|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Plenipotentiary Conference (PP-14) Busan, 20 October – 7 November 2014** |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| **PLENARY MEETING** | **Document 173-E** |
| **3 December 2014** |
| **Original: English** |
|  | |
| minutes  OF THE  FIFTEENTH plenary meeting | |
| Wednesday, 5 November 2014, at 0940 hours | |
| **Chairman:** Mr. W. MIN (Republic of Korea) | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Subjects discussed | Documents |
| 1 | Ninth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B9) | [156](http://www.itu.int/md/S14-PP-C-0156/en) |
| 2 | Draft Resolution 162 (Rev. Busan, 2014) – second reading | [156](http://www.itu.int/md/S14-PP-C-0156/en) |
| 3 | Tenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B10) | [158](http://www.itu.int/md/S14-PP-C-0158/en) |
| 4 | Tenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee – second reading | [158](http://www.itu.int/md/S14-PP-C-0158/en) |
| 5 | Eleventh series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B11) | [159](http://www.itu.int/md/S14-PP-C-0159/en) |
| 6 | Eleventh series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee - second reading | [159](http://www.itu.int/md/S14-PP-C-0159/en) |

**1 Ninth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B9)  
(Document 156)**

**Draft Decision 5 (Rev. Busan, 2014) – Revenue and expenses for the Union for the period 2016-2019**

1.1 The **Chairman of the Editorial Committee** noted that draft Decision 5 (Rev. Busan, 2014) contained the financial plan of the Union for 2016–2019 in Annex 1.

1.2 The **delegate of the Russian Federation** said that, in light of the Union’s present financial situation, draft revised Decision 5 should also include the following text: “The Council in 2017 is invited to fix at its ordinary session the provisional amount of the contributory unit. Member States are invited to notify the Secretary-General of their intended commitment to the number of their contributory units as soon as possible, and preferably before the end of December 2017.”

1.3 The **Chairman of Committee 6** agreed that, in view of the difficulties experienced in developing a revised and balanced financial plan at PP-14 owing to the unexpected decrease in the number of contributory units committed to by Member States, it would be wise to adopt measures to help ensure that the same situation did not occur again at such short notice. However, the secretariat should be asked whether such a procedure would be acceptable under the Constitution.

1.4 The **Secretary of Committee 6** said that, as the proposal referred to the provisional amount of the contributory unit, it was compatible with ITU regulations and would facilitate the adjustment of budgetary figures at the next plenipotentiary conference.

1.5 The **delegates of India, Tunisia** and **the United Kingdom** supported the proposed modification in principle.

1.6 The **delegate of South Africa** also supported the proposed modification, but considered that the amount of the contributory unit should be fixed, rather than provisional, so as to ensure stability of budgetary planning.

1.7 The **delegate of the United States** welcomed the proposal; she considered that the additional text should be included in a new *invites* section.

1.8 The **delegate of Saudi Arabia** agreed with the practical solution proposed, but pointed out that the contributory unit had already been set for the period 2016 to 2019. The proposed text would therefore refer to the period 2020 to 2023.

1.9 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that the proposal was wise and acceptable. However, the Legal Adviser should consider carefully whether it was in accordance with Article 28 of the Constitution.

1.10 The **Chairman**, noting the strong support for the proposed addition and the various points raised, suggested that the Chairman of Committee 6 consult the delegates concerned and agree on appropriate wording.

1.11 It was so **agreed**.

1.12 The **delegate of Mali** said that *decides* 6 a) was not necessary and should be deleted, as the internal audit function of the Union was already at a strong and effective level.

1.13 The **Chairman of Committee 6** noted that the expression “maintained at a strong and effective level” meant that the internal audit function of the Union was already strong and effective, and should continue to be maintained at that level.

1.14 The **delegate of Mali** proposed the deletion of *instructs the Secretary-General and the Directors of the Bureaux* 2*.*

1.15 The **delegate of the United States** emphasized the importance of a culture of efficiency and economy given the current economic situation and therefore opposed the deletion of that paragraph.

