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**1 Twenty-first series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B21) (continued) (**[**Document 162**](https://www.itu.int/md/S18-PP-C-0162/en)**)**

**Draft Resolution 102 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) – ITU's role with regard to international public policy issues pertaining to the Internet and the management of Internet resources, including domain names and addresses (continued)**

1.1 The **Chairman** invited the Plenary to resume its discussion on the proposed amendments to draft Resolution 102 (Rev. Dubai, 2018).

1.2 The **delegate of the** **Czech Republic**, speaking on behalf of CEPT, reiterated that, in the interests of ensuring technological neutrality and openness of standards, the proposed reference to the Digital Object Numbering Authority (DONA) should not be added to the footnote to *resolves*1.

1.3 The **delegate of Denmark**, supported by the **delegates of** **Canada, Poland, Portugal, Finland** and **Ireland,** endorsed the positions previously expressed on behalf of CEPT and CITEL that digital object architecture did not contribute to the functioning of the Internet, and agreed that reference to DONA should not be included in the footnote to *resolves* 1. It had become clear over the course of discussions that agreement would not be reached on broadening the membership of CWG-Internet to encompass all stakeholders. The composition and mandate of CWG-Internet should therefore remain unchanged.

1.4 The **delegate of the Russian Federation**, speaking on behalf of RCC, said that her delegation wished to continue discussions, through the ad hoc group, on the proposed new *instructs the Council Working Group on international Internet-related public policy issues.*

1.5 The **delegate of China** said that he was in favour of cooperation between ITU and other international bodies, and therefore supported the proposal to add a reference to DONA in the footnote to *resolves* 1. He also agreed that mention should be made under *recognizing* that CWG-Internet could draft resolutions and decisions for submission to the Council.

1.6 The **delegate of South Africa,** supported by the **delegate of Nigeria**, said that many African countries and other developing nations wished to include DONA in the list of institutions referred to in the footnote. The Internet was not proprietary technology.

1.7 The **Chairman** said that since opinions were divided, he proposed to convene a small, informal group of regional representatives to seek consensus.

1.8 It was so **agreed**.

**The meeting was suspended at 1520 hours and resumed at 1640 hours.**

1.9 Following the informal consultations, the **Chairman** announced that a consensus had been reached. The proposed text on which agreement had not been found would be deleted, it being understood that the Rules of Procedure of the Council would apply, including Rule 14. The references to DONA would therefore be deleted and all the square brackets would be removed from the text. The same would apply to the three other draft resolutions pertaining to the Internet in Document 162.

1.10On that understanding, draft Resolution 102 (Rev. Dubai, 2018), as amended, was **adopted.**

**Draft Resolution 101 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) – Internet Protocol-based networks**

**Draft Resolution 133 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) – Role of administrations of Member States in the management of internationalized (multilingual) domain names**

**Draft Resolution 180 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) – Promoting deployment and adoption of IPv6 to facilitate the transition from IPv4 to IPv6**

1.11 **The Chairman** said that, in line with the agreement reached with regard to Resolution 102 (Rev. Dubai, 2018), the proposed reference to DONA in the corresponding footnote in each draft resolution would be removed.

1.12 On that understanding, draft Resolutions 101 (Rev. Dubai, 2018), 133 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) and 180 (Rev. Dubai, 2018), as amended, were **adopted.**

1.13 The twenty-first series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B21) (Document 162), as amended, was **approved.**

**2 Twenty-first series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee – second reading (Document 162)**

2.1 The twenty-first series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee (Document 162), as amended on first reading, was **approved** on second reading.

**3 Amendments to Resolution 99 and Resolution 125 – first and second readings (**[**Document 154**](https://www.itu.int/md/S18-PP-C-0154/en)**)**

**Draft Resolution 99 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) – Status of Palestine in ITU**

**Draft Resolution 125 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) – Assistance and support to Palestine for rebuilding its telecommunication networks**

3.1 The **Chairman** thanked the Arab group, Palestine, Israel and the United States delegation for the outstanding spirit of cooperation and compromise they had demonstrated in reaching consensus on the two draft amended resolutions, which were submitted to the Plenary as a package in Document 154. He also thanked the Secretary-General for the pivotal role he had played. Noting that the compromise had been reached after lengthy and delicate discussion, he said that the floor would not be opened for discussion on either resolution. He would only give the floor to the Secretary-General to deliver a brief statement.

3.2 The **Secretary-General** said that he had been assured by the Director General of the Ministry of Communications of Israel that the progress items listed in the amendments to *resolves* 2 in Resolution 125 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) would be taken up promptly and addressed by the appropriate forum if raised by the Palestinians for inclusion on its agenda. ITU would continue to offer its assistance for the implementation of the resolution within its mandate. He expressed his appreciation for the spirit of compromise and cooperation shown by those involved in the negotiations on the two resolutions, with a view to achieving common goals.

3.3 Draft Resolutions 99 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) and 125 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) (Document 154) were **adopted** on first and second readings.

**4 Thirteenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B13) (**[**Document 139**](https://www.itu.int/md/S18-PP-C-0139/en)**)**

**Draft Resolution 48 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) – Human resources management and development**

4.1The **delegate of the** **Russian Federation**,speaking on behalf of RCC, proposed the addition of the phrase "in accordance with the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity" at the end of *instructs the Secretary-General* 3. Also, the words "as a target" should be inserted before "50 per cent of all candidates" in Annex 2, §4, in line with the wording used in *instructs the Secretary-General* 5 of Resolution 70 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) - Mainstreaming a gender perspective in ITU and promotion of gender equality and the empowerment of women through telecommunications/information and communication technologies.

