



## DRAFT INTERNATIONAL GUIDELINES ON PEOPLE-CENTRED SMART CITIES MEMBER STATES CONSULTATIONS

### Comments received from Member States of the 65<sup>th</sup> Ad-Hoc Working Group on Programmatic, Budgetary, and Administrative matters (March 5, 2025)

#### VERBAL FEEDBACK

##### Republic of France

- Cautions against making significant changes to the text developed by experts.
- Emphasizes that the guidelines should be guided by Resolution 2/1, which provides the framework for discussions.
- Opposes the deletion of key references to human rights throughout the document, noting that human rights are explicitly mentioned in Resolution 2/1 (OP1, OP1A, OP1D, and OP3).
- Opposes the deletion of the paragraph in the introduction (page 4), which is a direct reference to Resolution 2/1, OP3.
- Opposes the addition of "to bridge the digital divide" in the definition of people-centred smart cities (page 7)
- Opposes the deletion of "human rights" in the thematic area of equity and inclusion (page 8) and requests that it be retained.
- Opposes the deletion of "digital twins" (page 15)
- Opposes the removal of references to deforestation, land degradation, water, and energy consumption (page 15) under sustainability, resilience, and crisis response.
- Opposes the deletion of references to the right to privacy in the digital age (pages 19-20), as privacy is a fundamental human right already recognized in Resolution 2/1.
- Opposes changes to a recommendation on disinformation and unlawful surveillance (page 21).
- Notes that the document was received only the previous afternoon and must be sent for translation today, requesting the Secretariat's indulgence as further work is needed.
- Finds it difficult to accept that this current version will be the basis for translation and review by experts, as there was insufficient time for proper examination.
- Recognizes frustrations from delegations whose comments were not reflected in the new version.

##### Japan

- Opposes the deletion of "digital twins" (page 15), stating the term as necessary.
- Opposes the deletion of a paragraph on privacy violations (page 20), emphasizing its importance under human rights law.
- Opposes changes in disinformation and unlawful surveillance (page 21).



### **United States of America**

- Supports digital technologies serving all community members and fostering innovation-friendly AI and data policies.
- Opposes excessive AI regulation, advocating pro-growth policies that maximize AI's transformative potential.
- Does not support any program that uses any form of diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility (DEIA), stating that such programs replace merit-based systems with preferential treatment.
- Underscores that the UN-Habitat Smart Cities initiative should not include any form of DEIA programming or gender programming inconsistent with BI. States that U.S. policy, recognizes only two sexes (male and female) and does not promote gender ideology.
- Does not support the engagement of stakeholders who are focused on DEIA or gender ideology programming or initiatives.

### **Czech Republic**

- Believes the document should not be subject to line-by-line negotiations, as it was crafted based on broad expert input.
- Acknowledges the Member State consultation and right to comment but questions the extent of the level of revisions in the draft shared.
- Does not support the extensive deletions and changes made in the current version of the document.
- Prefers working with the original version of the document that was first submitted with expert support, as it was carefully crafted through an established process.
- Believes the expert-driven process should remain the basis rather than engaging in in-depth negotiations over the revised version.

### **European Union**

- Echoes the concerns raised by France and Czech Republic regarding the extent of substantive changes in the document.
- Previous consultations with the EU experts yielded no comments, but the significant changes require it to be sent back for review.
- Cannot approve the document in its current form without further consultation with experts in the capital.

### **Arab Republic of Egypt**

- Surprised, not by the changes, but by the Secretariat's omission of Egypt's written comments, which were submitted before the deadline on the deletion of 'Human Rights'.
- Requests justification from the Secretariat on why Egypt's comments were not included.
- Believes that neither the expert group nor the Secretariat has the mandate or expertise to draft the section on human rights.
- Finds the inclusion of human rights in the guidelines an infringement on the mandate of the UN Human Rights Council (Geneva) and the Third Committee (New York).



- Reserves its position on the current draft and reiterates its request to remove the section on human rights, which was not reflected in the revised version.
- Reserves the right to revisit the document, up to the UN-Habitat Assembly.

