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1. **Opening of the meeting and welcome remarks**

Dr Ahmad Sharafat (Iran (Islamic Republic of)), Chair of the TDAG Working Group on the future of Study Group Questions (TDAG-WG-futureSGQ) welcomed all present (see list of participant [TDAG-WG-futureSGQ/9](https://www.itu.int/md/D22-TDAG.WG.SGQ-C-0009/)) for the second meeting of this TDAG Working Group.

He acknowledged the presence of Dr Cosmas Luckyson Zavazava, Director of the BDT, who extended greetings to the participants and wished them successful outcomes of the TDAG working groups. The Chair thanked also Ms Roxanne McElvane Webber (Unites States), Chair of TDAG, for her presence.

The Chair provided a brief summary of the previous meeting held on 24 March 2024. During that meeting, the terms of reference of TDAG-WG-futureSGQ were agreed upon and subsequently endorsed by TDAG, and a background paper that shared considerations to be mindful of when making proposals for future study Questions was discussed. He highlighted that two additional virtual meetings were scheduled, on 3 December 2024 and 4 March 2025.

1. **Approval of the agenda**

The agenda was presented in Document [TDAG-WG-futureSGQ/7](https://www.itu.int/md/D22-TDAG.WG.SGQ-C-0007/) (Rev.1). The Chair highlighted that the focus of the meeting would be to review and agree on the online consultation form (questionnaire) that had been prepared as part of the mandate of this TDAG Working Group. He noted that no other contribution was received. The agenda was approved without comments.

1. **Contributions submitted to TDAG-WG-futureSGQ**

Document [TDAG-WG-futureSGQ/8](https://www.itu.int/md/D22-TDAG.WG.SGQ-C-0008/) was introduced, which contained an online consultation form (questionnaire) developed in collaboration with the TDAG-WG-futureSGQ management team and the secretariat. This consultation was informal and aimed to gather views from all interested members subscribed to the TDAG and TDAG-WG-futureSGQ’s mailing lists.

The consultation form was structured into the following sections:

1. Section 1 (“Current study Questions”) included general queries to respondents about their knowledge of the current structure of the ITU-D study groups, as well as which Questions in the current study period were important to them.
2. Section 2 (“Number of Questions”) enquired on the number of Questions to consider in the next study period with a deeper dive in Questions to merge or discontinue.
3. Section 3 (“New topics”) focused on identifying emerging topics to be addressed in the upcoming study period, with an emphasis on providing guidelines, best practices, and experience sharing for developing countries.
4. Section 4 (“Cross-cutting topics”) probed on cross-cutting topics to be addressed in a separate study Question or across multiple study Questions.

The following subsections provide the gist of discussions and agreements reached for each section of the consultation form. All question numbers below refer to the numbers included in Document [TDAG-WG-futureSGQ/8](https://www.itu.int/md/D22-TDAG.WG.SGQ-C-0008/).