4.2 The **Chairman of Committee 6**, supported by the **delegate of Argentina**,said that *instructs the Secretary-General* 3 pertained to equitable geographical and gender representation, whereas the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity ought to apply to the entire recruitment procedure. He could support the proposed amendment to Annex 2, §4, to bring the text into line with Resolution 70 (Rev. Dubai, 2018).

4.3 The **delegates of** **Canada** on behalf of CITEL, **Sweden** and **the Dominican Republic** said that they would prefer not to resume drafting, and wished to adopt the text as submitted.

4.4 The **Chairman** agreed that it would be preferable not to re-open the discussion and to adopt the text as submitted by Committee 6.

4.5 The **delegate of the Russian Federation** agreed to withdraw her proposed amendments.

4.6 **The Chairman of Committee 6**, responding to a question from the **delegate of Uganda**, said that the issues raised by the African group in its proposal to create another Council working group (CWG) on human resources would be taken into account by the CWG on financial and human resources.

4.7 Draft Resolution 48 (Rev. Dubai, 2018)was **adopted.**

4.8 The thirteenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B13) (Document 139) was **approved.**

**5 Thirteenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee – second reading (Document 139)**

5.1 The thirteenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee (Document 139) was **approved** on second reading.

**6 Twentieth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B20) (**[**Document 161**](https://www.itu.int/md/S18-PP-C-0161/en)**)**

6.1 The **Chairman of the Editorial Committee,** introducing Document 161, suggested that discussion of draft Resolution 64 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) should be postponed pending the preparation of a revised version of the text in all working languages.

6.2 It was so **agreed.**

**Draft Resolution 130 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) – Strengthening the role of ITU in building confidence and security in the use of information and communication technologies**

6.3 The **Chairman of the Working Group of the Plenary** drew attention to four remaining issues, presented in square brackets, on which agreement had not been reached during the deliberations of the working group. Those pertained to the addition of new provisions on an update of the Global Cybersecurity Agenda (GCA) and on the elaboration of an international convention under *resolves*, a new provision instructing CWG-Internet to study cybersecurity-related issues, and an invitation to Member States, Sector Members and Associates to contribute financially or in-kind to the implementation of the resolution.

6.4 The **delegates of** **Sudan** and **Jordan** said that the unresolved issues could potentially be agreed through further discussion. The issue of financial or in-kind contributions ought not to be a matter of contention.

6.5 The **delegate of the United Kingdom** on behalf of CEPT, supported by the **delegate of** **Canada**, speaking also on behalf of CITEL, and the **delegates of Australia, the Czech Republic**, **the United States, Japan, Sweden, Israel, Chile**, **New Zealand, the Netherlands** and **Portugal**, welcomed the extensive additions that had been agreed to in the important draft resolution after much negotiation and compromise. With regard to the remaining proposed texts on which agreement had not been reached, she said that the GCA had been successfully guiding work on cybersecurity for 11 years. It worked well and there was therefore no reason to update it. International law, supported by agreed voluntary norms of responsible State behaviour, was applicable to cyberspace, and a new international convention on securing cyberspace would not assist in meeting the very real challenges faced by all States. Moreover, ITU was not the forum for developing such an instrument, which would take years to negotiate and would quickly become outdated owing to the rapidly changing technological environment. ITU already had a remit to provide capacity-building on cybersecurity with the potential to provide tangible outcomes for developing countries. The texts in square brackets reflected a genuine lack of consensus and should be deleted.

6.6 The **delegate of Norway** expressed concern that any efforts to draft an international convention could potentially undermine the work of the United Nations General Assembly on cybersecurity.

6.7 The **delegate of** **China,** supported by the **delegate of South Africa,** speakingon behalf of the African group,and by the **delegates of Uganda, Botswana, Tanzania, Kenya** and **Senegal**,said that the GCA had been adopted some 11 years previously and should be updated to take account of technological developments and increasing cybersecurity challenges. The call for voluntary financial or in-kind contributions from Member States should also be included in the resolution. The **delegate of Cuba** agreed, adding that the Plenary should consider each of the paragraphs in square brackets in turn.

6.8 The **delegate of Saudi Arabia**, speaking on behalf of the Arab group, supported by the **delegate of Bahrain**,said that the Internet was a platform that was not restricted by national borders, and could be used for non-peaceful objectives. Notwithstanding the importance of an international convention on securing cyberspace, he suggested, in the interests of compromise, the deletion of *resolves* 13. The other proposed changes should be accepted.

6.9 The **Chairman** said that, since opinions were divided, he proposed to convene a small, informal group of regional representatives to seek consensus.

6.10 It was so **agreed**.

**The meeting was suspended at 1830 hours and resumed at 1900 hours.**

6.11 Following the informal consultations, the **Chairman** announced that a consensus had not been reached and he therefore suggested that further discussion of draft Resolution 130 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) be postponed.

6.12 It was so **agreed**.

**Draft Resolution 139 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) – Use of telecommunications/information and communication technologies to bridge the digital divide and build an inclusive information society**

6.13 The **Chairman of the Working Group of the Plenary** introduced draft Resolution 139 (Rev. Dubai, 2018), which included several modifications accepted by the working group. Square brackets remained around *recognizing l)*, which was based on a proposal from CITEL and concerned the participation of small and community operators in national initiatives for underserved and/or unserved areas.

