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| **Abstract:** | This LS/r proposes several possible compromise solutions from ITU-T Study Group 2 to advance WTSA Action Item 9, in lieu of the proposed joint correspondence group on IoT identification and NNAI (CG-Identification). |

ITU-T Study Group 2 thanks ITU-T Study Group 20 for the productive joint management team meeting on 24 July 2025, to discuss next steps and potential ways forward regarding WTSA Action 9 (*i.e.*, establishing a joint coordination or agreement mechanism between the study groups to determine a demarcation line for IoT identification and NNAI aspects).

SG2 agrees with the conclusion that it is untenable to maintain the status quo, *i.e*., SG20 supports a joint correspondence group on IoT identification and NNAI (CG-Identification), and SG2 does not (for the reasons explained in [SG2-LS4](https://www.itu.int/ifa/t/2025/ls/sg2/sp18-sg2-oLS-00004.docx)). A continued stalemate will reflect poorly on both Study Groups, if we’re unable to report positive progress to the next TSAG. Therefore, it is in the best interest of both Study Groups to instead consider creative compromise solutions to address WTSA Action Item 9.

SG2 has considered the various alternatives initially raised during the joint management team meeting and can confirm its support for any of the following options:

* **A series of three virtual joint meetings between Q1/2 and Q6/20**, in lieu of the proposed CG-Identification. (This was our initial compromise proposal, although we understand that SG20 did not agree with this.)
* **An initial virtual joint meeting between Q1/2 and Q6/20, followed by further consideration of the draft Terms of Reference (TORs) for a possible CG-Identification**. This initial meeting could kickstart the discussion, demonstrate whether a CG-Identification is needed to continue the conversation, and if so, help inform the development of tailored TORs. Moreover, this option could take advantage of lessons learned from the nascent Joint Correspondence Group on IoT security (between SG17 and SG20) and Joint Correspondence Group on trust (between SG13, SG17, and SG20), rather than simply replicating this model without an opportunity to first assess whether it has been successful.
* **An “exchange of experts”** whereby SG2 experts attend relevant SG20 meetings, and vice versa, to exchange information on each Study Group’s work on IOT identification that could lay the foundation for determining the demarcation line in WTSA Action 9. (During the joint management team meeting, it became clear there is currently a lack of understanding about each Study Group’s work; without a shared baseline understanding, however, it would be difficult to determine a demarcation line for the division of responsibilities, regardless of mechanism.)

We invite SG20 to reflect on these (or suggest other) compromise solutions. We hope that the back-to-back nature of the latest SG2 and SG20 meetings will allow us to conclude on this in short order and agree to a mechanism that we can report to the next TSAG.

We look forward to your positive reply, and to continued cooperation and coordination throughout the 2025-2028 Study Period.
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