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Introduction

In analysing the current ITU-T structure, study questions, number of participants and associated statistics, it is evident that there are many overlaps in work areas among different study groups. These overlaps have the following issues:

Subject matter experts in a particular field such as security or multimedia, are often required to attend different study groups, leading to inefficiency and time wastage for these individuals.

The number of liaisons among study groups on similar topics will cause unnecessary delays in work progress.

Administrative overhead associated with holding meetings with a few work items and participants.

In addition, Study Groups must possess delineated mandates and a precisely focused purpose. This becomes paramount, particularly as the ITU-T endeavors to address the swiftly evolving landscape of global standardization. In this dynamic environment, marked by the pressing demands of future networks, artificial intelligence, the metaverse, and security, having well-defined boundaries for each Study Group is essential to expedite progress and meet the urgent requirements of these critical domains.

To address these issues, the following key strategic principles are used to guide the study group restructuring:

1 Optimized SG structure

a Reduce unnecessary number of SGs

b Reduce administrative overhead associated with holding the meetings.

2 Clear and non-overlapping SGs mandates (clarity of work programs)

a Mandates should avoid confusing terminology

b Avoid work proposals being introduced into different study groups causing potential work overlaps.

3 Cost-effectiveness and suitability for stakeholders

a Merging and consolidation of study Questions and their allocation to SGs will allow experts to attend and contribute cost-effectively.
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Proposal

The proposed study group restructuring focuses on re-grouping work of similar topic/nature from different study groups into the same study group with the necessary expertise and background needed, while at the same time minimizing duplication of standardization work between ITU-T study groups and with clear study group mandates.

Specifically, the following Study Group restructuring is proposed:

# 1 Consolidate all Security related work into SG17:

SG17 is the lead group on security. It is essential to consolidate security-related work into SG17, where security experts reside. For example, the part of Q6/20 on “security, privacy and trust for IoT and SC&C” could be merged with Q6/17, which works on Security for telecommunication services and the Internet of Things (IoT).

# 2 Consolidate all naming, numbering, addressing and identification (NNAI) related work into SG2:

It is essential to consolidate work that deals with NNAI aspects from other study groups with SG2, where subject matter experts reside. For example, the work on identification for IoT and SC&C in Q6/20 could be transferred to SG2. This realignment is per Q1/2’s mandate on NNAI for fixed and mobile telecommunication services. This strategic transfer ensures a more cohesive and streamlined approach to the diverse facets of identification within the telecommunication/ICT domain.

# 3 Consolidation of performance, quality of service and quality of experience related work into SG12

SG12 is the lead Study Group on performance, QoS and QoE for the full spectrum of terminals, networks, services and applications, including the operational aspects of QoS and QoE.

It is necessary to consider updating the SG points of guidance for the post-2024 work programme within the ANNEX B of Resolution 2 (Rev. Geneva 2022), to make sure there is no overlap between the work described in the points of guidance and the mandate of other SG.

# 4 Consolidation of multimedia applications related work, currently in ITU-T SG9 and SG16, in a single Study Group:

CITEL supports the consolidation of SG9 and SG16 into new Study Group C, “Technologies for multimedia, content delivery and cable television,” as already agreed by TSAG.

# 5 Clear and consistent terminology in SG mandates

ITU-T is responsible for developing international standards for telecommunication/ICTs. Within its mandates, SG5, SG16 and SG20 include the term “digital technologies”, which can lead to confusion because numerous digital technologies exist beyond the realm of ICTs. ICTs in essence, denote technologies that facilitate the handling and exchange of information through diverse communication methods. While many analog and digital technologies do fall within this category, there are also analog and digital technologies that serve purposes outside of communication and information handling and therefore would not be considered ICTs.

It is advisable to refrain from using the term “digital technologies” within the mandates of the SGs, opting instead for terms like “telecommunication/ICTs” or simply ICTs.

# 6 Clarifying the concept of a “lead Study Group”

While the concept of Lead Study Groups has been a longstanding practice, practical experiences have unveiled challenges in effectively leading the collaborative effort, especially since the work is based on contributions.

Notably, the operational dynamics of each Study Group seem deeply rooted in their distinct work programs, which diminishes the relevance of the Lead Study Group concept. Currently, Study Groups typically define their leadership roles by outlining their respective programs of work. However, this redundancy often echoes the inherent mandates of the Study Groups, rendering the explicit reiteration unnecessary. For example, the mandate of SG17 is Security, and SG17 is also the Lead SG in security, which appears tautological. The situation is similar for SG2, SG3, SG11, and others.

Therefore, the concept of “Lead Study Groups” needs to be reassessed to enhance its effectiveness. The goal should be to establish a clear definition and to address how a Study Group designates itself as the Lead Study Group, as well as the implications of this designation. This examination could help mitigate the issues arising from certain Study Groups asserting exclusive leadership.

WTSA Resolution1 defines the concept of a Lead Study Group in clause 2.1.5. In essence, a Lead SG addresses standardization studies involving several SGs. The Lead SG is responsible for the study of the core Questions and coordinating the overall framework. It coordinates, assigns (in consultation with, and recognizing the mandates of, the relevant study groups), and prioritizes the studies to be carried out by the related SGs. It ensures the preparation of consistent and timely Recommendations, updates TSAG on progress and seeks TSAG’s advice for unresolved issues.