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>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Greetings colleagues. Good morning, good evening, good afternoon to all. Let's start our final session of Working Group 1. I want to jump in directly to our Opinion 1. We have one hour to finish our work. So we have to be objective today. Firstly, I would like to inform you all that we have conducted some informal consultations during the evening yesterday. We could seek the views of several interested parties. And we reflected these views in the DL1 Rev that we have on the screen. I just wanted to make sure that we are all on the same page.   
 We had a very delicate balance and compromised text from the IEG. And we had several conversations yesterday during the session and after the session as well. And we had three outstanding issues on invite Member States, sector members, and other stakeholders to work collaboratively, 7, 8 and 10. One thing that I want to make very clear, we are not going to go back to the agreed text. I am putting forward this proposal on DL1, based on the views of several of the colleagues as the Chair's proposal to try ‑‑ try to resolve the outstanding issues. And we can go to the respective section so that we can have it on the screen.   
 And I would like to consult with the contributors through their focal point. If I go to section ‑‑ the section, invite Member States, please. Further down. The other edits that we see on DL, they relate to previous discussions. We go directly to ‑‑ it is ‑‑ yeah. That's it.   
 We have 7, 8 and 10. And 10 was moved up to invites Member States with one change. Instead of with all, we put relevant stakeholders. There was indeed some reference, circular reference to the collaboration here. So let's go back to 7, 8 and 10 below. And I want to consult with the contributors through Ghana. If we have agreement on this proposed text. Just a moment. I will give you the floor. Okay?   
 The ‑‑

>> GHANA: Sorry, Chair.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Yeah, I will give you the floor. Just one moment. I have to be very clear that if we don't have an agreement on this proposal that I'm putting forward, I will have to revert to the original text from the IEG. That is one very clear message that I want to convey to the group.   
 As I said from the informal discussions, the other interested parties are okay with the text. So I seek the views from the contributors, Ghana or as a representative. But you have the floor, Ghana, as you asked. Please go ahead. Ghana? Are you connected, Ghana?

>> MARCO OBISO: Chair, Ghana seems connected. Maybe he is muted. Maybe we can unmute him.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Yes, please.

>> Dear Chair, I cannot unmute a participant. I'm asking him to unmute himself. But no.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Okay. Any of the other representatives from the contributors are connected and are willing to take the floor?

>> MARCO OBISO: We have Kenya and United Kingdom.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: I want to urge other colleagues to only take the floor if we have a clear opposition to the text on the screen. And the silence meaning agreement. We don't have a lot of time.   
 And Kenya, just before you open the floor, and to other colleagues as well, I'm not going to allow extensive discussions. If I see divergent views I'm afraid I will have to revert back to the original text. Okay? The floor is yours, Kenya.

>> KENYA: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good to see you. I'm looking forward to having a compromised solution on this. Mr. Chairman, before I make my comments, Kenya feels that from your comments then maybe we should have just had these opinions approved by acclamation of the Opening Ceremony yesterday and then we don't need to put you through this strain we are in. Because if we can't contribute, we are being told that the original text will be the default, then I don't know whether it should even make my comment because we have some difficulties. Some of the words being used here. I'm afraid if I do so, from your opening remarks we may just go back to the original text. I don't know whether I can make my comment or if I do so you go back to the original text.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you, Kenya. Your comment gives me the opportunity to clarify. We had extensive discussions throughout two years and a quarter, since September 2019. And there was a lot of controversy on the preparations. And we did have half of our time yesterday to discuss the issues that we have on the DL on the screen. And we actually had a compromise. And the previous paragraphs of the opinion, we did agree to, for example, complementary connectivity solutions. And I stated very clearly in the beginning of the session yesterday there was a clear understanding that for this Forum that the divergence, we would stick with the IEG's text. That's the message that I want to convey. I see Egypt and Italy. Egypt first. And then Mr. Fabio Bigi.