6.14 The **delegate of Kenya**, speaking on behalf of the African group, supported by the **delegates of Uzbekistan** on behalf of RCC, **Saudi Arabia**, **Uganda, Tanzania, the United Arab Emirates, Zimbabwe, Bahrain, Sudan, South Sudan**, **Oman, Kuwait, Côte d'Ivoire, Jordan, Egypt** and **Algeria**,said that the inclusion of community operators was a sensitive issue. While different approaches had been adopted in different countries to bridge the digital divide, it was not appropriate to single any out in the resolution. The proposed text in square brackets should be deleted. The **delegate of South Africa** endorsed those comments, addingthat the absence of a clear definition in ITU of the term "community operator" could give rise to security questions. It was incumbent on the Union to ensure that infrastructure deployment was in line with approved policy and regulations.

6.15 The **delegate of Canada**, speaking on behalf of CITEL, supported by the **delegates of** **Sweden, the United Kingdom, Spain** on behalf of CEPT, **the United States, Guatemala, Mexico, Chile, the Dominican Republic, the Czech Republic, Argentina, New Zealand, France** and **Colombia**,said that small and community operators were already helping to bridge the digital divide in many countries, including developing countries. The provision, which would be included in the preambular part of the text, did not require any action from or impose any obligations on Member States, and should be retained. Similar language was already used in ITU-D documents.

6.16 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that the proposed text wouldbe better placed under the *noting* or *considering* sections of the draft resolution.

6.17 The **delegate of the Russian Federation,** recalling that the sovereign right of each State to regulate its telecommunications was enshrined in the Constitution, said that *recognizing l)* should be deleted. He noted that the majority of speakers from three regional groupings had not been in favour of the new provision, and called on other regional groupings to refrain from seeking to impose their views on others. The **delegates of Togo** and **Iraq** agreed, adding that it was important for the voices of developing countries to be heard.

6.18 The **delegate of Uruguay** proposed deleting the words "including what they refer to as small and community operators".

6.19 **The delegate of Ghana** pointed out that the notion of "small" was subjective. He proposed deleting from the words "may include" until the end of the paragraph.

6.20 The **Chairman** said that, since opinions were divided, he proposed to convene a small, informal group of regional representatives to seek consensus.

6.21 It was so **agreed**.

**The meeting was suspended at 2000 hours and resumed at 2015 hours.**

6.22 Following the informal consultations, the Chairman reported that CITEL had agreed to withdraw its proposal for *recognizing l)*.

6.23 The **delegate of the Russian Federation** welcomed the spirit of compromise demonstrated by CITEL.

6.24 Draft Resolution 139 (Rev. Dubai, 2018), as amended, was **adopted**.

**7 Sixteenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B16) (first and second readings) (**[**Document 149**](https://www.itu.int/md/S18-PP-C-0149/en)**)**

**Draft Resolution 146 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) – Periodic review and revision of the International Telecommunication Regulations**

**Draft Resolution 188 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) – Combating counterfeit telecommunication/information and communication technology devices**

7.1 **Adopted,** on first and second readings**.**

**Draft Resolution 189 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) – Assisting Member States to combat and deter mobile device theft**

**Draft Resolution 196 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) – Protecting telecommunication service users/consumers**

7.2 The **Vice-Chairman of Committee 5** said that square brackets remained in both draft resolutions in connection with the protection and privacy of personal data.

7.3 The **delegate of Egypt** said that one of the main issues was whether or not to include the concept of data accessible by the device as well as on the device; the matter was close to being resolved.

7.4 Following comments from the **delegates of the United States, Mali, Romania** and **the Islamic Republic of Iran**, the **Chairman** suggested that the delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran lead informal consultations to resolve the outstanding issues.

7.5 It was so **agreed**.

**The meeting was suspended at 2045 hours and resumed at 2145 hours.**

**8 Update from the Chairman of Committee 2 (Credentials) (**[**Document 106(Rev.3)**](https://www.itu.int/md/S18-PP-C-0106/en)**)**

8.1 The **Chairman of Committee 2** **(Credentials)** said that since the adoption of the report of the Credentials Committee, five additional Member States had submitted credentials. Those credentials had been found to be in order and the Report of Committee 2 (Document 106) had been updated accordingly.

**9 Fourth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for second reading (R4) (**[**Document 164**](https://www.itu.int/md/S18-PP-C-0164/en)**)**

**Draft Decision 5 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) – Revenue and expenses for the Union for the period 2020-2023**

**Draft Resolution 11 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) – ITU Telecom events**

**Draft Resolution 154 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) –** **Use of the six official languages of the Union on an equal footing**

9.1 **Adopted**.

9.2 The fourth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for second reading (R4) (Document 164) was **approved**.

**10 Twenty-third series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B23) (**[**Document 166**](https://www.itu.int/md/S18-PP-C-0166/en)**)**

**SUP Resolution 192 (Busan, 2014) – ITU participation in memoranda of understanding with financial and/or strategic implications**

10.1 **Approved.**

10.1 The twenty-third series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B23) (Document 166) was **approved**.

**11** **Twenty-third series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee –   
second reading (Document 166)**

11.1The twenty-third series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee (Document 166) was **approved** on second reading.