### **Russian Federation**

- Believe the changes made align with the enabling resolution and that the text effectively reflects human rights, climate, environment, and sustainable development priorities.
- Finds the structure distracting due to lengthy sections on human rights, environment, and climate change, which are already addressed under other UN frameworks, and suggests reducing their volume to maintain a technical focus.
- Does not oppose human rights, environment, and climate change references but suggests limiting recommendations to ensure that digital technologies and smart cities do not impede these issues.
- Opposes references to the Global Digital Compact, citing concerns about its non-consensual nature and how it was developed in New York.
- Raises concerns about the mention of disinformation.
- Acknowledges concerns about the limited review time but opposes reverting to the original draft, arguing that the revised version reflects Member State inputs, including Russia's, and that a rollback would undo progress.
- Asserts that the core enablers and purpose of the guidelines remain intact, with most changes being political rather than substantive, and supports adhering to Resolution 2/1 to ensure alignment.

### **Federative Republic of Brazil**

- Surprised by the extent of changes in the document, as the guidelines were developed over a year-long expert-driven process with input from all Member States.
- Believes the document should not be subject to line-by-line negotiation, as it was crafted by experts.
- Prefers submitting the original version while keeping discussions open for potential changes.
- Requests access to the comments that led to the revisions to ensure transparency,
- Noted that the Member States did not have sufficient time to review or consult with their capitals and reserves the right to provide further input as the changes require further review.
- Opposes the removal of human rights references, aligning with Resolution 2/1
- Believes the initial version of the document was more balanced.
- Points out inconsistent communication from the Secretariat regarding document availability and updates, requesting clearer notifications on when revisions are uploaded.

### **Federal Republic of Nigeria**

- Supports Egypt's position regarding concerns over the mandate of the Secretariat and experts in drafting certain sections.

- Raises concerns about the term "interoperability", stating that developing nations may not yet have the capacity to engage at this level.
- Believes the meaning of interoperability has not been clearly defined, particularly regarding whether it refers to engagement within national and local governments or between states.
- Emphasizes that if interoperability refers only to national-local engagement, this must be explicitly stated to avoid confusion and controversy.
- Nigeria headquarters is still reviewing the document and may provide further input later.

### **Kingdom of the Netherlands**

- Surprised by the extent of changes in the document
- Believes the document is an expert-led process, where Member States provide input, but the Secretariat and experts should ultimately guide the drafting process.
- Requested additional time to review the substantive changes with their capital.

### **People's Democratic Republic of Algeria**

- Reserves the right to provide further input later, as they are still awaiting feedback from their capital.
- Opposes specific wording in the principles under equity and inclusion (page 15), particularly the legislation insertion regarding the unlawful and arbitrary collection, processing, retention, sharing, or use of personal data.

### **Federal Republic of Germany**

- Requests to consult with their capital and take time to review the revised version thoroughly.
- Questions the transparency of the revision process, particularly how Member State comments were incorporated, as the Secretariat initially requested general comments rather than tracked changes.
- Expresses concern over the last-minute circulation of the document, noting that less than 24 hours is insufficient for proper review.
- Believes the revision process risks undermining the expert-driven approach mandated by the resolution, as extensive tracked changes have significantly altered the document.
- Describes the document as heavily modified and raises concerns about whether it remains aligned with the expert-driven process.
- Opposes forwarding the document to the UN-Habitat Assembly as a pre-session document without proper review by Member State capitals.
- Supports continuing discussions in the coming weeks but insists that the current version is not ready for submission.
- States that Germany was not adequately consulted in the revision process and does not feel there was a proper second round of consultation.
- Clarifies that Germany had no interventions on substance, meaning its views were not incorporated into the revised version.



- Reserves the right to revisit and review the document thoroughly in the future.

### **Kingdom of Morocco**

- Notes that the current document was circulated very late, making it difficult for capitals to review and provide input.
- Supports transparency in the revision process, noting that the document does not indicate which Member State proposed each change.
- Believes the process is being handled too hastily, warning that rushing the document may lead to problems at the Executive Board level that could hinder its recommendation to the UN-Habitat Assembly.
- Expresses concern over inconsistencies in how different UN-Habitat documents are handled, comparing this process to the strategic plan, which was managed with clearer consultation.
- Supports the proposal to submit the track-changed version for translation, allowing Member States to identify and discuss contentious sections.

