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(Five‑minute break).

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Hello, colleagues, Ladies and Gentlemen. Let's start our session for this Working Group 1 of the Plenary on this WTPF‑21. My name is Roberto Hirayama from Brazil. I firstly want to thank my administration for nominating my name to be proposed for the election of Chair of this group which I think all too as well.
 In opening this Working Group, I wanted to make some initial words related to the important task that we had ahead of us. As some say, the whole is greater than its parts, some of its parts. And we have two draft opinions that when together with the other ones, compose a package. All together these opinions to address very important, and pressing opportunities and challenges, spanning from COVID to digital divide and passing through connectivity and security, affordability, digital skills, et cetera.
 And in this next couple of days we are going to be discussing these opinions 1 and 2. And this will be a very good chance for us to better build our digital future, having in mind that we have some policy challenges, that this Forum can give some guiding principles overall.
 Relating to the two opinions, Opinion 1, enabling environment for the development of new and emerging telecommunication ICTs services and technologies for sustainable development and Draft Opinion 2, affordable and secure connectivity in mobilizing new and emerging ICTs for sustainable development. These are two critical aspects. The first of them being an enabling environment which at the end foster or not investments and deployments and give innovation space to thrive, when the policies and regulations of each country are better suitable for those important tasks. The whole sector thrives and gets better and addresses the challenges that we face in front of us.
 And the other opinion, the Opinion 2, gives us a very important scope on discussing connectivity, affordable and secure. And in the mobilization of these new and emerging technologies for sustainable development, we know that 37% of the population around the world is not connected yet to the Internet. And this is a huge challenge that we seek to have some understanding when discussing Opinion 2.
 These are some initial ideas. I want to also convey the message that we had a long and fruitful preparatory process. We had several meetings in the IEG WTPF under the leadership of Fabio Bigi, which I ‑‑ who I thank again.
 And we have a set of opinions, Opinions 1 and 2, building blocks of the whole package. And we hope to have as much as possible this important preparatory work be the basis of the consensus that we want to achieve, especially with Opinions 1 and 2. With that, I thank you again the ITU for having and preparing and having this Forum. And I want to invite the Vice‑Chair of Working Group 1, Mr. Aymen Almogherah from Saudi Telecom Company to give us a few words as well. Please, sir. Go ahead. The floor is yours.

 >> AYMEN ALMOGHERAH: Thank you. Distinguished Delegates, it is a great honor and a great pleasure for me to participate in the Working Group 1. And thank you for nominating me as Vice‑Chair. As you all know WTPF was affected in the last two years with the COVID‑19 pandemic. And it has demonstrated the importance that telecom communication infrastructure plays. Because of the economic and social disruption caused by the pandemic people across the globe relied on technology for information, for social distancing and working from home.
 As providers of digital connectivity, telecom operators play a leading role in the story of COVID but only successfully respond to the search and data traffic. They stepped forward to work with Governments through extraordinary circumstances to keep people connected and to support the pandemic response. As the effects of the pandemic proceed for most people it is not possible to reflect on how the world has changed. That are necessary for digital inclusion and advancement.
 The pandemic made it abundantly clear that high performing networks are essential and even more so in times of crisis. Public services relied more heavily than ever on digital solutions. Educators, for example, embraced distance learning with as unprecedented lockdowns forced them to take classrooms wholly online. The WTPF gives us a unique opportunity to come together to reflect and to debate the emerging issues and telecoms and ICTs and their significance. Most importantly, it allows us to look at how we can connects the unconnected and keep focused on ITU and the significant role they all ‑‑ we have played and continue to play in enabling the Internet adoption. On this perspective it is important that we all need to have a hand and engage in proactive discussions and dialogue and work towards a consensus upon the pressing issues.
 The focus efforts from the Member States will take us indeed one step closer to transform the information society and the norm society where all people of the world will be able to assess views and share information in an affordable and secure manner. Thank you very much. Back to you, Mr. Chair.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you, Aymen, for your words. I want to recognize also the Secretariat by means of the honor of having the director of the BDT here with us, Ms. Doreen, for giving some opening words and also to be with us throughout the process. Please, I invite you to address us. Thank you.