**12 Nineteenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B19) (**[**Document 160**](https://www.itu.int/md/S18-PP-C-0160/en)**)**

**Draft Resolution 197 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) – Facilitating the Internet of Things and smart sustainable cities and communities**

12.1 The **Chairman of the Editorial Committee** said that square brackets remained around *recalling l)* and *m)* pending decisions of the conference*.* If Resolution 130 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) was not adopted, reference would be made in *recalling l)* to Resolution 130 (Rev. Busan, 2014). If no resolution on artificial intelligence for sustainable development was adopted, *recalling m)* would be deleted.

12.2 On the understanding that *recalling l)* and *m)* would be dealt with editorially in line with the decisions taken by the conference, draft Resolution 197 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) was **adopted.**

12.3 On the above understanding, the nineteenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B19) (Document 160) was **approved.**

**13 Twenty-second series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for   
first reading (B22) (**[**Document 163(Rev.1)**](https://www.itu.int/md/S18-PP-C-0163/en)**)**

**Draft Resolution WGPL/4 (Dubai, 2018) – Artificial intelligence related to telecommunications/information and communication technologies**

13.1 The **Chairman of the Working Group of the Plenary** said that consensus had yet to be reached on three issues: the scope of the work of ITU related to artificial intelligence (AI) (*resolves* 2i)); the AI for Good Global Summit *(instructs the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Directors of the three Bureaux* 4); and an AI Readiness Index (*instructs the Director of the Telecommunication Standardization Bureau*). The entire text of the draft resolution had been placed in square brackets pending the resolution of those issues.

13.2 The **delegate of Egypt**, speaking on behalf of the African group, said that AI undoubtedly had many important uses in the work of the Union, most notably development activities. It was essential for ITU to collaborate with other stakeholders in the field of AI, and not for the plenipotentiary conference to seek to restrict the mandate of ITU as enshrined in the Constitution and Convention. Accordingly, the phrase in square brackets in *resolves* 2i) that began “while affirming that the work would exclude…..” should be deleted, and *instructs the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Directors of the three Bureaux* 4 should read “to continue, when appropriate, taking into account financial implications, to hold the AI for Good Global Summit, in partnership with all interested United Nations agencies, as well as other interested stakeholders”.

13.3 The **delegate of the United States** said that there was general agreement that AI applications, which had the potential to yield enormous benefits, went far beyond the work of the Union. Accordingly, the draft resolution must clearly set out the scope and objectives of ITU’s activities on AI related to telecommunications/ICTs. The **delegates of Canada**, **Japan** and **the Czech Republic** endorsed that position, as did the **delegate of the United Kingdom** who suggested that ITU take more time to properly consider what it wished to achieve in regard to AI.

13.4 The **delegate of Tanzania**, supported by **the delegate of Uganda,** said that ITU, which had consistently supported the development of new technology, should not abdicate its responsibility to conduct studies on AI, particularly given the fundamental contribution of telecommunications/ICTs to AI. The draft resolution provided a framework for ITU’s activities in that regard. Moreover, ITU, as a contribution-based organization, could not act beyond its mandate. He supported the texts proposed by the delegate of Egypt, adding that the square brackets around the entire draft resolution should also be deleted.

13.5 The **delegate of New Zealand** said that the draft resolution did not seek to reinterpret the Constitution and Convention, but to define clearly the scope of ITU’s work on such a broad subject as AI. The square brackets in *resolves* 2i) should be deleted; while ITU should continue studies on AI related to telecommunications/ICTs, the work should exclude the development of policy/rules and regulation. Telecommunications served as a support service for AI, and the AI for Good Global Summit should be held in partnership with other organizations. It would be premature to develop an AI Readiness Index.

13.6 The **delegate of the Russian Federation**, speaking on behalf of RCC, concurred with the views expressed by the delegates of Egypt and Tanzania. The mandate of ITU was clearly set out in the Constitution and Convention. All States in ITU were equal; it was not for developed countries to dictate to developing countries what the organization would do.

13.7 The **delegate of the United Arab Emirates** said that his country was one of the first to have invested in AI andto have a minister of artificial intelligence. The draft resolution was highly important for developing countries and he called for further informal discussions with a view to achieving a consensus text.

13.8 The **delegate of Bahrain** expressed support for the adoption of such a forward-looking resolution. ITU’s mandate was clearly set out in the Constitution and she would have reservations about the inclusion of text seeking to limit the scope of studies.

13.9 The **delegate of Zimbabwe** said that the phrase in square brackets in *resolves* 2i) that began “while affirming that the work would exclude…..” would limit the mandate of ITU with respect to AI and should be deleted.

13.10 The **delegate of Saudi Arabia** said that AI, which would greatly influence the future of telecommunications and ICTs and contribute to sustainable development, should be facilitated. Noting that ITU’s mandate was defined in the Constitution, he would support the deletion of the text in square brackets in *resolves* 2i).

13.11 The **Secretary-General** said that ITU had held thetwo AI for Good Global Summits at the request, and with the sponsorship, of industry, not at the request of a Member State or on its own initiative. ITU’s leadership in the field was appreciated. The first summit in 2017 had been attended by some twenty United Nations agencies and over thirty had attended the second in 2018. The new Secretary-General of the United Nations recognized the potential of new frontier technologies in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. However, he had informed the Secretary-General of the United Nations that AI was in the initial stages of development and that it was still quite early to consider regulatory issues. ITU was considered by industry as an ally; it should maintain that trust and create an environment conducive to AI development, instead of being in a hurry to develop regulations. He was very pleased to see that numerous Member States, including developing countries, had incorporated AI in their national agendas, and he called for further efforts to reach consensus on the draft resolution.