1.16 The **delegate of the Russian Federation** also considered the paragraph to be important in ensuring the financial stability of the Union.

1.17 The **Chairman** suggested that the Chairman of Committee 6 discuss the matter with the concerned delegates.

1.18 It was so **agreed**.

1.19 The **delegate of the Philippines**, drawing attention to item 6 in Annex 2, recalled that Document DT/26 on the empowerment of youth through telecommunication/information and communication technology, which had been widely welcomed, called for high priority to be accorded to the incorporation of young professionals in the Union and for the maintenance of a youth perspective in the implementation of the ITU strategic plan and financial plan. That appeared to be at odds with item 6 in Annex 2 to draft revised Decision 5, which indicated that new hiring should be “the last option”. The wording of the two documents should be reconciled.

1.20 The **Chairman of Committee 6** said that the issue of a youth perspective had been discussed in the committee. In that regard, care was also needed to avoid any age-related discrimination.

1.21 The **delegates of Gabon** and **Mali** shared the concerns expressed regarding the wording of item 6. While there should be no discrimination against older people, nor should there be any discrimination against the young.

1.22 The **delegate of Guyana** emphasized the importance of striking a balance between the employment of young people, who were needed to give new energy to the Union, and benefiting from the experience of mature staff.

1.23 The **delegate of Saudi Arabia** suggested that a small group could examine the matters raised in relation to the draft decision and report back to the Plenary.

1.24 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** said that the issues raised were substantive and should be discussed by all interested parties, not just a small group of delegates.

1.25 It was so **agreed**.

1.26 The **delegate of Jamaica,** with reference to Annex 2, item 9, observed that the call to reduce the cost of documentation probably in practice meant reducing the cost of the production of documents.

1.27 The **delegate of Chad** observed that Annex 2, item 12, appeared to run counter to the goal of using the six official languages of the Union on an equal footing. He also requested clarification concerning the working groups referred to in item 16.

1.28 The **Chairman of Committee 6** said that the reference to savings in languages concerned innovative ways of doing translation and interpretation, including contracting out, but without any loss in quality. With regard to item 16, the aim was merely to ensure that the work carried out by regional study groups did not overlap with the work of the main study groups.

1.29 The **delegate of Brazil** observed that the measures set out in Annex 2 had been studied carefully and had been taken into account when preparing Annex 1 to the draft decision, which contained the financial plan for 2016-2019. He emphasized that it had been difficult to agree on a balanced financial plan, which had had to include CHF 13 million in savings. Most of the savings were derived from the measures set out in Annex 2. The points raised during the discussion concerned essential elements of Annex 2 and to alter them might well entail a substantial redrafting of the financial plan, which should be avoided. He added that translation accounted for almost 10 per cent of the ITU budget.

1.30 The **delegate of Switzerland** drew attention to a discrepancy between the English and French versions of Annex 2, item 12, where the French text referred to ‘possible’ savings. He added that, although there were possible savings in translation and interpretation, they should be in proportion to savings made in other areas. There should be no greater sacrifices in the area of languages than elsewhere.

1.31 The **Chairman** noted that, as its report had not yet been adopted, Committee 6 had not yet finished its work. He therefore proposed to refer draft Decision 5 (Rev. Busan, 2014) back to Committee 6 for discussion of the points raised. The draft decision would subsequently be resubmitted to the Plenary for first reading.

1.32 It was so **agreed**.

**Draft Resolution 162 (Rev. Busan, 2014) – Independent management advisory committee**

1.33 The **delegate of the United Arab Emirates** observed that dates should be set for the implementation of IMAC’s recommendations, and their financial impact should be outlined.

1.34 That observation was **noted**.

1.35 Draft Resolution 162 (Rev. Busan, 2014) was **adopted.**

1.36 Except for Decision 5, the ninth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee (B9) (Document 156) was **approved** on first reading.

**2 Draft Resolution 162 (Rev. Busan, 2014) – second reading (Document 156)**

2.1 Draft Resolution 162 (Rev. Busan, 2014) (Document 156 – ninth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee) was adopted on second reading.