 >> DOREEN BOGDAN‑MARTIN: Thank you. Thank you, Chair. Thank you for giving me the floor and, of course, thank you for your leadership that you have shown throughout this preparatory process.
 The two draft opinions before us in this Working Group today are the result of rigorous consensus driven and a collaborative process. And they will, I believe, set the tone for the entire Forum. These documents when taken together go to the core of what it means to deliver connectivity.
 The two draft opinions encompass the need for policymakers to find new ways to facilitate infrastructure deployments, to promote more affordable connectivity, and to build greater confidence and security in digital networks and services.
 The COVID‑19 pandemic as we have heard from so many previous speakers have thrown the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development squarely in the spotlight. It is abundantly clear the communities identified in this agenda at most risk for being left behind are the same communities that are being digitally left behind, digitally excluded as Her Excellency, Minister Ursula Owusu‑Ekuful stressed in the Opening Forum. As stated before in the draft opinions today, a digital divided remains between certain segments of populations can who access, afford and adopt new and emerging technologies, ICTs, and those who cannot. The crippling cost of digital exclusion is real and it is growing.
 We heard that repeatedly last week at the Internet Governance Forum. And it now seriously jeopardizes the achievement of the UN Sustainable Development Goals. That means our work over the next three days is crucial, collaborative, agile and enabling policy frameworks and the need to intensify cooperation are more important than ever before.
 Mr. Chair, I am most encouraged that one of the draft opinions developed by our Working Group recognizes both GIGA, the joint ITU global school connectivity initiative as well as ITU's new Partner to Connect Digital Coalition as two highly powerful transformative initiatives. These kinds of collaborative partnerships that harness the power of digital to reenergize progress around our global goals serve as models for what we can achieve when we really commit to working together.
 I urge all ITU members and partners to join us in these endeavors so that together we can accelerate global efforts to bridge the connectivity divide, still separating the digitally affluent from the digitally deprived.
 Dear colleagues, the work of this Consultative Forum is going to serve as an important basis for next year's World Telecommunications Development Conference, which comes at a critical juncture for our collective future. We have a once‑in‑a‑ generation opportunity to use technologies and services at the heart of this Forum combined with the power of multi‑stakeholder partnerships to reenergize sustainable development, and to drive social and economic prosperity for all the world's people. Let's seize that opportunity with both hands and make history as our WTPF Chair stated, and let's do that together.
 Thank you very much.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you, Doreen, for your important and very relevant words. Important to be remembered. I understand that we have before jumping to our agenda, we have a couple of videos that will be shown on the screen. I seek the Secretariat to give us a word on that. If not, we can go to the agenda. No problem about that.

 >> DOREEN BOGDAN‑MARTIN: Chair, I think we can proceed to the agenda. Please. Go ahead.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. So can we have the document ADM/2, which is our agenda on the screen? Yes. There it is. Thank you. So. First of all, the agenda is on the screen for your approval. Anyone would like to ask for the floor? Any comments on the agenda? I see none. So it is adopted.
 Thank you. So we have as we said two draft opinions. And we received three contributions to those draft opinions. I want to highlight that some of these contributions did have specific contributed text to the existing IEG draft opinions, which were sent to the Forum for our consideration. So this ‑‑ we have also in front of us a consolidated document, which is DL1, which consolidates all the contributions that were put forward and will be the basis for our discussions.
 The important information that we have to be discussing also is that we ‑‑ we have the opinions that were sent and are in front of us as the basis from the IEG. And the edits that were proposed for those paragraphs and sections.
 For every edit that has been suggested in this ‑‑ in these contributions, we are going to seek a consensus of the group of all of us here. And try to reflect these ‑‑ in the ‑‑ in the final texts that we put forward to the Plenary.
 However, if there is significant divergent views, and, of course, after some discussions, and we continue having these divergent views, then I propose that we don't include that edit, specifically discussed. And maintain the agreed text as proposed and which are all in the document 3 of the report of the Secretary‑General.
 In case we can resolve the divergence, I hope we ‑‑ I honestly hope so. The proposal text will be the one considered to be forwarded to the Plenary. But finally, I want to emphasize one thing, we do not have that much time. We have a limited time allocated in our agenda. So why I seek your understanding that we do need to seek consensus as far as possible. Okay. With that I propose that we go to Opinion 1 which is on the screen already. Thank you.
 The Opinion 1 as I said is enabling environment for the development of new and emerging telecommunications/ICT services and technologies for sustainable development. And I would like to invite our contributors. First Burkina Faso, Ghana, Kenya and Uganda for contribution No. 5. I see Ghana. Ghana, you have the floor.