13.12 The **delegate of Mali** thanked the Secretary-General for his explanation, as did the **delegate of the Russian Federation,** who suggested that it might help to alleviate the concerns of those Member States that were anxious that ITU would rush into developing regulations for AI.

13.13 Following comments from the **delegates of the United States, the Islamic Republic of Iran** and **Romania,** the **Chairman s**uggested that the delegate of Egypt lead informal consultations to seek consensus on the draft resolution.

13.14 It was so **agreed**.

**14 Sixteenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B16) (first and second readings) (resumed) (**[**Document 149**](https://www.itu.int/md/S18-PP-C-0149/en)**)**

14.1 The **Chairman** invited the meeting to resume its consideration of draft Resolutions 189 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) and 196 (Rev. Dubai, 2018).

14.2 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that, following consultations with interested stakeholders, agreement had been reached on amendments to both draft revised resolutions as projected on-screen in the meeting room. Regarding Resolution 189, those amendments comprised a new *recalling* section at the beginning of the text, and amendments to *considering d)*, *resolves*, *invites Member States and Sector Members* 3. As to Resolution 196, one amendment would be made to *invites Member States* 2. Those changes and the removal of all the square brackets in the text were the result of a delicate agreement and should be accepted without further discussion.

14.3 Subject to those amendments, draft Resolutions 189 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) and 196 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) were **adopted** on first and second readings.

14.4 The sixteenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee (B16)(Document 149), as a whole, as amended, was thus **approved** on first and second readings.

**The meeting was suspended at 2300 hours and resumed at 0050 hours.**

**15 Twentieth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B20) (resumed) (**[**Document 161 and Revision 1**](https://www.itu.int/md/S18-PP-C-0161/en)**)**

15.1 The **Chairman** invited the conference to resume its consideration of draft Resolution 130 (Rev. Dubai, 2018). He drew attention to a number of modifications now proposed to the draft revised resolution as projected on-screen in the meeting room.

15.2 The delegate of the **United States**, supported by the **delegate of the United Kingdom** on behalf of CEPT, reiterated that the draft resolution had been the subject of extensive discussion and amendment, and much had been achieved. The text in square brackets reflected a genuine lack of consensus and should be deleted, and he would be reluctant to accept any of the amendments now proposed by the Chairman. However, in the interests of compromise, he could accept the retention of *resolves* 12.1, which read “to utilize the GCA framework in order to further guide the work of the Union on efforts to build confidence and security in the use of ICTs”.

15.3 The **Chairman** suggested retaining *resolves* 12.1, and deleting all other square-bracketed text in the draft resolution.

15.4 The delegates of **Australia**, **Canada**, **Romania**, **Israel**, **Brazil**, **the Netherlands**, **Mexico** and **Uruguay** endorsed that suggestion.

15.5 The **delegates of Jordan** and **Bahrain** supported the modifications projected on-screen, as did the **delegate of Saudi Arabia** who added that the Arab group and others had already made many concessions on the draft text and failed to understand the reluctance to update the GCA. He proposed that *resolves* 12.1 should be modified to read : “to align the GCA with the current work of ITU on building confidence and security in the use of ICTs, in line with the relevant ITU resolutions”.

15.6 The **delegate of the United States**, supported by the **delegate o**f **New Zealand**, opposed that amendment. There appeared to be general agreement that if no consensus was reached on the square-bracketed text, it should be deleted. At such a late hour, it was not appropriate to introduce new text.

15.7 The **Secretary-General** noted with satisfaction that during the discussions on the draft resolution the value of the GCA had been widely recognized. He appealed to the Plenary to accept the retention of *resolves* 12.1, which would allow ITU to utilize the GCA to guide its work on confidence and security in ICTs. He would seek advice from the Council and from the former chairman of the High-Level Experts Group dealing with the GCA, Judge Stein Schjolberg, in that connection.

15.8 The **delegate of** **Jordan** said that many compromises had been made in order to achieve consensus. However, the debate was not confined to updating the GCA framework, but also concerned what developing countries required from ITU for securing cyberspace. Accordingly, he would not support the deletion of other square-bracketed text, including in *bearing in mind b)* and *invites Member States, Sector Members and Associates* 7, which concerned the provision of voluntary financial and human resources.

15.9 The **delegate of the United States** emphasized that the text on which agreement had been reached reflected a large number of positive contributions and months of work by many delegations. The programmes, policies and initiatives provided for would benefit all countries, not just the developing world.

15.10 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that, in view of the late hour, the Plenary should accept the Chairman’s proposal to retain *resolves* 12.1 and delete all other square-bracketed text. The Secretary-General should bring the comments made concerning the GCA to the attention of the Council. The **delegate of Mali** endorsed that suggestion.

15.11 The **delegate of the United Arab Emirates**, speaking also on behalf of the Arab group, said that in order to reach a consensus at such a late hour, he could go along with the Chairman’s proposal to retain *resolves* 12.1 and delete all other square-bracketed text.

15.12 The **Secretary-General** said that many resolutions included provisions inviting public members to provide financial support. In reality, while some calls for funds were heeded, many were not. Developing countries required support. ITU had mobilized funds to assist developing countries, including with regard to the creation of national computer incident response teams, and would continue to do so. ITU would continue to invite its public members to provide funding to build capacity in developing countries whether or not the provision was retained.