**3 Tenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B10) (Document 158)**

**Draft Resolution 146 (Rev. Busan, 2014) – Periodic review and revision of the International Telecommunication Regulations**

3.1 The **delegate of Saudi Arabia** said that the Expert Group on the International Telecommunication Regulations (EG-ITR) should submit its report to the 2017 session of the Council, and not to the 2018 session as indicated in *instructs the Secretary-General* 2. If the report were prepared any later, Member States would not have sufficient time to consider it and make a timely decision on it at the 2018 plenipotentiary conference.

3.2 The **Chairman of Committee 5** recalled that the review process would only be initiated at the beginning of 2017. It was proposed to submit the report to the 2018 session of Council in order to ensure that EG-ITR had sufficient preparation time.

3.3 Draft Resolution 146 (Rev. Busan, 2014) was **adopted.**

**Draft Resolution 177 (Rev. Busan, 2014) – Conformance and interoperability**

3.4 The **delegate of Saudi Arabia** proposed the addition, in *invites the membership* 2*,* of “in ITU-facilitated interoperability events and”, which had been the text adopted by PP-10.

3.5 The **Chairman of Committee 5** considered that the proposed addition afforded greater clarity, as the invitation was not just to participate in ITU study groups related to conformity and interoperability. He suggested that the proposed amendment be accepted.

3.6 It was so **agreed.**

3.7 Draft Resolution 177 (Rev. Busan, 2014), as amended, was **adopted**.

**Draft Resolution COM5/4 (Busan, 2014) – Combating counterfeit telecommunication/information and communication technology devices**

3.8 The **delegate of the United Kingdom** noted that Recommendation ITU-T X.1255, which was referred to in *recognizing e),* had been adopted only recently and she considered that it was too early to fully understand the implications of its inclusion in the present resolution. She therefore proposed the deletion of *recognizing e)*.

3.9 The **Chairman** **of Committee 5** said that it was clear from the discussions in the committee that *recognizing e)* was to be read with *recognizing f)*, which referred to device identifiers, such as the International Mobile Equipment Identity.

3.10 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** recalled that Recommendations were of an optional nature, and it was not therefore procedurally correct for a plenipotentiary conference to recognize them.

3.11 The **delegates of Sweden** and **the United States** supported the proposal to delete *recognizing e)*.

3.12 The **delegate of Saudi Arabia** recalled that the draft resolution had been discussed at length in Committee 5 and expressed the wish to retain *recognizing e)*. He added that many resolutions made reference to Recommendations.

3.13 The **delegate of the United Arab Emirates** agreed that *recognizing e)* should be retained, although it could be placed in the *recalling* section, if that was considered preferable.

3.14 The **Chairman** suggested that the Chairman of Committee 5, in consultation with the delegates concerned, discuss the matter informally and report back to the Plenary.

3.15 It was so **agreed**.

3.16 Except for draft Resolution COM5/4 (Busan, 2014), which would be resubmitted to the Plenary for first reading once the points raised concerning *recognizing e)* had been resolved, the tenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee (B10) (Document 158), as amended, was **approved** on first reading.

**4 Tenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee – second reading (Document 158)**

4.1 Except for draft Resolution COM5/4 (Busan, 2014), the tenth series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee (Document 158), as amended on first reading, was **approved** on second reading.

**5 Eleventh series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B11) (Document 159)**

**Draft Resolution 64 (Rev. Busan, 2014) – Non-discriminatory access to modern telecommunication/information and communication technology facilities, services and applications, including applied research and transfer of technology, and e-meetings, on mutually agreed terms**

**Draft Resolution 130 (Rev. Busan, 2014)** **– Strengthening the role of ITU in building confidence and security in the use of information and communication technologies**

5.1 **Adopted.**

**Draft Resolution 140 (Rev. Busan, 2014) – ITU’s role in implementing the outcomes of the World Summit on the Information Society and in the overall review by United Nations General Assembly of their implementation**

5.2 The **delegate of Indonesia**, having recalledthat a healthy cyberspace environment brought economic and social benefits and should be promoted by all stakeholders, praised the efforts of the Chairman of the Working Group of the Plenary and the ad hoc group that had dealt with Resolution 140.