>> EGYPT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning to everyone. I actually have the same feeling as Kenya. Yes, we do have ‑‑ we do have a problem with the word complementary. But your comments made me feel that it is very difficult to say that we have a problem because we agree ‑‑ the IEG had already agreed on the text and we would revert back to the text from the IEG. Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I understand that we have worked a lot for two years on the draft opinions. It has been ‑‑ it has been quite difficult and we made lots of progress. This contribution came from Burkina Faso and Ghana and other countries. It came on time and I believe it is important to take this contribution in to account. For us in Egypt the word complementary is going to be difficult to accept. Maybe we did not ‑‑ we clarified this with other colleagues and other members. So we are bringing it up now. As I understand the purpose of the Forum to share our views and continue discussion.   
 So I hope we can have some time to discuss this issue today. Thank you.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you, Egypt. We have one hour for Opinions 1 and 2 today. And I'm afraid that's all we have. So we had yesterday and during the informal discussions to reach a compromised text. And the text as I see on the screen, in my view is the compromise because we did agree to have complementary connectivity solutions. So that's where we stand.   
 Please, Mr. Fabio Bigi.

>> FABIO BIGI: Thank you, Chair. Simply to support the compromised solution. As you said we have had two years' discussion, seven formal meetings, a lot of formal discussion and you continue to provide a compromised text. I know that there are some parts who are very keen on having complementary in the text, they are opposing. With this text is making both sides equally unsatisfied. And I really urge the meeting to find and accept your compromised text. This is my intervention only to back you and we have other matters to discuss and the Forum is to approve all the ‑‑ hopefully the five draft opinions for you and all the experts, me also, have dedicated two years of our time.   
 So please come to compromise. Have an open mind. And do not back to a position that for those who are not present at the meeting previously, maybe are new. I heard several times already. Thank you.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you, Mr. Fabio Bigi. South Africa, the last intervention before I propose a way forward. Go ahead, South Africa.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, everyone. Chair, we are on your side. We really want to move forward and we are looking forward for us finding a compromised solution to this. And being the participant in the informal expert group we know how it was really painful for us to arrive at the way we are today. So Chair, we ‑‑ given what Saudi has proposed on the chat, I think that for us perhaps can assist us to then be able to move forward because clearly there is a problem with usage of the word complementary in the text. So can we then perhaps look at what Saudi is proposing which I think will be able to take us forward. Thank you.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. I'm afraid I will have to state again. We are not going to go in to editing in this session. And I will put forward this proposal and I seek your understanding and compromise and acceptance to the proposal that is on the screen.   
 Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you very much. Let's go to Opinion 2. We go to Opinion 2. Kenya, you want to have comments on Opinion 2? I'm not reopening the discussions. If we continue the discussions, I'm afraid I will have to revert to the original. We just had this approval. And I'm afraid that we will not have time to go through Opinion 2 which we have two outstanding brackets. Please consider that. We had informal consultations. And we honestly hope we can go and have this as colleagues said, equally unhappy solution. Because we did not have the term that we originally had discussed. And we hope that we can move on. Move forward. Kenya, are you insisting on taking the floor?

>> KENYA: Mr. Chairman, you didn't give me a chance to speak. So I think I remove my hand. Thank you.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Well, I'm afraid we have to move on. We had this conversation already. And we feel if we reopen the issues, that could compromise the discussions of the draft Opinion 2. We can ‑‑ after the Draft Opinion 2 is discussed, and if we have time, we can try to reassess the discussions. But I'm afraid we have to move on.   
 So let's go to Draft Opinion 2. We have two contributions. And the first one from Brazil and the other one from Internet Society. I will ask them to be very brief in their interventions. So that we can go to the two outstanding issues. Please Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Hi. Hello, everyone. Following your guidance, Chair, I will try to be very, very brief. Just to present what Brazil has proposed. The idea here is to try to resolve the remaining brackets that we have in Opinion 2. Those are in recalling E, and ease of the view D. So it is a very I would say simple solution. We believe it encompasses the main ideas of all the contributors on these topics since the beginning of the discussions.   
 And we hope that this text can resolve the pending issues and we can have a fully aligned text for Opinion 2. Thank you, Chair.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you very much, Brazil. Internet Society. Please be brief as well.