15.13 The **delegate of Uganda**, speaking also on behalf of the African group, said that it was important to note the need to make progress in updating the GCA. Further consideration should be given to retaining *invites Member States, Sector Members and Associates* 7. The **delegates of the Russian Federation, Kenya, Tanzania** and **Cameroon** agreed that that provision should be retained, as did the **delegate of Cuba,** who asked delegations to explain their objections to its inclusion.

15.14 The **delegate of Mexico** said that little was to be gained at such a late hour from insisting on the retention of the provision and encouraged Member States to support the Chairman’s proposal.

15.15 The **Chairman** suggested that the Plenary should agree to retain *resolves* 12.1 and to delete all the other square-bracketed text in the draft resolution, on the understanding that the minutes of the meeting would include the Secretary-General’s statement concerning financial support, and reflect the fact that numerous delegations had supported *invites Member States, Sector Members and Associates* 7, which read “ to provide voluntary financial and human resources and expertise to support the Union in implementing the actions arising from this resolution”.

15.16 The **delegates of the United Kingdom, the Russian Federation, Mali**, on behalf of the African group, **Australia**, **the** **Czech Republic, Senegal,** **Portugal** and **Togo** endorsed that suggestion, as did the **delegate of Sudan** who wished to place on record that the African group saw it necessary to update the GCA.

15.17 Subject to the agreement and on the understanding outlined by the Chairman, draft Resolution 130 (Rev. Dubai, 2018), as thus amended, was **adopted**.

**Draft Resolution 64 ([Rev. Dubai, 2018]) – Non-discriminatory access to modern telecommunication/information and communication technology facilities, services and applications**

15.18 The **Chairman** invited the Plenary to consider draft Resolution 64 ([Rev. Dubai, 2018]) as contained in Revision 1 to Document 161.

15.19 The **Chairman of the Working Group of the Plenary** said that no consensus had been reached on the draft resolution. There were three options: to make no modifications to the existing resolution; to modify the existing resolution with due consideration to the proposals made by the African group and make editorial updates to dates and references; or to make only editorial updates to dates and references. All the proposed changes were in square brackets.

15.20 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** proposed that the conference should decide to make no changes to the text.

15.21 The **Chairman of the Working Group of the Plenary**, replying to a question from the **delegate of Cuba** as to why simple editorial changes to the draft revised resolution appeared in square brackets in Revision 1 to Document 161, said that, owing to a lack of consensus, the working group had agreed to submit the draft resolution to the Plenary with the proposals by the African group in square brackets. All the changes of a purely editorial nature had also been placed in square brackets. If the proposals by the African group were accepted, the Plenary might also decide to update the text editorially.

15.22 The **delegate of Jordan** said that he would support updating the resolution.

15.23 The **delegate of Sudan** said that three different regions had proposed simple modifications to the text, which reflected developments in non-discriminatory access to ICTs since PP-14. Member States should be given the opportunity to adopt the text with those modifications.

15.24 The **delegate of New Zealand** said that the Plenary should avoid protracted discussion of the text; as there was no consensus, the text adopted by PP-14 should be retained.

15.25 The **Chairman** suggested, in the absence of consensus, that the text adopted by PP-14 should be retained without change.

15.26 Following applause in support of the Chairman’s suggestion, the **delegate of Sudan**, intervening on a point of order and on behalf of the African group, said that agreement by acclamation did not provide a clear indication of those in favour and those not in agreement with the decision being taken. The African group wished to update Resolution 64. At the very least, the designation in the title should be amended to read (Rev. Dubai, 2018) to indicate that the text had been considered by PP-18. The **delegates of Cuba,** **Egypt, Jordan** and **Saudi Arabia** concurred with that view; unless such a change was made, it would not be clear that the resolution had been examined by the conference.

15.27 The **delegate of Tanzania** pointed out that the African group had not withdrawn its proposal regarding editorial amendments to the text. He was concerned that the decision for no change was being taken even though an entire regional group had objected to no change.

15.28 The **Chairman** recalled *decides* 3.1 ii) of Decision 3 (Minneapolis, 1998), which stated that “resolutions not amended by plenipotentiary conferences subsequent to the Plenipotentiary Conference (Minneapolis, 1998) should retain their existing designation”. Accordingly, as there was no consensus on draft revised Resolution 64, the text adopted at PP-14 was being retained.

15.29 The **Chairman of the Working Group of the Plenary** reiterated that there had been no consensus on the text in the working group. Mention of the working group’s discussions on draft revised Resolution 64 had been made in her report to the Plenary (Document 143).

15.30 The **Chairman** invited interested parties to hold informal consultations.

**The meeting was suspended at 0230 hours and resumed at 0320 hours.**

15.31 Following the informal consultations,the **Chairman** said that the wish had been expressed to amend the designation in the title of Resolution 64 to read “(Rev. Dubai, 2018)” to reflect the fact that the conference had discussed draft revised Resolution 64 at some length. He also acknowledged the strong wish not to make any substantive or editorial changes to the text. Accordingly, he proposed that the title should be amended to read “Resolution 64 (Rev. Dubai, 2018)”. He also proposed a single, non-consequential editorial change, namely to delete the comma after the word “end” in the first line of *taking into account also* *b)*, in order to ensure legal consistency with Decision 3 (Minneapolis, 1998).

15.32 On that understanding, draft Resolution 64 (Rev. Dubai, 2018), as amended, was **adopted.**

15.33 The twentieth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee (B20) (Document 161 and Revision 1), as amended, was **approved** on first reading.