5.3 The **delegate of the Russian Federation** observed that the Working Group of the Plenary had approved draft Resolution 140 (Rev. Busan, 2014) prior to its consideration of draft Resolution WG-PL/9 (Busan, 2014) concerning the Connect 2020 Agenda. He therefore proposed the addition in draft Resolution 140 of a *recalling e)*, to read: “Resolution WG-PL/9 (Busan, 2014) of this conference, on the Connect 2020 Agenda on global telecommunication/ICT development”. The **Chairman of the Working Group of the Plenary** and the **delegates of the Republic of Korea**, **Uganda** and **Greece** supported that proposal.

5.4 That addition was **approved**.

5.5 The **delegate of the Russian Federation**, replying to aquestion from the **delegate of the United Arab Emirates,** said that the resolutions listed under the *recalling* part of draft Resolution 140 were key texts that had provided a basis for further work. It was therefore entirely appropriate to retain *recalling d)*, which referred to Resolution 172 (Guadalajara, 2010), even though that resolution was going to be suppressed. Resolution 73 (Minneapolis, 1998) had been suppressed some time ago. He proposed the addition of a new paragraph after *considering g)*, to read: “that Resolution WG-PL/9 (Busan, 2014) endorsed the Connect 2020 global telecommunication /ICT goals and targets”. The subsequent paragraphs would be renumbered accordingly.

5.6 It was so **agreed**.

5.7 Draft Resolution 140 (Rev. Busan, 2014), as amended, was **adopted**.

**Draft Resolution 150 (Rev. Busan, 2014) – Approval of the accounts of the Union for the years 2010-2013**

**Draft Resolution 179 (Rev. Busan, 2014) – ITU’s role in child online protection**

**Draft Resolution 182 (Rev. Busan, 2014) – The role of telecommunications/information and communication technologies in regard to climate change and the protection of the environment**

5.8 **Adopted.**

**Draft Resolution WG-PL/7 (Busan, 2014) – Using information and communication technologies to break the chain of health-related emergencies such as Ebola virus transmission**

5.9 The **delegate of Saudi Arabia** said that, in the interests of correctness and completeness, the draft resolution should include a *resolves* section. The **delegates of the Islamic Republic of Iran** and **Nigeria** concurred with that view.

5.10 The **Chairman of the Working Group of the Plenary** observed that the matter had not been raised in the working group. However, to take account of the concern expressed, the draft resolution might be amended by inserting “*resolves to”* before *instructs the Director of the Telecommunication Development Bureau in coordination with the other Directors*” and “*instructs the Secretary-General*”. The **delegate of Lebanon** supported that suggestion, as did the **delegate of Chad**, who proposed that the order of those two sections should be reversed.

5.11 The **delegate of the United Arab Emirates** said that “*resolves to instruct* *the Director of the Telecommunication Development Bureau in coordination with the other Directors*” was sufficient.

5.12 The **delegate of Nigeria** said that a separate *resolves* heading should be introduced.

5.13 The **Chairman** suggested thatthe paragraphs in the *instructs* part of the draft resolution should be included under a *resolves* heading, with the consequential editorial alignments.

5.14 It was so **agreed**.

5.15 Draft Resolution WG-PL/7 (Busan, 2014), as amended, was **adopted**.

**Draft Resolution WG-PL/8 (Busan, 2014) – Connectivity to broadband networks**

5.16 The **delegate of Canada,** supported by the **delegate of the Russian Federation,** proposed that in order to reflect the leading role of BDT in capacity-building activities, the *resolves* section of the draft resolution should be divided into two parts, as follows:

“*resolves to instruct the Director of the Telecommunication Development Bureau*

to continue to work closely with the Director of the Radiocommunication and the Director of the Telecommunication Standardization Bureaux on capacity-building activities related to the development of national strategies to facilitate the deployment of broadband networks, including wireless broadband networks, taking into account existing budgetary constraints of the Union,

“*resolves to instruct the Director of the Radiocommunication and the Director of the Telecommunication Standardization Bureaux”* followed by the wording of the existing *resolves to instruct the Director of the Radiocommunication and the Director of the Telecommunication Standardization Bureaux* 2.