>> ISOC: Yes. Thank you very much, Chair. And good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. I'm not sure where our contribution is here in this.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: The text that was reflected, the ones that had specifically suggested text. You can present it over all your contribution.

>> ISOC: I think that everything that we presented in line with Opinions 1 and 2 has been already reflected in the discussions. So thank you very much, Chair.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. Thank you, Internet Society. So let's go to the outstanding two issues. Huawei, do you want to address the issues that we have, the two brackets? Otherwise we come back to any other discussions after we discuss the points that are highlighted.

>> HUAWEI: Okay. That's fine. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I do have some other comments regarding Opinion 2, recalling part. Thank you. Okay? Thank you.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. So let's ‑‑ the two first contributions of Brazil as a whole, I think they are related. So the proposal is to the recalling section, it is to delete the reference to Resolution 1 or 2 by replacing it by the text on the recall 101. Any oppositions? Any comments related to that? None? Okay. Thank you. So we can have both approved. Next one, it is in subsequent sections. There it is. The proposal is to replace the word, delete the word privacy and replace it by personally identified information.   
 Any comments, any opposition to that change? None? Thank you. Now let's go section by section from the top. Opinion 2, recalling, any further comments on recalling? Huawei, please be brief, okay?

>> HUAWEI: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for giving me the floor. Yes, we do have many comments. Hello. Can you hear me?

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Yes. Loud and clear.

>> HUAWEI: Regarding our recalling part, because we think the IPv6 may deserve some place here. So continue discussion we raised yesterday, it seems probably we can find some other places to include IP basic related parts. So we just find ‑‑ by the way to IPv6 to be recognized here. So just try to bring to your attention to this existing, there is a Resolution, 180. I think Resolution 180 was issued in 2018. So the title is ‑‑ okay. So the title is about IPv6. So I mean if it is possible, can we just decide this as a useful part of this recording?

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Yeah, we did get your proposal. It is a clear one. It's to recall Resolution 180.

>> HUAWEI: Yes.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: It is I guess from Rev Dubai 2018 of the Plenipotentiary Conference.

>> HUAWEI: And Resolution. Yeah.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Can we have it on the screen? Can the Secretariat help us reflect that? Just one moment.

>> HUAWEI: Yeah, the title for this is promoting deployment and adoption at IPv6 for facilitators of translation from IPv4 to IPv6. This is a full title. Yeah. You are right. It is what is issued in Dubai 2018.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Yeah, yeah. What I'm proposing is that we call what we did as in the other Resolutions and Secretariat can take care of that if we approve it. Any oppositions to recall Resolution 180? I see none. So approved. Let's go back to the DL. Because we ‑‑ the text that will be transmitted at the end of our session to the Plenary we'll have that addition. Let's go back to the DL and go to the next ‑‑

>> HUAWEI: Thank you very much, Chair.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. Thank you, Huawei. The next section is recognizing. Oh, there it is. Thank you. Recognizing. Any comments to recognizing? Algeria, please. Go ahead. Algeria.

>> ALGERIA: Yes, good morning. Thank you very much. Chairman, just a question of clarification. Chairman, we are recalling all the PP Resolutions with their titles. But the Resolution 102 is excluded from that, you know, on the way on which we are proceeding in the recalling part. I mean, you know, for consistency perspective, I think that, you know, doesn't make sense for coherence. We are recalling all Resolutions with their title including 180 which is part of the Internet Resolutions. Because we recalled 101 and then 102 and we have 130 and the 180. So all of these Resolutions are recalled with their titles excluding 102 which is already a PP Resolution. Can we have a coherent approach in which we are proceeding, Mr. Chairman? Thank you very much.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. Let's hear from Brazil and then we try to have a discussion. Go ahead Brazil.