 >> GHANA: Thank you very much, Chair. Good morning to you all. Congratulations for being our Chair. We know what you did with the Informal Experts Group. We count on you that we can make a very progressive way forward.
 As we have as Contribution 5 from the group of the Developing Countries Africa, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Kenya, Uganda, I see that we want to go straight to the consolidated text. Just to give a background of why we made this contribution, as much as we may be identified as homogeneous groups, where Member States, telecommunication and ICTs provide a means for us to relate to others in harmony rather than deepening the digital divide.
 Therefore, connectivity solutions should be very open to have comparison without any discrimination. We consider that Paragraph 7 under the opinion, and invites Member States, sectors, members and other stakeholders tends to contradict the prior Paragraph 6, which is say fostering nondiscrimination, provision of connectivity solutions.
 And again further to word as we mentioned, policies, ownership and establishment and operations of connectivity solutions in the Member States is also a national matter subject to S laws.
 So we know what complementary solutions and networks are. What are the (Off microphone). Sorry, indeed what are the main ones and what are the complementary ones. So we want to be very concise and very, if you like, comprehensive or generic as much as possible.
 So if you may move on to the first part of view, as just a modification of replacing across towards the realization of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.
 So this is one that we propose. Then if you go on further to invites Member States, here our contribution is saying that we could be generic and rather than saying complementary access, we can say connectivity solutions.
 We move on further to invites Member States, sector members and other stakeholders to work collaboratively. And just as we have done in the Informal Expert Working Group, we are saying together they will encourage innovation and entrepreneurship in the provision of connectivity solutions. Here we see a number of including two phrases of including that without English proficiency that doesn't rewrite.
 Then we go on to 8, and here as well because it has mentioned Member States, sector members and other stakeholders, there's the mention of just to encourage one of them which is the private sector to develop applications. We consider that that is very selective because among the sector, among those who are collaborating any of them should be encouraged to develop applications and services. Considering that what we know as Internet today, was not something which was started by private sector anyway. But as time to be. So we should be available to which ‑‑ any of the stakeholders who may want to develop applications and services.
 And what we have is a listing of various people, and as we have mentioned other stakeholders. We consider that this list is not important. Because we have mentioned other stakeholders. So to be concise, to address the diverse population needs.
 Then we move on to 10, still under Member States, sector members and other stakeholders collaborating. We say rather than the same stakeholders consulting on all stakeholders, and then there is a listing of these stakeholders, we are saying that we are ‑‑ we already have a header, preamble and they should go in to action on an enabling policy environment in accordance to national laws.
 So Chair, I will pause here. This is our contributions to, if you like, fine‑tune what we have. Thank you.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. Thank you, Ghana, and the others, Burkina Faso, Kenya and Uganda for the contribution. I would invite the Internet Society to present first the document 7, which are the two contributions for Opinion 1. And then we can open the floor for broader interventions, if anyone likes to do so.
 Please, Internet Society, go ahead. You have the floor.

 >> INTERNET SOCIETY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. It is an honor and a privilege for us to be here and to be able to contribute with this multi‑stakeholder Forum that we have today here.
 And in the interest of time, our contributions to both Opinions 1 and 2, wanted to reflect and emphasize the importance of complementary access solutions. And we try to highlight that by introducing also examples that we work, that are the community networks. We want to emphasize the importance of this terminology for as an enabler of the traditional solutions that we have, be working until now. And trying to highlight that we require innovative solutions to achieve and connect the unconnected, especially in rural, remote, underserved and unserved areas. So we support the language that was agreed by the Informal Experts Group on complementary solutions. We ‑‑ we want to invite the consideration to add Committee networks as one of the examples. But again in the spirit of consensus and having an agreed upon text with everyone, we can agree on complementary solutions.
 And I think I yield my time with this and hopefully we will have a fruitful discussion. Thank you very much, Chair.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you, Internet Society. Any initial comments? The plan that we thought is that we go paragraph by paragraph in those paragraphs that have edits. And section by section in those that do not have an edit.
 I don't see initial comments. I think we can go to the recalling section of Opinion 1. We can start in the top part of the draft opinion, yeah. Any specific comments on this section recalling?
 Sorry? Did anyone ask for the floor?

 >> No, I did not ask.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Okay. There is someone unmuted. Thank you. I don't see any raised hands. So we can agree with that section. Please further down. Considering. In the same manner, any comments to this section on considering? Anyone asking for the floor? Doesn't seem the case. Thank you. So further down. Recognizing. And recognizing A through F. Any comments regarding this section? None. Okay. Thank you. We can agree on that.
 And now we come to the view where we have the first contribution, contributed text, where we are going to go specifically to that paragraph. So the contributed text is on the screen. And it reads, it is of the view that inclusive access and use of new and emerging telecommunications/ICTs services and technologies, new and emerging technologies such as 5G, IoT, Big Data and OTTs have the potential to accelerate progress towards the realization of the UN Sustainable Development Goals.
 The contribution is clear. Any oppositions on having that specific edit? Any comments towards specifically this section? This paragraph? Okay. Doesn't seem the case. Thank you. So here which we have an edit, please highlight that.

 >> (Off microphone).

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Sorry, go ahead, Marco. I didn't see that. Go ahead. You have the floor.

