working Group of the Plenary is a group created, made up by Plenary. When there is an absence of consensus on an issue, then it needs to be sent up to a higher level so that we can reach consensus or a solution.

So Chairman, we do not agree to delete the text in square brackets if there is no solution or consensus. Such decision should be made by the Plenary. Now as regards to your proposal, it is not a bad one in principle. However, it requires consultations. And we need to consult the Arab group on that. Thank you, Chair.

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

>> CHINA: Thank you, Chairman. First of all, I wish to clarify China's position as a Member State of the APT. China is not against the idea of this proposal. However, having said that regarding the content of the Resolution, there is no consensus. So I think Chairman, that your proposal which consists of suggesting it is the Council discuss the GCA is certainly a solution that we could think about. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, China. Algeria.

>> ALGERIA: Thank you, Chairman. And thank you for the proposals and colleagues who supported the proposal. I think in addition to softer language, we are going to propose a softer approach inside the recommendation. In a sense how Council are going to undertake this activity. And, of course, how the ‑‑ all of us Member States are going to embark in this process. So softer approach is added to softer language. Thank you very much for your proposal, Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. At this point as a response to the support so far I'm stepping down the GCA provision as in square brackets from the Resolution to the recommendation, the proponents are not just saying in softer language but a soft approach, as we don't have the text now, it will be one that everyone agrees to as a recommendation of my report. For the GDPR report to the Plenary, indeed there is time to report to the Plenary. So we could have lunchtime to consider the text for this recommendation.

I have a number of countries requesting the floor. But kindly remember that we have only 20 minutes to end this meeting. And we have two more Resolutions to consider. So if there is no strong objection to the proposed way forward on having a GCA in the recommendations, soft language, softer approach for the conversation to continue at Council, and for us to delete all text in square brackets as those who propose these are willing to withdraw these texts, can we move forward? Can you withdraw your request for this to be the way forward?

Unless there is a strong objection to the proposed way forward. Australia.

>> AUSTRALIA: Thank you, Chair. And thank you for the proposals. In terms of your suggestion that you just put forward, I just want to emphasize that we will need time to consider what the suggestion for No. 2 is and that we ask for more time to consider this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Australia. Everyone will have a time for lunchtime, two hours before we have Com 6 and then we have Plenary. And we have the time between the rest of today and tomorrow. There is some time to really work on this. Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you very much, Chairman. And thank you for giving us the floor. We are very grateful to all those who have taken the floor with support and indeed with other comments relating to the matter of the GCA. Thank you, Brazil, for raising this question. It is indeed a very important question. We would like to underline that participation in the Council and in discussions in GCA it is nothing new. It is a normal ITU practice. We cannot agree with your proposal to remove the square brackets now and then look at the text. Our feeling is that we should have two options on the table. Look at the square brackets, look at the text proposed. Even if it is going to be softer language. We need to see what it is going to say.

Taking in to account the experience that we have had in working on the GCA in Council in previous years. We'd also like to return to our comments on the issue of the matter of gender and gender agenda in this. We have said several times there are specific focused resolutions on these issues. And we don't need to have this in more general Resolutions, particularly not Resolution 130. So when we lift the square brackets, and I'm sure we will, then we think these provisions on individual groups should be unnecessary. We should use general characteristics. If necessary, the Russian Federation will provide a statement on this issue. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Cuba.

>> CUBA: Thank you very much, Chairman. Thank you to Mr. Peterson for the work he has engaged in over recent days. Just like the countries that participated in the arduous work over recent days, we Cuba in the Americas region, we agree with CITEL's proposal on the GCA, just like colleagues have already said. This is a new thing for the PP. The GCA is ‑‑ has been looked at in previous Council and we have suggested new Guidelines. And we certainly think that the GCA should be updated. And this is in line with a lot of debates that are happening in the United Nations on cybersecurity. We have also supported ITU playing an active role in cybersecurity. And so we support the idea of updating the GCA which was approved initially in 2007.

A lot of years have gone by and cybersecurity as we said many times is included in many of the activities that we do on a daily basis. And we risk facing vulnerabilities if we don't make the decisions required in order to resolve the problems that appear in that area. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Iran.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I apologize for asking for the floor. But I think we should not have multiple approach before that. Any recommendation would not be in your own name. Would on behalf of the Ad Hoc Group of Plenary. We had that before and we had some difficulty coming to have a proposal on its known name. If there is any recommendation that would be on behalf of the Ad Hoc Group of the Plenary.

And we don't want to put so much responsibility on yourself. This should be understood. Any recommendation or recommendation, if any, would be on behalf of the Ad Hoc Group of the Plenary to the Plenary of the conference.