### **WRITTEN FEEDBACK**

#### **European Union**

- Maintain the text of the guidelines fully in line with the resolution 2/1.
- Maintain all the references to human rights, environmental and climate impacts.
- Add a footnote, holding a reference to MIMs [ITU-T recommendation](#). “Clear governance arrangements and processes for secure interoperability of smart city technologies, interoperable design and minimum interoperability mechanisms to enable the safe integration of data from multiple sources and digital exchanges” ([Minimal Interoperability Mechanisms](#)).
- Add a paragraph in section 2.2.1. emphasizing the development and deployment of transparent, unbiased artificial intelligence algorithms to ensure fairness, accountability, and trust in decision-making processes.
- An expert group needs to leverage insights from leading global experts in smart city development, also on Local Digital Twins. Adding a definition to Local Digital Twins as a ‘Digital representation of a city offering dynamic simulation of urban systems, to enhance planning and resource management’.

#### **Kingdom of Morocco**

- Recommendations on urban planning should be further developed, particularly on mobility, affordable housing, and cybersecurity. Digital solutions should be integrated to reduce spatial inequalities, improve access to housing and land management, and connect urban and rural areas through smart logistics networks.
- The “Shared Prosperity” section should include concrete examples showcasing how digital technologies can reduce spatial inequalities and create sustainable local jobs.

- The "Sustainability, Resilience, and Crisis Response" section should expand its case studies to include sustainable water and waste management technologies.
- Develop practical tools for citizen participation, such as consultation applications and strategies to overcome barriers like digital literacy.
- The financial aspects and spatial integration of digital infrastructure need further development, including long-term financing models for low-resource contexts and specifying the physical integration of infrastructure (e.g., sensors in buildings).
- Further develop the part on traffic management and intelligent public transport systems, as well as the integration of transport systems in smart urban planning
- Detailed guidelines are needed to protect critical infrastructure from cyber threats, as well as securing urban systems.
- The report did not develop a reflection on smart urban forms and sustainable densification.
- Securing land rights and land administration is underexplored.
- Environmental sustainability is addressed, but there is little focus on preserving urban ecosystems.
- Urban heritage is neglected in favor of digital culture.
- Emphasis is on efficiency rather than the attractiveness and usability of public spaces.

#### **Federal Republic of Nigeria**

- The definition of "Interoperability" should be modified based on spectrum. Its spectrum should clearly refer to interactions/engagements between state/country (not between countries, at least not yet).

#### **Federal Republic of Germany**

- Requests to reinstate explicit references to human rights in the guidelines.
- The guidelines are no longer consistent with the German Smart City Charter. Therefore, do not align with Germany's position in the international discourse on smart city development.

#### **Republic of France**

- Similar to the verbal feedback captured above.



## **Comments received from Member States of the 64<sup>th</sup> Ad-Hoc Working Group on Programmatic, Budgetary, and Administrative matters (February 24, 2025)**

### **VERBAL FEEDBACK**

#### **Federative Republic of Brazil**

- Noted significant convergences between the guidelines and Brazil's national framework, (the Brazilian Charter for smart cities).
- Highlighted the importance of capacity building in digital literacy, recommending that smart city policies include training for citizens and local governments to use digital tools effectively.
- Ensure that the benefits of urban innovation are accessible to all, especially vulnerable communities.
- Called for continued engagement to refine the guidelines so they align with global commitments and national best practices for sustainable urban development.

#### **State of Palestine**

- The framework should ensure that digital transformation and technological advancement contribute to inclusive, sustainable, and resilient urban development worldwide.
- Noted that the guidelines acknowledge the diverse socioeconomic and governance contexts of different countries and be tailored to each nation's unique circumstances.
- Emphasized the importance of the guidelines in humanitarian contexts, such as natural disasters, conflicts, and displacement, where smart city technologies can be leveraged to support emergency response, enhance resilience, and improve service delivery.
- To provide additional comments after further review of the guidelines.

#### **Republic of Indonesia**

- Consulting with their capital and will submit written feedback focusing on the human rights section.

#### **Federal Republic of Nigeria**

- Noted that the concept of interoperability was not originally introduced by UN-Habitat and it should be put on hold or considered for future use.
- Expressed concerns that consultation at this level may not yield productive outcomes or enhance transparency and trust in information transfer.

#### **Russian Federation**

- Proposed sharing Russia's additional ideas on building smart cities in writing—ideas that may not yet be incorporated into the current guidelines.
- Recommended including the digital twin model as an analytical tool within the smart city framework.