 >> I didn't raise my hand. Thank you.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: That's okay also. If I don't see any raised hands, please let me know. That's something sometimes happens. Anyway, we have this specific clause that we just ‑‑ okay. I have now Japan on the ‑‑ on raising hand. So please Japan, go ahead.

 >> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think in that case the achievement of the SDGs is more appropriate in the ‑‑ I think ‑‑ achievement of the SDGs is more natural and appropriate in this case. I think I propose to use that achievement instead of the realization. Thank you very much.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Okay. We have a clear proposal. So towards the achievement of the UN Sustainable Development Goals, yes, please reflect this on the screen. However to the contributors, any concerns on changing realization by achievement?
 None. Okay. Ghana. Please go ahead.

 >> GHANA: Thank you, Chair. I just quickly checked the dictionary and we have a few items. It is up to membership as to what best fits. Both ‑‑ any of the two could be used. So accomplishment, fulfillment, realization. It is not to move between realization and achievement. As we prefer any of them.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: We had the proposal from Japan and I see no harm in changing to achievement. Ask any comments or positions to changing that.

 >> Kenya was asking for the floor. Now they lowered their hand. And now we have Huawei asking for the floor.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. Does Kenya want to address this?

 >> KENYA: Thank you very much.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Go ahead.

 >> KENYA: Congratulations for being elected to this position. I lowered my hand. I was going to support the proposal of Japan in the interest of time and moving forward.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. Huawei, go ahead.

 >> HUAWEI: Thank you, Chair. Mr. Chairman. This is Huawei. My version is regarding this paragraph in general. I don't want to address the subutilization between the two words. Rather I want to address some other issues in this paragraph. We have a list of digital technologies, 5G, AI and IoT and OTT and Big Data as well. This list of technology is used in many other places throughout the text of these five opinions but here I want to make some intervention. Sorry. Apologies, we didn't have time to provide a formal contribution. But we believe, try to list those digital technologies on 5G, AI, IoT, Big Data and OTTs. They are very good. They seem to be mainly something equally important from the structure from the view. We believe that IP business can also be considered to be included here, just for your consideration. So this is our intervention. Thank you very much.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. I want to make a brief comment regarding the list of the technologies. They come from Decision 611. And they were extensively discussed. And it's going to be some hurdle to change that in this final stage. I do see a merit on IPv6, but I want to seek clarification if they ‑‑ they need to be in the list of the new and emerging technologies.
 I see IPv6 as an existing technology already. If you can clarify that. And then I open the floor for comments of the group. Please, Huawei. Please unmute yourself. We are not hearing you.

 >> HUAWEI: Thank you, Chair. We wanted to propose IPv6, this is a good result from this discussion. And you have various discussions to include this as several names, several names of technology. However I think I make the ICT and connecting technology just in the context of this first opinion, second opinion and remaining opinions. Those technologies need to work together to enable us to build an end‑to‑end infrastructure, to enable the connectivity and the wider range throughout the world. So I think our 5G represents wireless communication, AI, also IoT and Big Data. Each of them have their own reputation. However from the fixed point of view, whatever ‑‑ whatever connected technology you are using you need to implement these networks on top of the IP layer while this greater trend that migration from IPv6 ‑‑ IPv4 to IPv6 is quite substantial. And it is a very certain trend we are observing. So that's a motivation for us to propose possible inclusion of IPv6 as one of the ‑‑ under representative technology for consideration. But we fully understand and appreciate Huawei's practical use to include one more name here. We are ‑‑ yeah. We appreciate if they can be considered. But we understand that we may encounter. Thank you very much.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. Let me put it to the floor. Are there any concerns on including IPv6 to that list? I see United Kingdom. And I saw Algeria putting on the chat that Algeria wants to keep the list as it is. But let's hear from UK. Go ahead, UK.

 >> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you, Chair. And I appreciate the ‑‑ sorry. I'm having a bit of feedback. I appreciate the contribution from our colleague from Huawei. I would however align with your suggestion, Chair, that we stick to the language as is currently in the text. I think you rightly pointed out this language comes from Decision 611. It was discussed quite a bit at the ‑‑ at Council when they put this together. We have discussed this quite a bit during our time in IEG. And we have kept to the list as laid out. We would like to keep it is here and align ourselves with other colleagues.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. I saw also in the chat that Netherlands supports UK. Honestly, with those positions, I am afraid we have to keep the text as it is. And I'm seeking to move on this subject. Brazil also supporting UK to keep the list. Huawei. You are insisting on adding IPv6 to the list?

