Chair, I said on Tuesday that a clear roadmap for discussions in the OEWG will allow us to move from general statements to more detailed discussions, which is crucial if we are to make any kind of progress together. Adopting this report would take us in that direction.

Chair, Sometimes I speak directly. I’m going to do it now because the mood in this room feels flat. Delegates need time to clear drafts in capital. We need a final version of our text today. States should consider whether they would genuinely be willing to break consensus on their asks and put forward only those amendments without which they would genuinely walk away from our process. The UK can accept minor and specific amendments to this report if needed and is happy to discuss how we reach consensus wording on a handful of specific issues. But we cannot redraft this report. We must be clear that the cost of doing so is no report.

The UK remains unhappy with several aspects of the report, but in the interests of this group we will show flexibility on everything we can. But only up to a point. We agree with Brazil and Singapore’s very sensible comments. Everyone must temper their ambition. We have a very short amount of time to team up and get this solved.

We have minor requests for amendments. We support the request for the inclusion of the text that has been omitted at para 9. It has been in every resolution and report as long as I have been working on this topic. Now would be the wrong time to remove it. We hope a solution can be found to the issue raised by the Netherlands at para 13. Minimal as it may be China and Netherlands request for a semi colon between state responsibility and due diligence would help us. We support the US’s request on the POC directory. We also support Canada’s proposal for language at 18a but are also open to working on text with any who require it.

We particularly welcome the inclusion of a reference to international humanitarian law in this report and the flexibility of others to accept the inclusion of this previously agreed consensus text. I would appreciate the opportunity to review China’s requests in writing. However willing we may be, some appear extensive and challenging to manage at this stage. But we remain willing to work together to resolve issues where we can.

We are open to discussing existing international legal obligations on the threat or use of force in a future session as raised by Vietnam. But we caution against inserting language into this report at this stage given it has historically been challenging to find consensus language in this regard. I have previously noted that the OEWG is not a technical forum. I would like to clarify that we remain open to the inclusion of language on cooperation and CERTs in our report, as raised by Kenya, Colombia, Chile and others, where this is at the strategic level. We can also accept language on ransomware, which we note remains important to Costa Rica, but will not break consensus without it.

Chair, it’s been a long year. Whether it is a Caipirinha, a smoothie or a glass of wine, I don’t really care I’d just like us to drink it tomorrow please.