## FOR A BETTER URBAN FUTURE

- Recommended the introduction of feedback platforms that enable residents to participate by sharing their opinions on the city's development and services.
- Suggested the idea of integrating all urban services into a single ecosystem (or a single-window solution).
- Proposed a mechanism for sharing expertise and best practices—potentially through a “smart cities hub”

### WRITTEN FEEDBACK

#### Japan

- Request to add the concept of digital twins in the body of the guidelines (in addition to footnote 34), in sections 2.1.2, 2.2.2, and 2.2.3 (with specific text recommendations).

#### Arab Republic of Egypt

- Requests the deletion of point 2.1.4 titled "Human Rights, Equity and Inclusion", given that O.P. 3 of Resolution 2/1 on International Guidelines on People-Centred Smart Cities stated the need to develop International Guidelines that ensure cities are respectful of human rights, not to include a section on Human Rights.
- The Permanent Mission is of the view that neither the Expert Working Group for the Development of the International Guidelines on People-Centred Smart Cities nor UN-Habitat Secretariat is qualified or equipped with human rights expertise to provide human rights-related guidelines. This constitutes an infringement on the roles of the Human Rights Council and the Third Committee of the United Nations General Assembly.

#### Republic of Indonesia

- Request to change the word "gender" with sex and "persons in vulnerable situations" with people in vulnerable situations (in section 2.1.4, Human Rights, Equity and Inclusion, page 15).

#### Russian Federation

- Language changes such as the replacement of words like ‘should’, ‘must’ and ‘required’.
- Deletions of text related to human rights, climate action, and environmental sustainability.
- Deletions of mentions of global agreements like the Global Digital Compact, Paris Agreement, and UN human rights frameworks.





## Comments received from Member States of the 63<sup>rd</sup> Ad-Hoc Working Group on Programmatic, Budgetary, and Administrative matters (February 17, 2025)

### VERBAL FEEDBACK

#### Russian Federation

- Reduce emphasis on environment, climate, and human rights, ensuring these topics are only referenced in relation to the impact of digitalization as per Resolution 2/1 (op.1b).
- Relocate sections on environment, climate change, human rights, and inclusivity to the end of the guidelines, following the key enablers.
- Revise the definition of Smart Cities to align with the agreed language in Resolution 2/1
- Replacing terms like "should" and "must" with "States are encouraged," "advised," or "may consider" to be in line with the agreed UN-Habitat language
- Remove footnotes 45 and 50 due to diverse national positions on the referenced documents (Global Digital Compact).
- Replace "vulnerable groups and communities" with "people in vulnerable situations".
- Replace "underserved communities" with "people in underserved areas."
- Strengthen the connection between smart city policies and economic development, ensuring digital transformation benefits employment, businesses, and service affordability.
- Refocus human rights discussions on practical inclusion measures that promote equitable urban service delivery rather than a legalistic framework.
- Reduce emphasis on climate change mitigation, prioritizing urban resilience, efficiency, and infrastructure sustainability instead.

#### Republic of Colombia

- Valued the strong emphasis on the inclusion of people in vulnerable situations and the human rights-based approach, ensuring no one is left behind in the digital transformation of cities.
- Recognized the importance of the step-by-step implementation approach outlined in the guidelines.
- Acknowledged the implementation and monitoring section, which highlights the need for regular updates to reflect the evolving nature of technology and digital transformation.
- Welcomed the focus on governance, equity, and resilience within the smart city framework.
- The guidelines will serve as a valuable reference for national and local governments in designing and implementing inclusive and transparent smart city initiatives.

#### Federative Republic of Brazil

- Document shared with Brazil for review and cannot guarantee compliance due to time constraints.



### **Argentine Republic**

- Argentina is currently reviewing the draft guidelines internally.
- Unsure whether they will be able to submit written comments within the given deadline.

### **United States of America**

- Document is still under review.
- Hoped to provide substantive input within the given timeline.

### **Arab Republic of Egypt**

- Currently reviewing the document and reserves the right to provide further input later.
- Requested substituting "vulnerable communities" and "vulnerable groups" with "people in vulnerable situations", as previously commented on in the strategic plan.

### **Republic of Indonesia**

- Document is still under review and will provide further input
- Recommended ensuring that the guidelines remain flexible and adaptable to accommodate the specific needs and necessities of cities globally.