5.17 It was so **agreed**.

5.18 The **Chairman of the Working Group of the Plenary** proposed the addition of a new *recognizing* *c)* to read: *“*that broadband plays a vital role in transforming economies and societies, as stated in the open letter from the Broadband Commission for Digital Development to the ITU 2014 Plenipotentiary Conference”.

5.19 It was so **agreed**.

5.20 Draft Resolution WG-PL/8 (Busan, 2014), as amended, was **adopted**.

**Draft Resolution COM6/5 (Busan, 2014) – Options for the Union’s headquarters premises over the long term**

5.21 The **delegate of France,** noting that there was an urgent need for action, said that it was unclear from the text whether the Council or the plenipotentiary conference would take the final decision regarding the headquarters premises. For the purposes of clarity, *further instructs the Council* should therefore be amended to read “to submit a report on its decision to the next plenipotentiary conference”.

5.22 The **delegate of Mali** agreed with that amendment. He asked whether, should the decision be deferred to the next plenipotentiary conference, the Swiss offer of a fifty-year interest-free loan would still stand.

5.23 The **Chairman of Committee 6** said that it was her understanding that the draft resolution gave the Council the authority to take the decision, but also gave the Council sufficient flexibility to defer the decision to the next plenipotentiary conference in the absence of all appropriate and necessary information.

5.24 The **Secretary of Committee 6** confirmed that that understanding was correct.

5.25 The **delegate of the United States** proposed that the order of *further instructs the Council* and *authorizes the Council* should be reversed.

5.26 The **delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran** suggested that, to address the concerns expressed, *further instructs the Council* might be amended to read “to decide on the matter, as appropriate, and report to the next plenipotentiary conference accordingly”. The **delegate of Mali** supported that suggestion.

5.27 The **delegate of the United Arab Emirates** said that it was his understanding that the ad hoc group of Committee 6 established to consider the matter had concluded that the final decision was to be taken by PP-18.

5.28 The **delegate of the Dominican Republic** supported the suggestion of the United States. If the order of the paragraphs were reversed, much of *further instructs the Council* would be redundant.

5.29 Following informal consultations among interested parties, the **delegate of Spain**, supported by the **delegates of the Islamic Republic of Iran**, **the United** **Arab** **Emirates**, **Germany**, **Mali** and **Tunisia**, said that it was proposed to delete *further instructs the Council* in its entirety, and to add “and report to the next plenipotentiary conference accordingly” at the end of *authorizes the Council*”.

5.30 It was so **agreed**.

5.31 Draft Resolution COM6/5, as amended, was **adopted**.

**SUP Resolution 35 (Kyoto, 1994) – Telecommunication support for the protection of the environment**

**SUP Resolution 172 (Guadalajara, 2010) – Overall review of implementation of the outcomes of the World Summit on the Information Society**

5.32 **Approved.**

5.33 The eleventh series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee for first reading (B11) (Document 159), as amended, was **approved**.

**6 Eleventh series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee – second reading (Document 159)**

**Draft Resolution 182 (Rev. Busan, 2014) – The role of telecommunications/information and communication technologies in regard to climate change and the protection of the environment**

6.1 The **delegate of Guyana** proposed that the last indent under *instructs the Directors of the three Bureaux, within the purview of their mandates* 1 be amended to read:“to enable telecommunications/ICTs to contribute to disaster prediction, early warning, mitigation and relief”.

6.2 It was so **agreed**.

6.3 The eleventh series of texts submitted by the Editorial Committee (Document 159), as amended, was **approved** on second reading.

**The meeting rose at 1225 hours.**

The Secretary-General: The Chairman:

H. TOURÉ W. MIN