>> BRAZIL: Thank you, Chair. Just continuing on the comment made by Algeria, the proposed text that Brazil presented was a compromise to accommodate exactly this discussion, I would say. So maybe Algeria is right in the sense that the idea we put in with other related Resolutions are all the Resolutions that conference Internet Protocol based networks. So 180 would fall on the category as well such as 102. And we do have probably other Resolutions that are related to IP‑based networks.   
 So one idea for consistency would be on D, that we just approve, could just say such as Resolutions 102 and 180 to try to accommodate Huawei's suggestion and keep the consistency that we are trying to keep. Thank you.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you, Brazil. I was trying to unmute myself. I feel that's a good suggestion from Brazil to try to solve the issue. And keep consistency. So we would have such as Resolutions 102 and 180. Can we reflect that in a ‑‑ I will try once more. Can we accept the proposed text? Okay. Thank you. So we delete the.

>> MARCO OBISO: It seems the Chair is not connected anymore. Roberto, can you hear us? Seems not. So if you ‑‑ the meeting can give us a minute to reconnect him. Thank you. I think you are back.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Yes, I can hear you. Sorry about that. My Internet connection just dropped. But let's go to recognizing. Any comments on recognizing?   
 I see none. Okay. Let's move to reaffirming. Any comments? I see none.   
 Okay. Noting. I see none. Thank you. Is of the view. Apart from the text that we already discussed. Yes, please go ahead, Vice‑Chair of Working Group 3.

>> NATALIA VICENTE: Hi. Good morning, everyone. I am ‑‑ I have been looking on the opinion itself. And it is of the view, when you can do a word search, you see that 5G is noted 12 times, compared to even broadband noted just three, one of them being on a Resolution. So I was a bit surprised when we were talking about sustainable development and affordable development and connectivity to see that much reference to a specific technology, when it can be definitely just new and emerging technologies and telecommunications and ICT as it was also in WTDC in the 17. I especially have a comment, let me just go to the document itself. So along ‑‑ is of the view as you can see on C, that investment infrastructure in particular in broadband and 5G infrastructure. It is always mentioning 5G specifically. We see one that in our opinion is not appropriate to put this when it comes to personal matters. Allocating sufficient spectrum for 5G, if we should just say new and emerging technologies and ICT services.

So sufficient spectrum for any kind of telecommunication and ICT services, not just the 5G. I think having this specific comment on 5G can be misleading to administrations and Member States. It is not necessary when we are talking about the future. Technology evolves and we should keep it open and keep it is an opinion that is as inclusive as possible. So that would be my two cents here. And thank you very much.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. One thing that I have to 5G is mentioned in technology, including IoT, Big Data and OTTs. This is reflecting Decision 611. So we do not want to touch that. In your comment on C, when we talk about broadband and 5G infrastructure, we are inclusive. And we try to be inclusive overall. But let's hear from colleagues from Intel and Iran so we can see how we proceed. Intel.

>> INTEL CORPORATION: I believe that we sufficiently discussed 5G and other technologies. And we already have a concise text. And also important that WTPF Resolution clearly explains this importance of the 5G IMT, for the ‑‑ and this will also in full alignment in Resolution.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you, Intel. Iran. And I'm closing the list before Algeria. And before ESOA. Close the list again. Go ahead, Iran. Iran? Please unmute yourself.

>> Dear Mr. Arasteh, can you please unmute yourself?

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: I don't see his raised hand. Let's go to Algeria then.

>> ALGERIA: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. Two suggestions, Chairman. In the case, paragraph 8, after this year, I suggest you include ITU. Right? Just to be precise and ‑‑ yes. ITU JCA because it is indeed a global. ITU framework. In part C, I think I agree with Natalia. We have discussed this extensively in different occasions. What we suggested in previous meetings to solve this issue, we suggested to include that investment in to terrestrial and nonterrestrial infrastructures.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Let's reflect on that. In the beginning of C.

>> ALGERIA: Yeah, that investment in.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Terrestrial.

