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>> CHAIR: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome. And welcome to the Closing Plenary of Study Group 15. This is our first Study Group 15 meeting of the 2022‑2024 study period, and I'm honored to be chairing. My name is Glenn Parsons. I work for Ericsson Canada. And I must say that I found this first in‑person meeting, our first in‑person meeting in nearly three years has really shown the value of human interaction in reaching consensus. And while we have continued our work during the global pandemic and have successfully consented, a lot of work that was already in progress, I think that some of our questions have found some difficulties with some new work where there may have been differing views.

However, as I mentioned at the beginning, at that in‑person meeting, where you can have side conversations, whether they be at a coffee break or over a meal, that's where the real progress towards consensus can be made. I hope we can continue to meet despite the building project that I mentioned at the beginning, but we hope to mitigate that and we'll talk more about that later in our agenda. But before we get to the agenda, let me introduce the head table ‑‑ I introduced the head table at the opening plenary, but there are additional faces here this time, so I'll just introduce the head table again, just to make sure that everyone knows who we are.

And I'll start on my left. We have Vice Chairman from the Central African Republic. Welcome. Next to him, we have Mr. Sadipta Bomak, a Vice Chairman from India. Next we have Mr. Tom Starr, who is our Working Party 1 Chair. And next to him, we have Mr. Malcolm Betts, our Working Party 3 Chair. Now on the right, we have Mr. Taesik Cheung from Korea, who is our Vice Chair. And then we have Mr. Paul Doolan, who is our Working Party 2 Vice Chairman, but he'll be acting as the Chair to make the reports for this meeting, as the Chair is remote for this meeting. And then, of course, we have our Study Group 15 advisor, Mr. Hiroshi Ota. So, thank you, everyone, for being here in person.

There are a number of our Vice Chairs who are attending remotely. I haven't checked to see if they're all online, but of course, we have Mr. Fatai Zhang, Mr. Mohammed Ben Zhang, Mr. Manuel Nastri, Mr. Tom Hoover as well as Study Group 15 Vice Chairs. So, that's an introduction of your leadership.

Let's continue with our agenda that is showing now in TD2 of plenary. There is a minor update that will be shown in TD1. I'll point out that to you in a minute, a little typo that I made. And this TD is an update of TD1, which was the original opening plenary agenda. We've done a few things. I've added this table of references for the reports of the working party. So, there's five reports. So, each of the working party reports are broken into five TD plens, and you'll see the numbers there, so you can pay attention to that. We'll ask each of the working party chairs to go through their reports in order and we'll make the approvals as we go. And so, that's what we have there.

There's also the ‑‑ so, without ‑‑ I mean, throughout section 13 and 13.1, 2, and 3, and so, this will all be covered as we do the reports. But I will do the 13.1 and 2 first. So, but then, if we scroll down, Hiroshi, we'll notice as well that I have crossed out items 14 and 15, as there are no items under that, although I think there is a mistake, though. I think we do have an item for TAP, though, don't we? Oh, okay, that's determination, right. So, there's nothing from determination for approval here at this meeting, so that's right. So, 14 and 15, there's nothing for that, right. So, we have the determination, but we have no approval for those, right. Right.

Okay. And so, then, in the other addition here to the agenda is in 16, 17, and 18. I have itemized some additional items under there and added the TD numbers so you have some clarity as to what we'll be doing after the reports as well. And so, Hiroshi's showing the change that we have, which is in 18.1, the draft Study Group 15 report is in TD49 of plenary. So, that is the agenda. Are there any comments, ladies and gentlemen, on the agenda before we proceed? Okay, thank you. Seeing none, we'll take this as the agenda that's agreed to, to proceed.