### **Republic of Costa Rica**

- Approved the inclusive, balanced, and open process of developing the document, which has benefited from expert advice from Costa Rica's Ministry of Housing and Human Settlements.
- Expressed support for the document, stating that it provides a valuable framework for harnessing digital technologies to improve the quality of life.
- Emphasized the importance of local community participation in planning and implementing smart city initiatives to ensure they are responsive to residents' needs.
- Smart city initiatives must be inclusive and accessible to all, addressing the digital divide so that everyone, regardless of socioeconomic status, gender, or location, can benefit from digital technologies.
- Need to ensure that smart city initiatives are sustainable and environmentally friendly, using digital technologies to promote energy efficiency, reduce waste, and protect natural resources.
- Called for stronger data protection measures, ensuring that data collection and usage are responsible, ethical, and give individuals control over their data.
- Encouraged collaboration between different stakeholders—governments, the private sector, civil society, and academia—to leverage expertise and resources for more effective and sustainable smart city initiatives.
- Looked forward to the approval of the guidelines by the Assembly.

### **Republic of France**

- Stated that the document aligns with Resolution 2/1 and provides strategic guidance and technical advice for national and local governments to develop smart city strategies while keeping people at the centre.

- Recognized that the guidelines effectively encompass the three dimensions of sustainable development: economic, social, and environmental.
- Noted that the diversity of government-appointed experts involved in drafting the guidelines gives them legitimacy.
- Acknowledged the World Smart Cities Outlook as providing scientific data to support the guidelines.
- Informed that the document has been forwarded to capital experts for review, and feedback will be provided later.
- Expressed confidence that the guidelines will be adopted by the Assembly in May, as requested by Resolution 2/1.

#### **People's Democratic Republic of Algeria**

- Document is still under review and Algeria reserves the right to provide further input once the analysis is complete.
- Recognized the document as non-binding, affirming that Member States have the right to adapt their policies to address urban and city challenges.
- Replace the term "vulnerable groups and communities" with "people in vulnerable situations" to ensure broader applicability to national and local contexts.

#### **Federal Republic of Germany**

- Currently reviewing the guidelines and will send comments in writing as requested.
- Germany has been involved in the process from the beginning, even before the resolution was adopted.
- Reaffirmed Germany's commitment to guiding principles in smart city development, emphasizing that smart cities must prioritize the common good and serve society as a whole rather than private interests.
- Smart cities should be inclusive and foster multi-stakeholder collaboration, adhering to the rule of law.
- Advocated for open-source solutions and interoperable systems to ensure transparency, adaptability, and citizen participation.
- Highlighted that digitalization should strengthen social equity, sustainability, and democratic governance rather than just being a tool for efficiency.
- Emphasized that implementation is critical, and smart city strategies must be both concrete enough for effective implementation and flexible enough to foster innovation.
- Climate change, environmental considerations, and resource limitations are essential for sustainable smart city development and should remain a core part of the guidelines.
- Ensure smart city strategies support municipalities with limited capacities, particularly in the implementation phase.
- Make global funding mechanisms more accessible, especially for smaller municipalities with constrained resources, to support equitable digital transformation.
- Strengthen the ecological well-being aspect, ensuring that environmental health is a key consideration in decision-making to create a symbiotic relationship between people and their surroundings.

- Avoid reopening discussions on definitions and core concepts of the drafted guidelines that have been developed over the past 1.5 years, as this would not be productive.
- Maintain an integrated approach to smart cities, ensuring that environmental and climate considerations remain central to the people-centred smart city concept.
- Sought clarification on how UN-Habitat plans to monitor the implementation of the guidelines globally, specifically regarding the role of global data, review of practices, and the World Smart Cities Outlook in tracking progress.

### **Federal Republic of Nigeria**

- Emphasized the importance of advancing cities with digital technologies to improve living standards, highlighting ongoing partnerships with the private sector and UN-Habitat.
- Replace “should” and terminology related to vulnerable groups.
- Stressed that safe, affordable, and adequate housing is a fundamental human right, but that smart cities themselves should not be attributed the same status.
- Recognized the non-binding nature of the guidelines, as outlined in Resolution 2/1, and the importance of respecting human rights.
- Expressed concerns about the unpredictability of managing new initiatives, particularly with the growing presence of cyber threats, artificial intelligence (AI) evolution, and the digital divide.
- Interoperability should not be considered an essential enabler or protocol at this stage due to a lack of trust, transparency, and sufficient technological advancement. Instead, it should be put on hold until conditions improve.
- Encouraged UN-Habitat to work within its mandate and collaborate with sister organizations while ensuring efficiency and equitable attention to developing states and regions.
- Suggested that if the guidelines are non-binding, their practical application should also reflect this flexibility in implementation.