Second, Chairman, we could not as I mentioned have a double approach or triple approach. Maintaining the square brackets and going to recommendation. We have to be quite clear. If we agree that we agreed to your proposal to remove all the square brackets with the content, all the square brackets with the content, although there is no rules, but that's the outcome. And then go to the recommendation to the Plenipotentiary Conference in order to instruct the Council.

I would like to suggest for your consideration of the people between now and next meeting instruct the Council that taking in to account the outcome of the Plenipotentiary Conference or discussion of GCA issue, considering ways and means on how the framework of GCA could be reviewed with the view to be adapted, if necessary and so agreed.

This is just a suggestion, Chairman, because we have to start to work on something. Whether you call them light approach or light proposal, or whatever, that's something along the lines of that. That would be on behalf of the Working Group of Plenary, delete all square brackets with the content. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Indeed any recommendation just as we have done for the pandemic and for connecting refugee shelters will be part of the WG‑PL report. I would invite Jordan and I will close on South Africa.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chairman. I apologize for taking the floor again. However, it is not clear for us how to address this issue during this meeting and during the following meeting of the Working Group.

The representative of Saudi Arabia very widely stated that we do not agree to remove the square brackets and the content of them. While there is still not consensus on the recommendation, the recommendation will figure a new report. It will be submitted to the Plenary for the ‑‑ for its approval. Will it be approved by the Plenary? We don't know. The best would be two proposals. The document to be submitted as it is to the Plenary with the square brackets. And the other hand is your proposal is to take out the square brackets and their content as long as the recommendation is presented. Could you specify also how the recommendation will be drafted and when before we can decide on the next step? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I will get back to you on that. South Africa, you have the floor.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you. And thank you, colleagues. I would like to take this opportunity to once again thank all of the participants in the Ad Hoc Group on cybersecurity and yourself, Chairperson, for the amount of time and attention that you have given to the topic. Everyone has done a lot of work. And it is much appreciated. And as colleagues have indicated, the Resolution is a greatly improved document on matters of substance that relates to cybersecurity. I think, Chairperson, colleagues have already raised the procedural issues that we need to consider in order to conclude on this matter. We will be all guided by yourself. I would indicate that South Africa, we will be available and ready to continue to support the Resolution of these matters through whatever process of consultation may take place.

If we have to defer the matter to Plenary, which it seems like we may have to do, we would recommend that informal consultations still take place so that when we do arrive at Plenary, it would be possible for you to present a document that has addressed all the outstanding issues. Thank you, chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you to you all. So on the way forward, and as I earlier indicated there is time. The understanding that I had from a number of countries and regions were that they were available to the approach and the text as may be a recommendation from WG‑PL to the Plenary and they want to consider it. So we will use our lunchtime as South Africa Ad Hoc Chair has made himself available.

So Algeria, who will introduce the text and that could be considered by everyone. We will have the opportunity of holding a parallel meeting with Com 6 from 2:30 to know the outcomes and updates as to where we are. I suppose when we have that agreement on soft approach, soft language that we all like it, and if that is the trigger to keep in square brackets or the system, maintain square brackets to the Plenary, that could be decided in the meeting.

I suppose it is clear the way forward. So lunchtime informal consultation on the recommendation from 2:30. We reconvene in parallel with Com 6 to continue on our agenda.

I see Iran asking for the floor. And Jordan. Iran, you have the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. No difficulty for any consultation. My question is that Chairman Peterson would have a meeting after your group is finished before the 2:20. Nothing prevent the regional group or whoever want to consult with each other, but we need to get together again and look at all those coming. And I request that Chairman, just take in to account what I have suggested with more or less in line in the framework of the Algerian proposal. More practice language on that one. Thank you.

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

>> JORDAN: Thank you. Chairman, in the program for today I see that Committee 6 needs to meet after the Plenary ‑‑ before, before. Committee 6 needs to meet before the Plenary. So Committee 6 needs to meet first and then the Plenary. So how can you be sure that your work will be finished before the Plenary? I would propose that you meet after the Plenary which would give us more time for consultations.

>> CHAIR: Let me have South Africa.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, Chairperson. And thank you for your continued guidance. We've scheduled a meeting for 1 p.m. in the Cuza room to begin this process or recommence this process to address this latest proposal. Thank you, chairperson.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, South Africa. So 1 p.m. And then we will reconvene as WG‑PL from 2:30 p.m. in parallel with Com 6. We want to be able to meet and close our meetings ahead of the Plenary. We cannot hold meetings in parallel with the Plenary. We count on your cooperation. That is the ‑‑ that's what we seen this morning. Many countries, many, many, many countries speaking on their proposal and saying for whatever is in square brackets. They wanted it deleted. And this is leaning forward as we discussed last evening. And I hope it continues at lunchtime and possibly even have a shorter WG‑PL in the afternoon. I see Iran asking for the floor. Iran, you have the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you. Simple question, Secretariat, where Mr. Peterson meet at 1 o'clock in which place?