* 1. **Section 1 (“Current study Questions”)**
* Mr Woodhouse (United Kingdom) proposed the addition of two questions aimed at identifying the membership type and country represented by the respondent’s entity as this information would enable better statistical analysis of the outcome of the consultation, per region and per level of development. With the understanding that the additional questions may lead to inference of the submitter of the consultation form, the proposal was agreed following comments from Dr Oloyede (Nigeria), Dr Mazar (Israel) and Ms Rimkeviciene (Lithuania).
* Question 1 asked whether the respondent is aware of the current structure of the ITU-D study groups and their Questions. This question was agreed without changes.
* Question 2 asked whether the current structure of the ITU-D study groups and their Questions addressed the needs of the respondent’s country and organization. Mr Woodhouse (United Kingdom) proposed to rephrase it in a way to determine how well the current study Questions meet the respondents’ needs on a five-point scale. However and following interventions by Dr Oloyede (Nigeria), it was agreed to remove the question.
* Question 3 asked which study Questions are important for the respondent. This question was agreed without changes.
  1. **Section 2 (“Number of Questions”)**
* A proposal was made to add a new question on how many study groups would be appropriate for the next study period. While some concerns from Dr Mazar (Israel) were raised about the impact of having more than two study groups, support from Mr Plossky (Russian Federation) were also expressed. Since the intent was to collect views on the number of study groups and not to make an immediate decision, this new question was agreed to be included.
* Questions 5 to 18 asked whether each of the 14 study Questions respectively should be discontinued, and if so to provide the reason(s). The following actions were agreed:
  + A proposal was made Dr Mazar (Israel) and supported by Dr Imanaka (NICT, Japan) to simplify the first option of the multiple choices to “*This Question was studied over several study periods*”, and remove “*with little evolution*”, making it more neutral.
  + A proposal was made by Dr Mazar (Israel) and supported by Dr Imanaka (NICT, Japan) to remove the second option "*All topics in this Question have already been studied*" due to the potential for ambiguity and the challenge of proving that all topics have indeed been addressed.
* Question 19 asked whether some Questions should be merged given potential similarities and overlaps. Suggestions were made by Dr Mazar (Israel) and Dr Imanaka (NICT, Japan) to provide some existing statistics namely: 1) the number of documents received for each Question, in order to understand the level of workload; and 2) the number of contributions submitted to multiple Questions, in order to get an idea of potential similarities and overlap between them. The secretariat was requested to add corresponding links in the consultation form to such statistics, if possible.
* Ms Vicente (GSOA), proposed the inclusion of a new question that invites additional details related to the options selected in Question 19, e.g. proposed title of the resulting merged Question. Following discussions with interventions from Mr Burton (United States) and Mr Woodhouse (United Kingdom), it was decided not to add this question, since this consultation only aims to identify potential candidates for mergers and not to decide how the merging is implemented.
* Question 20 asked whether other Questions not listed in Question 19 should be merged, and if so, to specify which ones and to provide the rationale(s). This question was agreed without changes.
  1. **Section 3 (“New topics”)**
* Question 21 sought views on new topics to be addressed in the next study period. A query was made by Dr Mazar (Israel) on the inclusion of airborne platforms as a topic, expressing concerns about potential duplication of work with ITU-R. It was clarified that the intention was not to duplicate work but to share case studies and experiences for the benefit of ITU-D members. The TDAG-WG-futureSGQ secretariat highlighted that the last option (“Other”) will allow respondents to suggest other new topics they feel appropriate. The Chair proposed to add a note to indicate that the topics listed are only examples, and the proposal was agreed.
  1. **Section 4 (“Cross-cutting topics”)**
* Question 22 asked views whether listed cross-cutting topics proposed can be addressed in a separate Question or across Questions. The proposal of Mr Mazar (Israel) to add “Economic aspects” as an additional cross-cutting topic, was agreed.
* Question 23 asked views whether other cross-cutting topics not listed in Question 22 should be addressed in a separate Question or across Questions, and if so to provide further explanation. This question was agreed without changes.
* Following interventions by Mr Woodhouse (United Kingdom) and Mr Burton (United States), it was agreed to add a new question which asked if respondents have any further comments related to future study Questions, as well as to submit contributions that reflect their views to the TDAG-WG-futureSGQ in addition to this questionnaire.
* Question 24 concluded the consultation form by seeking views for any innovative and effective approaches to work in ITU-D study groups. This question was agreed without changes.
  1. **Next steps**

It was agreed that the consultation form would be updated to reflect the agreements made during this meeting and shared on 17 September 2024, with a response deadline set to 1 October 2024.

The results would be then submitted as a contribution by 15 October 2024 to guide inputs from the membership for the next meeting of TDAG-WG-futureSGQ, scheduled on 3 December 2024, and to assist regional groups in preparing for WTDC-25.

1. **Any other business**

The Chair acknowledged that all agenda items were covered, and that the online consultation form would be sent out in accordance with the agreed schedule.

The Chair closed the meeting by expressing appreciation for the productive session and looking forward to future contributions and meetings. The meeting was adjourned with other thanks and positive remarks from the participants.
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