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| **Abstract:** | Through this document, the SCV requests advice from ITU-R SG 1 on HEMP- and PLT-related terms currently being defined by ITU-T SG5. |

At its 17 January 2024 meeting, ITU-T’s Standardization Committee for Vocabulary (SCV) addressed several definitions currently being developed by ITU-T SG5 (see [CCT/51](https://extranet.itu.int/rsg-meetings/ccv/Share/CCT%20meeting%202024-01-17%20(SCV%20only)/Input%20contributions/051e.docx)), and decided to request ITU-R SG 1 for their advice on the definitions given below related to high-altitude electromagnetic pulses (HEMP) and power line communication (PLC) versus power line telecommunication (PLT).

The third column shows comments provided by the CCT secretariat and the ITU-T SG5 vocabulary rapporteur, Mr. Haim Mazar.

| **Term** | **Definition presented in draft** | **Comments from CCT Secretariat (in black font) and from ITU-T SG5 Vocabulary rapporteur (in blue font)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **threat mitigation** | The preparations made to avoid threat. Note: In this Recommendation, the threat caused by a malfunction due to a vulnerability to high-altitude electromagnetic pulses (HEMP) or high-power electromagnetic (HPEM) emissions, or a lack of confidentiality due to an insufficient electromagnetic emanations security (EMSEC) are treated. The level of the threat mitigation of the equipment can be calculated from the threat level and the vulnerability level | Add a qualifier to differentiate the term from the same term as understood in other contexts such as that of ITU-T SG17. |
| **electromagnetic emanations security (EMSEC)** | Physical measures to keep confidentiality by prevention of signals emanated from a system, particularly blocking electromagnetic radiation. Note - In this Recommendation, EMSEC means only information leakage due to unintentional electromagnetic emission | Do you mean 'by preventing signals from emanating from a system' ?  The Note should go in a note in this Recommendation. |
| **vulnerability** | The possibility that the equipment is influenced and does not function correctly Note – In this Recommendation the term is used when equipment is exposed to HEMP or HPEM | Maybe specify what causes the influence?  Add a qualifier to differentiate the term from the same term as understood in other contexts such as that of ITU-T SG17.  Note should go as note in this Recommendation. |

The SCV would appreciate if ITU-R SG 1 would provide their advice on the terms and definitions listed above.
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