 >> HUAWEI: Thank you, Chair. Huawei also go to other speakers for your approved comments. So we are flexible. We are very open to the options. We don't have much inconsistence in adding the specific term here. We think probably the text will look better and be enriched and more representative if we have the inclusion of IPv6 term. If the general opinions are not in favor of this, we don't insist. Thank you very much. Yeah, probably can offer us solutions to, yeah, probably the ‑‑ through other interventions in the subsequent discussion of this.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you for your flexibility. So we can move forward. We can put in green the text. We don't have any specific edit on those. But as this very important clauses and paragraphs, I will give a read. And then I will open the floor for comments overall in these paragraphs. Okay.
 So as of view that establishment of an enabling environment for investment is critical to mobilize such services and technologies as mentioned in the view 1, above for sustainable development. 3, that removal of barriers to investment and innovation is essential to mobilizing the services and technologies mentioned in this view, one above for sustainable development. Four, if you can scroll down, yeah, maybe I will follow ‑‑ no, no. Please go up. By using targeted Government support where the business case for private investments is otherwise lacking and in support of an affordable connectivity as mentioned in the view 1 for sustainable development. Five, is of the view that use of services and technologies as mission of the view 1 for sustainable development can empower marginalized groups and including women and girls children and youth, older persons, Persons with Disabilities and Indigenous People. That that use of a new and emerging telecommunications/ICT services and technologies and complementary solutions can promote sustainable development. And that policies in the field of telecommunications/ICTs should consider environmental challenges such as climate change mitigation.

The last two, that enabling environment for the development and deployment of services and technologies as mentioned in these view 1, based on transparent, stable, predictable, independent and nondiscriminatory policies in regulatory and legal environments, promote innovation and investment from both private sources. And that stakeholders should continue to work together to encourage and promote exchange of information, capacity building and best practices to create an enabling environment for the mobilization of new and emerging telecommunications/ICT services and technologies. So this is the subsequent view on the section. Now I will open the floor for any specific comments on those paragraphs.

 >> MARCO OBISO: Algeria is asking for the floor. And I don't know if Huawei is still asking for the floor because I guess the hand was raised as before intervention. Thank you. Huawei and then Algeria and Kenya.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you, Marco. Let's go to Algeria. Please go ahead.

 >> ALGERIA: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, Distinguished Delegates. I'm very proud to be able to participate to this important event. Thank you very much for the organization. And my congratulations, Mr. Chair, for your nomination. If you don't know, I have a small comment on the section 2 of the view ‑‑ the view part. I think we believe that we propose to include that the removal of the unnecessary barriers, not the barriers, not of barriers. The necessary ‑‑ the removal of unnecessary barriers to investment and innovation and, et cetera. We believe that Governments are free to apply or to develop regulations and policies to discipline, to discipline and deregulate investment and innovation. This is why we prefer to include this ‑‑ the word unnecessary, such as the environmental barriers or technical barriers.
 Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you, Algeria. Can you ‑‑ yeah. That's what I wanted to see. Yeah. Does that reflect your comment, Algeria?

 >> ALGERIA: Yes, Mr. Chair. Yes. Thank you very much.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. Anyone opposed to changing this paragraph and adding this word unnecessary barriers? Doesn't seem the case. Okay. Thank you. We had Kenya, but Kenya does not ‑‑ is not asking for the floor. But we have United States and Ghana. United States first. Go ahead.

 >> UNITED STATES: Thank you, Chair. And good evening, good afternoon, good morning, everyone. Excited to be with you today. And thank you, Roberto, for your leadership of this Working Group. I think I recall that there had been discussion within the Informal Experts Group about this question of including unnecessary barriers or not including this term. And I believe the consensus achieved at the IEG was not to include unnecessary. So my preference here would be again to move forward with the consensus text of the IEG. This is looking at how we are seeking to spur and mobilize these technologies. And we think that the removal of the barriers, obviously people would not want to remove necessary barriers. But we think the text as it was great. Thank you.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you, U.S. Ghana.

 >> GHANA: Thank you. The U.S. has seemed to have said what I intended to say. Thank you.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. Wow. Yeah. Our Vice‑Chair, Mr. Aymen Almogherah also agrees. And I think the general text of barriers, it's more encompassing because it's ‑‑ we don't prejudge if it is necessary or unnecessary. So I will ask for us to keep the text as it was. And I see Indonesia. Are you agreeing to having the text as it was? Please go ahead.

 >> INDONESIA: Thank you, Chair. First of all, we would like to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, for your appointment. Further, we would also send our sincere appreciation to the ITU Secretariat for organizing this WTPF Forum. We thank the Chairman and members of the Informal Experts Group for developing the draft opinions. Indonesia highly supports the Draft Opinion 1 and the idea to foster an enabling environment that is conducive for mobilizing new and emerging telecommunications and ICT and emerging technologies. We believe it is essential to develop supporting policies to impact community.