>> ALGERIA: Broadband infrastructures. And then we continue, nonterrestrial infrastructures has now 5G components. We are seeing satellite that has a 5G component and even the hubs are also having a 5G component included. So I think this would solve the concern raised by Natalia. Thank you, Chairman.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: I have one minor editorial change to delete the first broadband. And put it only access. Because it's more inclusive. And then in particular in broadband in 5G infrastructure, if that is okay. Natalia and then Iran. Iran, you are back, okay?

>> NATALIA VICENTE: Maybe Iran can speak before because I just spoke. So I think it is good that he can share his views.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Okay. Iran.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning to you and to others. I think in ITU we don't have nonterrestrial. We have terrestrial and space. Nonterrestrial is not very relevant. Terrestrial and space services access, but not nonterrestrial. It is not wrong but it is normally just for Chairman. Thank you.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. Japan and then ESOA. Let's hear from Natalia regarding this change.

>> NATALIA VICENTE: I think the best thing would be to check I think how it is in other documents from the ITU because we have made reference to this kind of infrastructure in other cases. We use nonterrestrial in many cases, but I'm not sure if it is the terminology that the ITU officially uses. Space based access infrastructure, it could also be good possibly. I still think that it is important to mention. And I wasn't making any comment about list of 5G and AI and so on. I'm sure it has been agreed upon. I still think it is important to make a point on the G No. 3 when we talk about spectrum available. And we mention new and emerging telecommunication and ICTs and services. I think it should be kept at that. Including 5G or not including 5G. It's part of the new services. And it should not in our opinion be pointed out. There is the work that's done in the ITU‑R is specific to that. And I don't think that we need to point it out.   
 So that would be my comment on it.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Okay. Thank you. We had a comment on the chat that nonterrestrial is referenced in other standardization organizations from the industry. I feel we can try it. Or there is one comment from Russia, terrestrial and space services is in the ITU radio regulations. Maybe we can try that.   
 But let's hear from Canada first.

>> CANADA: Yes, thank you, Chairman. Good morning. Thank you very much again for your great efforts. Very briefly on directly related to the wordsmithing and terminology. It might be a question for the Secretariat. It is my understanding that Member States are entitled to submit written statements to the record of the Plenary, am I correct? These opinions are nonbinding and not restricted, that still allows us to submit statements at the end of this important meeting. Am I correct? Thank you.

>> MARCO OBISO: Yeah, the Secretariat confirms.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you, Marco. Let's go back to C. So as we are in ITU, let's use ITU terminology. Terrestrial and space. What is space? Services? Space services infrastructure maybe. And delete access. Access, no. Access will not fit here, I guess. Terrestrial and space services infrastructure.

>> INTEL CORPORATION: Terrestrial and space based.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Space based, that works. Canada, you requesting the floor again or just a legacy hand?

>> CANADA: Apologies. Legacy.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. Japan.

>> JAPAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So in that case, that's a very ‑‑ marine cable is excluded from the sentence that's my question. Submarine cable.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Can you repeat it?

>> JAPAN: If we use these words, what would happen with the submarine cable? Submarine cable is ‑‑ infrastructure.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Okay. Well, this is a question that the radio experts would have to answer, if anyone would try. But I'm guessing that terrestrial would include submarine if we delete the word services. Is that correct, anyone? I guess ‑‑

>> MARCO OBISO: Sorry, Chair. Just a little note from the Secretariat, just to add a little bit of pressure to the meeting. We have just 15 minutes to go because we have time allocated for the interpreters. Thanks.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you, yeah. Let's try this as a series, terrestrial, space based access. Can we agree and move on? It seems so. Okay. Thank you. Let's go ‑‑ are there any other comments to the rest of is of the view section?   
 It doesn't seem the case. Okay. Let's go to invites Member States.

>> MARCO OBISO: Mr. Chair, we have ESOA asking for the floor, unless it is a hand from before.