### **People’s Republic of China**

- Emphasized the need to carefully define key terms and principles to ensure the guidelines are comprehensive and aligned with their intended objectives.
- Highlighted that the definition on Page 5 mentions improving quality of life, sustainability, and resilience, and stressed that “people” should include all residents, particularly those in poor areas without basic living conditions.
- Stated that environmental considerations should be addressed from a global perspective, ensuring that all countries, including those lacking basic electricity and internet access, are accounted for.
- Reiterated the principle of “leaving no one behind”, questioning how the guidelines can practically support marginalized populations.
- Ensure there is access to basic services (such as reliable electricity and internet) before introducing advanced digital technologies.
- Include community participation and establish regular monitoring mechanisms to ensure smart city initiatives meet the needs of all residents.
- Evaluate the practicality and affordability of digital technologies in real-world applications, ensuring that solutions benefit all residents.



## FOR A BETTER URBAN FUTURE

- Encourage local governments to lead smart city efforts, ensuring that essential infrastructure and quality standards are in place.
- Adopt a nationally led, standardized framework to prevent market monopolization and ensure equitable access to technology.

### **Republic of Senegal**

- Inquired about measures to promote a thriving digital economy in areas with limited internet access.
- Seeks strategies to address digital literacy and access to technology barriers.
- Seeks strategies that ensure transparent and inclusive communication with local communities in smart city projects.
- Requests clarification on governance frameworks and regulations to enhance transparency, accountability, and public participation in managing digital infrastructure.
- Inquired about approaches to promote digital skills development, particularly in underserved communities.

### **European Union**

- Expressed full support from the European Union for the guidelines on people-centred smart cities.
- Note that cities are not isolated from environmental and climate impacts, emphasizing the need for digital solutions to address these challenges. Requested for the guidelines to maintain a broad scope, integrating environmental and climate considerations into digital solutions for cities.
- Affirmed that urban planners and governments require broad and inclusive guidance that considers all issues affecting urban areas.
- Emphasized that smart city guidelines must be based on fundamental human rights, particularly in relation to housing and other urban issues.
- Appreciated the inclusive consultation process.

## **WRITTEN FEEDBACK**

### **Russian Federation**

- Similar to the verbal feedback captured above.

### **Federal Republic of Germany**

- Supports the emphasis on human rights, gender equality, and inclusion
- A people-centred approach is fundamental to ensuring that smart cities are not just technologically advanced, but also socially just, inclusive, and sustainable.
- Smart cities must work for all people regardless of gender, socio-economic status, disability, age, or other factors to guarantee fair access to urban services
- Smart cities risk deepening existing inequalities discrimination, exclusion or surveillance abuses if human rights, gender and inclusion are not prioritized.



## FOR A BETTER URBAN FUTURE

- Guidelines must align with existing internationally agreed frameworks to ensure consistency and reinforce commitments made by the international community (NUA, SDG 11, SDG 5 and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights).
- Encourages strong, explicit language on gender equality, diversity, and inclusion, ensuring that smart city policies proactively promote equal access to opportunities, technology, and decision-making to avoid reinforcing traditional power imbalances
- Guidelines should reinforce the commitment to protecting privacy, preventing digital discrimination, and ensuring that digital governance is transparent, accountable, and inclusive.
- Without ethical safeguards smart cities risk becoming surveillance-driven, exacerbating discrimination and exclusion.
- Supports the inclusion of climate, environmental, and biodiversity aspects in the guidelines (should align and reference NUA, SDGs, Paris Agreement, and the Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction).

### **Federal Republic of Nigeria**

- Appreciate the document's emphasis on the responsible use of technology (page 11).
- Noted that Nigeria's collaboration with member states and UN-Habitat should be such that enables the advancement of our relative capacities as we progress into an agreed international guideline for people centred smart cities for all.
- Propose that though the UN's idea of interoperability may have its initial positive intention, but due to the non-binding status of the draft guideline, the fact that this new initiative is still at its' infancy and member states are at the first stage of understanding the pros and cons of this level of global engagement, the use of this concept/term should be put on hold for a time when there is a reasonable advancement to enable increased trust and transparency.
- Given the future of AI, Nigeria inquired on the possible downsides to the future of people-centred smart cities.
- Other written feedback is similar to the verbal feedback captured above.