Mr. Chairman, regarding this point on Draft Opinion 1, in principle, Indonesia welcomes the invitation to encourage foreign and domestic investment in the digital ecosystem. And as ‑‑ we also notice that the draft use of the term barriers for this point and several parts of the opinion. As we all know something that's considered a barrier to one country might be different from others. Further, there are types of barriers, whether it is technical barriers, policies, barriers or any other barriers that might also generate different sense of the meaning to each country.
 With this regard we would like to seek clarification regarding the term barriers used in the draft. We would be happy if we can have the background since not all of us are part of the IEG discussion. With that we conclude our intervention. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you, Indonesia, indeed. Barriers are supposed to be a term that is general and often to encompass the issues that we face in fostering investment and innovations. It is supposed to be a general terminology for us to have a say inside each country on what is a barrier or not. It is aligned with what you said, that a barrier in one country can be something that is not in another country.
 And the text as it stands without the change proposed by our colleagues does reflect that notion. But I have Iran. Please go ahead, Iran.

 >> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. A general comment for your consideration to be conscious of time, you don't have so much time. You have a little bit today. And I don't know how much time you have tomorrow. Second, this text has been worked with extensive attention to various meetings. And we are not looking for perfection. We are looking for consensus. But the most important, Chairman, how we could identify what barriers is necessary and what barriers is unnecessary. What's the criteria. Something that makes the implementation critical may not be productive. The term barriers is sufficiently broad. Leaves the room for any future flexibility and so on and so forth and putting an objective, necessary, unnecessary. Then we need somebody to say this barrier is necessary. This barrier is not necessary.

Perhaps our Distinguished Colleagues first look at we have done that very extensively and try to make as possible to retain what we have, unless it is a grammatical mistake or a substantive mistake. And second not make such a distinction between necessary and not necessary. Chairman, I'm not opposing to anybody at all. I'm just giving the logic. Thank you.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. Your points are very clear. We have to move on. So what I'm proposing is to maintain the original text. Thailand, are you opposing to that? If not, if you want to oppose to that, take the floor. But otherwise, we have to move on. My proposal is to keep the original text. Okay. Thailand, go ahead. You have the floor.

 >> THAILAND: Thank you very much. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, and congratulations to you. I was about to lower my hand, but I agree that we should keep original text and want to add that. It is a general will that we are of the view to remove barriers. So I do agree that inputting what, unnecessary, it then creates the point of what is necessary and what is not. It is just the general term that we think removing barriers to investment and innovation is essential. So it is the idea. So we agree to keep the original text. And we would like to thank the expert groups for that. Thank you very much.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. So let's move on. I think we have agreement to delete unnecessary, to just keep the regional. Thank you. I will ask once more to this section of the view. Any other comments or do we agree with the text as we discussed to this point? Thank you. Moving on, so we invite Member States. We do have a contribution and invite Member States 1. So let's give a read to that contribution from Burkina Faso, Ghana and Kenya and Uganda. So invite Member States to consider how best to foster an enabling environment that's conducive for mobilizing new and emerging telecommunications/ICT services and technologies as well as connectivity, solutions for sustainable development to maximize the benefits and minimize their risks.
 So here the contribution is to change complementary access by connectivity. I will ask in that way, do we have opposition to changing that terminology? I see Kenya. Please go ahead, Kenya, and then Internet Society.

 >> KENYA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Kenya is one of the countries that have proposed this amendment. Mr. Chairman, about 15 years ago with reviewing policies for connectivity the buzz word then was Telecenters or community Telecenters or community access centers.
 Now Telecenters, they are less common in the last few years. It is selective. And when we talk about solutions this is broad enough to accommodate any other connectivity solutions that may come in the future, other than picking on one that is current today. Because nobody ‑‑ we don't talk about Telecenters and those community access centers. That's why we are proposing that by having a prescriptive, a general word like connectivity solutions is suitable. And Chair, this is in line with the Resolution 2 as well as Decision 611 that says that the opinions should not be prescriptive. Complementary access is a very specific way of giving a connectivity. So in that regard, Chair, that's why these countries that have made this proposal are making this general description. Now for other solutions which include community access.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you, Kenya. We do need to speed up a little. Just as we can to conclude this specific clause, I would ask the interpreters if we are allowed to have I'm guessing here 15 extra minutes. Are we allowed to extend our time a little bit? Thank you. Thank you very much.

So we heard your explanations, Kenya. And we have Internet Society and I'm seeking to see if there are ‑‑ are there any oppositions to change this terminology? Go ahead, Internet Society.