>> NATALIA VICENTE: Sorry. I still would like to go to point G3, about making sufficient spectrum available for a wide range of new and emerging technologies, ICT and services, including 5G and high, medium and low frequency bands. Including 5G in this case it can be choosing a specific technology and already got my opinion on it. So I think it should just be until telecommunication/ICTs and services, full stop. The rest in my opinion is already expressing an opinion on what should be given to 5G.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Can we reflect what we just did? Including 4, terrestrial and ‑‑ sorry. We had a comment here. Well, anyone could ‑‑ if you can, ESOA, just state very clearly what is the text that you want to include or delete. It is just that?

>> NATALIA VICENTE: That could be. Yeah. I mean for us the important thing is that we believe that we don't need to specify to which do we have to give, what. That's something that ITU‑R various expert groups have for years to decide upon. So that should be good.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Okay. Thank you. Iran.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Thank you, Chairman. The text as it is is okay. Because we have given sufficient spectrum to 5G. 17.5 gigahertz two years ago. So we don't need to take 5G, 6G, 3G and I don't understand high and medium and low frequency band. We don't have that definition in ITU. High frequency band. We have very high frequency band. We have low frequency, medium frequency but mid frequency, I don't know. It is good you delete everything after services. Thank you.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. Any oppositions to that? I see none. Okay. Moving on to invites Member States. Any comments on invites Member States? I see none. Thank you. Invites Member States, sector members and other stakeholders to work collaboratively. Any comments? I see none.   
 Thank you. Finally, invites the Secretary‑General. Any comments? I see none. Okay. So we've concluded Opinion 2.   
 ESOA, please.

>> NATALIA VICENTE: Just for the last time and I will not interrupt you. Sorry, that it was a little bit fast, invite Member States, point 3, it is not necessary to point out such as 5G rollout. I think it is expert group as it is without it and it includes everyone else and not specifically one technology only. When in some regions we know that it is not 5G. It can be 4G or any other solution that they want to go forward and invest on it. So I think to give it a particular ‑‑ access to the markets, should be okay. To consider how the use of shared digital services can support sustainable development by lowering the cost of doing business, enabling access to markets, full stop. It is a matter of I think ‑‑ I think it is more appropriate, I would not enter in to big discussions.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Okay. Thank you. The proposal to delete this part. I have several hands raised. But let's first take those that are related to this specifically. If you are not having discussions on this, ask the floor after. But we have South Africa and Intel. No. Intel. Intel.

>> INTEL CORPORATION: Thank you, Chairman. We oppose the deletion of the 5G related part. 5G is not ordinary technology. All the countries investing for 5G, the successful implementation of 5G is important for the countries and the people that jointly oppose the deletion. Thank you.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you, Intel. South Africa, you want to have a comment on 3? I guess not. But if you want to, you can take the floor now. Or...

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Thank you, chairperson. No, I want to just for consistency like on the next ‑‑ on invites Member States, sector members on 4, just if you allow me to come back.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Yes, I will do that. So the ‑‑ we have an opposition and divergent views. So let's divert to the regional text. As ESOA was saying, Natalia will not insist. Let's keep it as it is. South Africa, you are commenting on invites Member States, sector members and others, 4. Go ahead.

>> SOUTH AFRICA: Yes. Thank you very much for giving me the floor again. Good morning, good evening, good afternoon to everyone on the call. Chair, here in No. 4 we use terrestrial and nonterrestrial infrastructure. I think for ‑‑ we just need to be consistent throughout the document. And there are some views in the chat that was raised that HAPS and GBS, is it nonterrestrial or space services? We need to be consistent throughout this document or we might find ourselves in some conundrum.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Yes, we have to be consistent. I propose that we have the same formulation as we had before. It would be space, space based access. As the other point, Intel, do you want to comment on this No. 4 specifically? Or it is a legacy hand.

>> INTEL CORPORATION: Sorry. Legacy hand.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Kenya, you want to raise any issues on 4? Or you want to make other comments? Just to conclude this section.