**16 Twentieth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee – second reading (Document 161 and Revision1)**

16.1 The twentieth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee (Document 161 and Revision 1), as a whole, as amended on first reading, was **approved** on second reading**.**

**17 Twenty-second series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for   
first reading (B22) (resumed) (**[**Document 163 (Rev.1)**](https://www.itu.int/md/S18-PP-C-0163/en)**)**

17.1 The **Chairman** invited the conference to resume its consideration of draft Resolution WGPL/4 - Artificial intelligence related to telecommunications/information and communication technologies.

17.2 The **delegate of Egypt** reported that further to the informal consultations, agreement had been reached on all but one of the outstanding issues. Concerns persisted with respect to *resolves* 2i) and the development of policies, regulatory guidance and frameworks for AI technologies in line with the mandate of ITU.

17.3 The **delegate of Romania**,speaking on behalf of CEPT, considered that the scope of ITU’s work should be defined. Accordingly, the square brackets in *resolves* 2i) should be removed.

17.4 The **delegate of Jordan** said that the conference should delete the text in square brackets in *resolves* 2i) and adopt the important resolution.The **delegate of Tanzania**, on behalf of the African group, supported that proposal. The ICT infrastructure was essential for the deployment and growth of AI and ITU must be seen to act on that emerging technology. If consensus could not be achieved, however, it would be better not to have a resolution at all than one that restricted the Union’s work.

17.5 The **delegate of Brazil** said that, although discussions had not delivered a consensus, important issues and concerns had been raised, laying the groundwork for future agreement.

17.6 The **delegate of the United Arab Emirates** asked the Legal Adviser to clarify whether a Member State could propose to amend the text of a resolution in a way that would effectively restrict the scope of the Union’s work.

17.7 The **Legal Adviser** said that the plenipotentiary conference was bound by the ITU Constitution and Convention; its decisions should be in line with the provisions of those instruments.

17.8 The **delegate of the Russian Federation** said that it was important not to set a precedent limiting the scope of activities provided for in the Constitution and Convention. The text in square brackets in *resolves* 2i) should therefore be deleted.

17.9 The **delegate of the United Arab Emirates** said that, following the clarification by the Legal Adviser, he would support deletion of the text in square brackets. The **delegates of the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia** and **Kenya** shared that position.

17.10 The **delegate of the United States** stressed the need to define the scope of the Union’s work in the field of AI and to develop targeted strategies. While it was unfortunate that consensus had not been achieved, the robust discussion had enhanced Member States’ understanding of matters relating to AI and would provide the basis for future work on that issue.

17.11 The **delegate of New Zealand** said that, although it was disappointing that no consensus had been reached, the appropriate course of action was to accept the useful work done and move forward without a resolution.

17.12 The **delegate of Canada** said that it was unfortunate that no consensus had been reached, but the useful discussions had deepened Member States’ understanding of the issues involved. However, deleting text in *resolves* 2i) was not a viable solution and would create inconsistencies in other sections of the resolution.

17.13 The **Secretary-General** said that there was widespread support for ITU’s engagement in AI studies and noted the trust that industry, academia and other United Nations agencies placed in ITU’s work on the matter. While acknowledging the concerns of some delegations about the Union rushing into regulatory activities that could stifle development and innovation, he said the technologies were in their infancy and it was, in his opinion, still too early to begin work on regulatory issues. Moreover, such work would begin only at the request of industry. He also recognized the concerns of other delegations that *resolves* 2i) could limit the scope of ITU’s activities and convey a negative message. In order to retain the draft resolution, which overall was very positive for ITU, he proposed replacing the entire text of *resolves* 2 with instructions to the Council to conduct further studies on the areas in which ITU could contribute to AI studies, within its mandate.

17.14 The **Chairman** invited the conference to consider the Secretary-General’s proposal.

17.15 The **delegate of South Africa** said that it was important to uphold the Constitution and Convention and ensure that ITU promoted the extension of the benefits of new telecommunication technologies to all the world’s inhabitants. While it would be preferable to delete the text in square brackets in *resolves* 2i), she would be prepared to go along with the Secretary-General’s proposal.

17.16 The **delegates of Jordan** and **Tanzania** said that they could go along with the Secretary-General’s proposal. They warned against limiting the scope of the Union’s work and against sending a negative message to the outside world by not adopting a resolution on the subject. The **delegate of Ghana** also supported the Secretary-General’s proposal, praised his vision and pointed out that the Council had previously established a dedicated group on international Internet-related public policy issues to study matters related to those issues.

17.17 The **delegate of Japan** said that there was a need to clearly set out the scope of ITU’s work on AI in the first draft resolution on that topic. The wording of *resolves* 2i) had been proposed as a compromise, and if no consensus could be reached it would not be possible to move forward on the text as a whole. Current studies in ITU on AI would not be inhibited if the conference failed to adopt the draft resolution.

17.18 The **delegate of the United States** said that ITU was a member-driven organization, thus the scope of its activities should be driven by its members. It was therefore not appropriate to instruct the Council to consider ITU’s mandate with regard to AI. All Member States – not just the Council’s limited membership – should participate in the debate. He noted that the Legal Adviser had not specifically stated that the text proposed in *resolves* 2i) was in conflict with the ITU Constitution and Convention.

17.19 The **delegate of Kenya** said that, although he could support the Secretary-General’s proposal, it might be time to acknowledge that the Plenary had been unable to achieve consensus on the resolution.