 >> INTERNET SOCIETY: Thank you. We would rather have the agreed upon text that we agreed during the IEG. The reason why is that we ‑‑ from the Internet Society we don't believe that mentioning (inaudible) is something specific. Rather we are trying to address the issue that there are ‑‑ the connectivity solutions that we have currently are not addressing all the situations going DD, especially in places ‑‑ in rural places and very remote places where the business models that are being applied currently do not work because of the characteristics of those local communities. So adding complementary it is just that. It is a solution for access that complements existing ones.

We at the Internet Society we believe that community is one of the solutions, but we don't want to be prescriptive. And we appreciate any other complementary solutions that exist out there to try to connect the unconnected. So hopefully again just to be clear we don't believe it is the word complementary it is self‑prescriptive of any solution.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Yeah, it is a good comment on the terminology. Thank you. Brazil, please go ahead.

 >> BRAZIL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening for all. We just in order to contemplate the possibility of other forms of excellence, we believe that the original text it is better. So we suggest that we ‑‑ it is ‑‑ if it is possible to maintain the original text with the complementary access or something that can reflect other types of complementary access. Thank you.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you, Brazil. I see APC agreeing with Brazil. And we have Algeria Telecom, please. Go ahead.

 >> ALGERIA TELECOM: Thank you. Good morning. Congratulations, Roberto, to your appointment. I wish you all the best in your duties.
 I think to my opinion, I don't really understand what we mean by complementary access for being honest. We don't see this word in this standardization organization or even ITU‑T or ETSI (cutting out). Description or ‑‑ actual contribution of opinion access technologies, whether it is ‑‑ (cutting out). Use technologies like HAPS and area vehicles and so on. And IMT base station, whatever. But these are defined in the 3GPP and INR and there is definitions on that.

So Chairman, I think we prefer connectivity which is ‑‑ encompasses as my colleague said the existing and even potential complementary as we are trying to say here access technology, whether they are wired or wireless or outer space technology access for broadband, of course. And again we support connectivity. Thank you, Chairman.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. Well, the final, final comment for Ghana.

 >> GHANA: Thank you again, Chair. We heard from Internet Society they don't want to be discriminatory. And definitely that's what we are seeking with a proposal of connectivity. The reason why the current text or the amended text is discriminatory just as Algeria it doesn't take solution to connect the last mile. In concerned cases you need a backhaul. For to mention access alone you are quite limiting. When you say connectivity, you can have the various mix which will be complementary among themselves to achieve and that's what we seek. So we agree with you, just as we had the opportunity where certain adjectives, one unnecessary which nobody can similarly ‑‑ we cannot do so for complementary, that can be accomplished. Thank you, Chair.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. We have a proposal from the Internet Society in the chat. Maybe it is a good thing to put it on the screen. So it would be complementary.

 >> GHANA: Complementary solutions. Forgive me, the United Kingdom. I'm not a native English speaker. Complementing connectivity solutions.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Yeah, I'm not a native English speaker as well. But the proposal from the Internet Society it is on the chat and it is complementary connectivity solutions. Any oppositions to that? I seek your agreement to this. It is a middle ground between the views. Thank you. So let's move on. We can move to the rest to invite Member States. Any comments to the ‑‑ invite Member States 2 through 7? I see Iran. Are your hand a legacy hand or you want to take the floor again? Legacy hand. And Iran as well.
 Intel Corporation, please go ahead.

 >> INTEL CORPORATION: Thank you, Chair. I have a simple comment for the item 3. Just an addition. To take a coordinated Government approach, after approach, implementation of national, digital strategies is very important I believe. Just in 3.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Can you say it again in dictation speed?

 >> INTEL CORPORATION: Yes. After approach to, after 2, implementation of national digital strategies. Yes. Thank you. I believe this is very important. Thank you.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you, Intel. Iran and then we open the floor for any comments and oppositions for that insertion. Please Iran.

 >> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. We have agreed to change complementary, access solution to complementary access connectivity. There is no complementary access in the rest. May be editorial. And may be something. Once we change something in a part, we should be consistent throughout. Thank you.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you, Iran. I ask you to ‑‑ if the term arises, please take the floor again and make sure that it is aligned.
 Okay. Any comments further to the addition of Intel? It doesn't seem the case. Thank you. Let's go to invite Member States, sectors members and other stakeholders to work collaboratively.
 We have contribution on 7. And I will ask 1 through 6 if there are any comments on that part of the section. None. Okay. So let's go to 7, which is invite Member States, sector members and other stakeholders to work collaboratively to encourage innovation, entrepreneurship in provision of connectivity solutions. This is the contribution. Any oppositions to having this new text? Internet Society, please go ahead. Be quick, please.

 >> INTERNET SOCIETY: Yes. Super quick. Just to add complementary solutions and to keep as the colleague from Iran a good, consistent text across the opinion. Thank you very much.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: I'm understanding that you want to revert the deletion of complementary solutions, is that it? Or can you clarify?