>> KENYA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My comment is not on this 4. It is on the invites Member States, 3. Yes.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Okay. Let's ‑‑ I will come back to you. OneWeb you want to take the floor on that?

>> ONEWEB: Thank you. My comment is related to the previous point that related to the particularly 5G technologies. So I don't know if it is appropriate to raise it here or wait until we finish point 4.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Let's finish 4 first. And then I will get back to you. So maybe ‑‑ we have the director of BR, Mario, please.

>> MARIO MANIEWICZ: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to confirm that nonterrestrial is not ITU terminology. So your solution of having terrestrial and space based is the best. Just to clarify for some services of HAPS and others, that is terrestrial services. Thank you.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. Yes, I think we can agree with 4. Can we agree? Yeah, I think we can. Thank you. Kenya, you are up next.

>> KENYA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have ‑‑ my comment is on No. 3. Of course, if there is agreement to retain 5G. So I'm supporting retention. And then on No. 4, I am proposing to just some editorial at the end of No. 4, we add effective and efficient use of spectrum. I think efficient use of spectrum is also very key.   
 So I was suggesting slide modification to that invite 4. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you, Kenya. Russia.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Only one comment up. When we speak about Action Lines, on my knowledge C4, they are not the lead facilitator. We are the sole facilitator for C2, C5, C6. Thank you.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. Let's correct that. Iran. We are running out of time. We have four minutes.

>> ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. Efficient is very good after effective. It is constitution. It is okay, Chairman. That's a good suggestion. Thank you.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. So let's ‑‑

>> MARCO OBISO: Sorry. May I interject here? In response to the Russian Federation, we actually take him back, Action Line C4 we are the lead facilitator. It is actually correct.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Okay. Let's keep that. In the previous one, efficient, can we agree?

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Chairman ‑‑

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Just one moment, Russia. We conclude 4 and then we go back to Action Line C4. Can we agree on adding efficient? Are you asking the floor on that? It doesn't seem the case. So we can agree on that. So Kenya, are you having your hand raised? It is a legacy hand? Okay. So we are running out of time. So we have two other comments and then we close the list or no? Russia is not asking again.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes. I'm sorry.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Go ahead.

>> RUSSIAN FEDERATION: Yes. Let me keep the clear answer then. Officially we are not lead facilitator for C4. We do that in reality because the UNDP doesn't want to do that. But officially they are not the lead facilitator for that. That's up to you to decide. I am not against. But I draw your attention to that.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Thank you. What I propose it is the existing original text from the IEG. So let's keep it. So that's my proposal. United Arab Emirates, please be brief. We have only ‑‑

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Thank you, Chair. I don't want to take your time. Good day to everyone. Nice to hear you. Mr. Chairman, just in the ‑‑ in the ‑‑ I can see that sentence needs to be raised and somehow as grammatically right and interconnection, Mr. Chairman ‑‑ interconnection and efficient, I don't know if somehow can we write native English. So if you can help us.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Maybe you can delete the first "and". Interconnection, effective and efficient use of spectrum. I think that's ‑‑ that ‑‑ it is editorial. So let's just accept it. One last comment, very brief, please.

>> ONEWEB: Yes, I will be very brief. Propose 3 add such as 5G rollout and new innovative space applications or new innovative space networks.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Okay. Let's insert that. Repeat please?

>> ONEWEB: Based networks. Thank you.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: I feel it's only an exemplary. It is okay. We only have left invites. Any comments on that? I don't think so. Thank you very much.

So in conclusion just very briefly, the draft opinions and the changes proposed will be transmitted to the Plenary via an oral presentation from myself. I want to thank all of you for the good discussion and compromise. And we are going to be with our colleagues in Working Group 2 discussions. Thank you very much. I think we have two, three minutes break. But if the Secretariat can confirm that.

>> MARCO OBISO: Yes, Chair. We have a few minutes' break.

>> ROBERTO HIRAYAMA: Okay. Thank you very much, colleagues.   
 (Break)   
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