17.20 The **delegate of Romania**, speaking on behalf of CEPT, said that if no consensus could be achieved, it would be better to have no resolution at all.

17.21 The **delegate of Canada** said that, while he appreciated the Secretary-General’s proposal, it was premature to ask the Council to consider the matter before the scope and direction of ITU’s work in the field of AI had been defined.

17.22 The **delegate of Senegal** emphasized that it was important not to restrict ITU’s mandate, and noted that there was no consensus on the text of the resolution.

17.23 The **delegate of the Russian Federation**, who also noted that ITU was a member-driven organization, proposed deleting *resolves* 2i) and inviting the Council, RA, WTSA and WTDC to consider, in their respective areas of competence, further studies in the field of AI.

17.24 The **delegate of Egypt** said that legitimate concerns had been raised by delegates on both sides of the argument, and more time was required to examine the issues. However, the lack of a resolution on AI would send out a negative message. It was essential for ITU to collaborate and coordinate with other stakeholders in the field of AI, particularly as a number of its activities were associated with the use of AI. Greater understanding of AI technologies was required before developing regulatory guidance. He suggested deleting *resolves* 2i) and expressed support for the Secretary-General’s proposal and the proposal made by the Russian Federation.

17.25 The **Legal Adviser**, responding to a question from the **delegate of Romania,** reiterated explanations he had already given in the Working Group of the Plenary: thebroad wording used in *resolves* 2i) could *de facto* limit the ability of ITU to completely fulfil its mandate and to implement some of its core activities, particularly in the field of telecommunication/ICT standardization.

17.26 The **delegate of Zimbabwe** said that it was important to support the Secretary-General’s vision. ITU had been actively involved in a number of emerging technologies, yet was running the risk of appearing to be content with limited involvement in AI.

17.27 The **delegate of Saudi Arabia**, recalling the clarifications from the Legal Adviser, reiterated that the text in square brackets in *resolves* 2i) should be deleted.

17.28 The **Chairman** said that, in the absence of consensus on the text of the resolution, the Secretary-General’s proposal, and the scope of ITU’s mandate in the field of AI, it was not possible to proceed. He therefore proposed closing the debate without adopting the draft resolution.

17.29 The **delegates of the United States**, **New Zealand, Romania, Sweden, the United Kingdom, the Czech Republic** and **the Netherlands** supported the Chairman’s proposal.

17.30 The **delegates of Jordan,** **Kenya** and **Tanzania** drew attention to the support expressed by a number of Member States for the Secretary-General’s proposal.

17.31 The **delegate of Egypt** said that it should be recorded in the minutes of the meeting that some delegates had expressed the view that ITU should, within its mandate: contribute to other global efforts on AI through collaboration, including information sharing, with international organizations, relevant stakeholders and other private-sector, civil-society, academia and technical organizations, as well as through participation in multistakeholder initiatives; and should coordinate its activities concerning AI related to telecommunications/ICTs with the activities of other United Nations agencies and cooperate with relevant international entities engaged in work on AI technologies.

17.32 The **delegate of Bahrain** reaffirmed her support for the draft resolution and thanked the Legal Adviser for his clarifications.

17.33 The **Secretary-General** considered that, given the lack of consensus – including on his own proposal –, Member States should go along with the Chairman’s proposal to close the debate. Noting the strong support expressed for ITU’s work thus far on AI, he said that the Union would continue to collaborate with United Nations agencies and with industry in the field of AI.

17.34 The **delegate of Ghana** said that he could go along with the Chairman’s proposal.

17.35 The **Chairman** said that, given the lack of consensus, he took it that the Plenary could agree to close the debate without adopting draft new Resolution WGPL/4.

17.36 It was so **agreed.**

**18 Nineteenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee – second reading (**[**Document 160**](https://www.itu.int/md/S18-PP-C-0160/en)**)**

**Draft Resolution 197 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) - Facilitating the Internet of Things and smart sustainable cities and communities**

18.1 The **Chairman** said that the text of the resolution would be updated in accordance with the conference’s decisions. Accordingly, the square brackets around *recalling l)* would be removed, as draft Resolution 130 (Rev. Dubai, 2018) had been adopted; and *recalling m)* would be deleted, as the conference had not adopted a resolution on AI.

18.2 On that understanding, the nineteenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee (Document 160), as amended, was **approved** on second reading.

**19 Deadlines for the deposit of declarations and reservations**

19.1 The **Chairman** announced that declarations would be accepted until 0725 hours on Friday, 16 November, and that the Plenary would convene at 0900 hours on the same day, to take note of those declarations. The deadline for the deposit of additional declarations thereafter would be set at 1030 hours and the signing ceremony would take place at 1430 hours.

19.2 The **delegate of Tanzania** thanked the Chairman for his tireless work.

**20 Statement by the delegate of the Russian Federation**

20.1 The **delegate of the Russian Federation** said that the Russian Federation insisted that, when harmonizing the requirements for the new premises of the ITU headquarters, the agreement[[1]](#footnote-1) reached in connection with Decision 588 of the Council, namely that the detailed requirement specification would include options for the Popov room, should be taken into account.

20.2 That statement was **noted**.

**The meeting rose at 0525 hours.**

The Secretary-General: The Chairman:

H. ZHAO M. ALMESMAR

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. See §3.3 of the summary record of the eighth plenary meeting of Council-18 held on 1 June 2016. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)