>> SECRETARIAT: We already communicated that it will be in room Cuza. The room where we used to have the meeting of the Council. And the room Cuza is reserved after 2:30 for your possible Working Group of the Plenary meeting in the meeting room.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for the updates on where we continue on Resolution 130 and where we are convening for WG‑PL. So with the time of seven minutes to close, I will attempt to invite the Chair for Ad Hoc cyber to update us on the happenings this morning in respect to the Resolution. Kindly give Kenya the floor. Sorry, Chair Ad Hoc Internet. Not cyber. Please go ahead.

>> KENYA: Thank you very much, Chair. Chair, I would like to thank you for reconvening us as you did last evening. We had a very difficult time trying to see how to get consensus of a possible way forward. And I would like to thank most sincerely the meeting team of coordinators and focal points from all the regions who associated with the work of Resolution 102. Most certainly I would also like to thank our very able secretary who guided us through the process and this is my ‑‑ from ITU.

In my last meeting, Chair, on Monday, I invited the coordinators to surprise me with Resolution 102 and possible successful outcomes. Today they delivered the surprise following your guidance last evening. And for the second time, Chair, I present to you Resolution 102 for your consideration now without any square brackets.

Chair, if you allow me to mention how this happened is because we did get to an agreement or other consensus where there was existing text. We retained the existing text. All the outstanding issues which were in square brackets we agreed to delete in the absence of consensus, but the conversation continues on to the next meeting. I present to you Resolution 102. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Let's reflect that. That's supposed to be DT/78. Is that correct? I want everyone to look at as to whether it reflects our agreement. I see Iran asking for the floor.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you. I agree on the Resolution 102 which is another sensitive and delicate, very delicate issue among the other full Resolutions. Demonstrate the ability of the Distinguished Chair of the Ad Hoc Group relating to a very important matter. And we wholeheartedly congratulate the people or group for all membership or members working in that Ad Hoc and including it, Distinguished Chair. And we ask the people to applaud for the Chair and activities they have done. Once again thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. If you could go in there and delete everything. I see Saudi Arabia asking for the floor.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. We thank the Kenyan Chair for the tireless efforts on this issue. I think Resolution 102 is an important one. And I think it was decided ‑‑ it was not decided rather to suppress all of these square brackets. We need to discuss Resolution 102 before we remove the square brackets. This is why I would ask you to open this matter for discussion after lunch and that we discuss the text. If we cannot reach an agreement, then we will take a similar decision to the one we took on cybersecurity.

>> CHAIR: Sorry interpreters, thank you very much for your kind offer of 15 minutes. Very much appreciated. From the Ad Hoc Chair, there is agreement and we hear from Saudi Arabia that there was no agreement. Ad Hoc Chair, kindly clarify the situation. Let me give the floor to Kenya.

>> KENYA: Thank you very much. Indeed, Chair, I would like to confirm and maybe it would be helpful if the colleagues who are in the same meeting that we ‑‑ our colleagues from the Arab group, that there was this agreement because the text that we have within ‑‑ before, Chair, and I think it is the same text that you are looking at, there was no agreement that was arrived at by our meeting this morning. We did go through the text again. We did try to find compromise and alternative text in a sense to try and massage what was proposed from the different colleagues. But this was not arrived at ‑‑ the agreement was not arrived at.

And your general agreement was in the absence of the agreement before your meeting which was a few minutes actually in to your meeting that this text would be deleted. Chair, I believe and as I mentioned previously it is unfortunate that some of our colleagues had good proposals. But these proposals did not arrive at consensus. I believe that looking at them here you will realize the same is true because I reflect it as they were in square brackets in this document that you are looking at because it has not been published as a way forward. So that was the outcome from our discussions earlier this morning. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Chair of Ad Hoc cyber, can we get from the regional coordinators indeed what happened at the informal consultation this morning? Any of the regional coordinators? Yes, I see Jordan. Yes. Jordan. You have the floor.

>> JORDAN: Thank you, Chair. I do apologize for raising a point of order. I requested the floor before the Chair took the floor. Saudi Arabia asked for the discussion to take place later due to the square brackets and the quality of the proposal. The Chair of the Ad Hoc Group must carry out discussions and cannot say that we reach an agreement to remove the square brackets. It is your meeting that takes this decision as well as the Plenary. This is why I agree with the proposal from Saudi Arabia to bring back the discussions. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: I agree with the proposal of Saudi Arabia, but it is not the way forward of the meeting. Saudi Arabia indicated that that was not the agreement as reported by the Ad Hoc Chair. And I needed to clarify that. So I'm asking from those who were present in the meeting what happened. Because as a Chair there is a Chair report and there is another statement that was not the case.