 >> INTERNET SOCIETY: Yes. As some of the text that was ‑‑ that is structured to contain complementary solutions we would like to add that as we did previously with guaranteed solutions.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Okay. Please Secretariat, can you add complementary in the phrase? Not here. Down in 7. Yeah. Before connectivity. Complementary. We have Brazil and Kenya. Do you oppose to this new text? Brazil first.

 >> BRAZIL: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Yeah. No, we agree with the suggestion of ISOC. And we had an alternative solution, but I think this one it is already great. So we support the ISOC solution. Thank you.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. Kenya.

 >> KENYA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have to apologize that I have difficulty with the word complementary. I have just read on Google and it tells me that complementary means free, courtesy on the house. Mr. Chairman, is not prescriptive? What is prescriptive? So although we were ‑‑ we have not looked at what it means, unfortunately, Chair, Kenya will not accept the word of ‑‑ use of the word complementary. Thank you.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you, Kenya. I see the list increasing. I will just be very straightforward here. We either have the original text or the consensus text. I see the text as it is, provision of complementary connectivity solutions as the middle ground here because we agreed moments ago the same terminology above. So I urge you to consider that we have this new text or otherwise I will revert to the original text. UK, go ahead.

 >> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. Maybe just to touch very briefly on the complementary question. So there are a variety of meetings of complementary. I think this is in terms of something is able to compliment something else. So in this sense it means that it contributes to or it is a feature of, it is something like that. So it is kind of in parallel with another thing. And in the way in which we are using the word, the word complement is turned to complementary. We are not talking about free access.

On the proposal as a whole I do find this contribution actually changes the intention of bullet 7. And I'm wondering if we could revert to the original language, but then instead of complementary solutions we would say complementary connectivity solutions to align with the language we used both. But I think the purpose of the bullet is being lost in us curtailing the focus that we had here.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. First final comment to Algeria. And then in the meantime please put the proposal from UK, yeah. And please be quick. We are running out of our extra time. Please go ahead.

 >> ALGERIA: Yes. Thank you, Chair. Just want to support Kenya's comment, right. As they said there is no definition of complementary connectivity solutions. We don't find this terminology in ITU‑R or ITU‑T. Let's use industry terminology. We have venders in WTPF, they can agree with us. I suggest to wherever we put complementary, please, Chair, put square brackets. Thank you very much.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: It is very unfortunate because we feel that we're reaching some kind of agreement here. I will propose so that we revert to the original as we definitely have divergent views here. Please revert to the regional. If colleagues want to address the comments of Iran and then UK aligning the terminology that would be something that we could do as well. But at this moment, I don't see a consensus on that.
 But Ghana, less than final comments, okay.

 >> GHANA: Sorry. My apologies. The original doesn't read right. In English when you have including phrase, it goes with comma, and then another including follows. That's not correct in English.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Please propose something to change that, please.

 >> GHANA: Yeah. So that's why we made ‑‑ that's why we made it concise as to what will reflect all the including and we were very precise. Because what do we intend to achieve as collaborators? To encourage innovation and entrepreneurship. And it was to do what? In the provision of connectivity solutions. This is what usually entrepreneurship is look, based, innovation can come from anyone. It was concise and purposeful to summary. In summary it is one attribute of language that you are able to concise and to serve the purpose because the including, including makes it quite confusing and not really, if you like, a language for this level. Thank you.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: I do understand you, Ghana. I tried to put forward the text that is on the screen now. I will try again. Can we agree to have ‑‑ to encourage innovation and entrepreneurship in the provision of complementary connectivity solutions? Any opposition? No. The last connectivity we would ‑‑ will be deleted.
 United Kingdom. Yeah. Go ahead.

 >> UNITED KINGDOM: Thank you. (Off microphone). I do worry about ‑‑ I am wondering why we are not able to put out the work that we would like to do in the population and encouraging communities support. I just don't see how it is that we can't incorporate this contribution within the language that we have there. That's my question to the room. Thank you.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Okay. I'll ‑‑ as we are running out of time I will get the suggestion of Saudi Arabia to think more about that. But first thing tomorrow, we would be ‑‑ I would like to ask that involved members get in touch with one another to try to solve this particular issue here so that we can tomorrow have a proposed agreed text. If ‑‑ as Saudi Arabia was the one that suggested, please contact Saudi Arabia and please convey your discussions informally. With that, I thank you all and thank you the interpreters for giving us extra time. And the meeting is adjourned for today. And we come back tomorrow. Thank you.

 >> DOREEN BOGDAN‑MARTIN: Thank you, Chair.

 >> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you.

 \*\*\*

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

\*\*\*