I wasn't there either. So ‑‑ and this is a meeting of record. So I needed it from the regional coordinators the happenings at that meeting, for the facts of that meeting. I see Canada. You have the floor.

>> CANADA: Thank you, Chair. I just want to thank my colleagues and I want to thank the Chair of our Ad Hoc Group. As the CITEL lead on 102 we were present at the meeting last night as well as all our meetings this morning with the Chair and with the other regions. And I can confirm that there was agreement that we would have no change on the bracketed text from all regions present. So I would support the Chair of the ad hoc's interpretation of those events. And confirm that there was agreement to no change on the bracketed text. Thank you.

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

>> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. And on behalf of the CEPT we would also like to thank the Chair and thank colleagues for all the work that has been done and the flexibility shown. We understand there were no objections from the regions who were present to no change on this document. We have made a lot of progress here. But the final few points have not been agreed. And we think at this stage no change is the best option for those points. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Nigeria.

>> NIGERIA: Thank you very much. I was present at the meeting we had this morning. And the final meeting which was like when this WG‑PL was about to start the agreement we had was that we are going to the square bracket. Going to proceed with the WG‑PL. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

>> SAUDI ARABIA: Thank you, Chair. Once again I would like to thank the Kenyan Chair. She clarified ‑‑ during her last statement she clarified that there was no agreement during the meeting regarding the suppression. The group did not reach an agreement on the removal of the brackets. It recognized that there was no agreement. And the text was submitted to you to take a decision regarding the text.

This is exactly what was said by the representative of Nigeria. And we could ask Kenya to confirm what I have just said. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Saudi Arabia. Kenya, Chair of the Ad Hoc, kindly update us again on the situation.

>> KENYA: Thank you very much, Chair. Chair, I believe it is not ‑‑ it is not to go back on my word because my word is my bone. And that's what I did have when I was ‑‑ rather that's what I expressed myself when we were having our meeting.

Chair, when you have the meeting as I said we did have from yesterday evening, Chair, you were there. We did express our sentiments in that meeting. The same sentiments were expressed in today's meeting. There was a meeting that attempted to massage the text, but we gave room for the various focal points to go back to their regional groups and consult if that text was agreeable. That time was between the time that we had the Plenary meeting to this meeting, Chair.

Shortly before your meeting here we did convene another caucus and we did get the feedback that they did not agree to the massaged text, including to ATU, Arab group, CEPT, CITEL and RCC and we had Brazil also in our caucus. China as well in the morning.

Our final decision was in the absence of agreement on the text as was proposed in the terms of a compromise is we would divert to no change. I think it is worth mentioning when I'm talking about these things, the change of the membership, the constitutional membership, the Council Working Group amongst a few other issues which did not have any consensus by the close of our informal discussions. That could have been misinterpreted by the others. This is my record of the meeting. I present you for further guidance. Most certainly apologizing for this misinterpretation. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. It is clear to me now and I will give the opportunity to you and everyone else who may have misunderstood the final decision to meet you and for you to come back at 2:30 to update us on this. So you have a lunch date with everyone else, the coordinators and those interested in the no change or to be escalated to the Plenary. Thank you very much. We have two minutes to go. May I invite the Chair on network to give us an update on 139.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair. And thank you to all the regional coordinators that were indeed present yesterday evening and today at 8 until 9:30. We went and rediscussed the two brackets that were outstanding in the discussions related to a list of certain groups in Recognizing C and instructs BDT director 14. We had the conversations regarding which of the provisions could have the list included. And we had options discussed, either to retain it in the preamble or retain it in the operative part. But unfortunately, I have to report you back that certain regions preferred to have it in the operative part. And other regions preferred to have the list included in the preamble.

In the absence of the agreement, the outstanding brackets remain. And we seek your guidance on how we proceed on discussing them. Thank you. And just want to thank all those involved in the discussions, not only the regional coordinators because this was a tremendous effort to reach these conclusions that we put forward here. And, of course, the Secretariat and all the involved members and parties. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Ad Hoc Chair Internet. For you we will give you the opportunity at lunchtime, we will find a room for consultations to continue as we have the opportunity of a 2:30 meeting for WG‑PL so that you can update us.

Distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen, are there any other business to consider before we close this meeting and reconvene at 2:30 p.m. in Cuza? From 1 p.m. the Ad Hoc Group on cyber meets at Cuza to continue the conversation. We will update the rooms for Internet and networks as well. I see no one requesting for the floor. Thank you very much for your indulgence this morning. The meeting is closed.

(Session concluded at 12:47 EEST)
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