Okay, I'll recognize ‑‑

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a new sort of thing, but there is captioning going on. The link put on the SG15 web page contained a typo. So, I'd like to show ‑‑ this is the link which is shown on the web page, but there is a typo. You may see "TSG," but it should have been "TSB." So, just typing, retyping one letter, I believe, it should ‑‑ all right, yes. It works. So, you can follow from the link on the SG15 web page, retyping one letter. Then you can follow the realtime captioning. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much for that information, Hiroshi. I wonder if someone could put that in the chat as well for those following remotely. But anyway, thank you for that information so that we can follow the captioning. So, let's proceed then back to the agenda.

Okay. So, before we get to the Reports of the Working Parties, the first one, 13.1, matters for resolution at Study Group level. I'm not aware of any matters. Mm‑hmm, yes. And so, then I'll proceed to 13.2, which is the intellectual property rights inquiry. And so, as is indicated in Recommendation A. 1 ‑‑ of course, ITU has a common patent policy with ISO and IEC, and patent statement and licensing declarations that are relevant to the recommendations for decision at this meeting, and that had been received prior to the Study Group 15 meeting, are already listed in the ITU‑T patent database in the ITU‑T website. So, for this closing plenary, as chair, I will make the following inquiry. Does anyone have knowledge of patents or software copy rights, the use of which may be required to implement the recommendations that are being considered, which have not already been recorded in the IPR database?

I don't see anyone raising their hand and making that indication, so I'll thank you. We'll note that. And in addition, I'll confirm with TSB that there have been no patent and licensing declarations that have been received that would prevent the approval of any recommendations proposed for decision. Is that correct?

>> Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, yes. TSB hasn't received any of the patent or software declaration which would prevent approval of any of the candidate text for this meeting. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. So then, we'll note that. Then let's proceed then with the presentation of the reports. We'll start with Working Party 1, and I'll invite the Working Party 1 Chair to introduce your report for Working Party 1 in TD50 of plenary.

>> Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, TD50 of Plen. I'll wait for it to be projected. It contains the Working Party 1 report. We had a very productive meeting the past two weeks. I wish to thank all of the delegates for their good work. So, I'll just give a very brief summary here. Working Party 1 met for one day, updating the Access Network Transport Standards Overview and Work Plan documents. The Home Network Transport Standards Overview and Work Plan document was revised and the list of certification and interoperability activities for working party 1 recommendations was updated.

On question 2, met for five days, working on passive optical networks, preparing six texts for consent and one supplement for agreement. Question 2 requests the appointment of Mark Labach as liaison rapporteur for the FSAN group. And Question 2 held a special dinner to celebrate its 25th anniversary this week.

Question 3 met for three days, working on G.HN, fiber and the premises and home networking support for IoT. Board direct recommendations were prepared for consent. One predetermination, one draft supplement for agreement, and one technical paper for agreement.

Question 4 was scheduled for three days, working on access via metallic conductors. Four text were prepared for consent. Eric resigned with the rapporteur taking over that role with thanks expressed from Q4/15 for Eric's good work.

Question 4 also celebrated its 25th anniversary. That was back in April. That completes the summary of the Working Party 1 report. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Starr, for that. Do we have any comments/questions on the Working Party 1 report? Thank you. I'm not seeing any.

So there was one action in there, which was the appointment of a new liaison rapporteur. We'll take that up under Item 16.5, where we have an updated list of liaison rapporteurs to approve, so we'll do that later in the agenda. So, there's nothing in particular, in addition to approve here, but we'll ‑‑ if there's nothing further, then we'll accept this as the report from Working Party 1, unless there are any comments. Okay. It's so accepted.

So, let's move on, then, to the next, which are the text for determination consent agreement and approval in TD51 of Plenary. So, Mr. Starr, please.

>> Tom Starr: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. TD51 shows our texts from Working Party 1. Nothing in particular to note here, just to thank all of the rapporteurs and delegates for a very productive meeting, and we can just proceed to review each one. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. So, then let's proceed to the approvals here. I guess that's a typo in the first one there for AAP approval where there's TDXXX. I guess that's not supposed to be there, so. Okay. That's fine. So, I guess we'll scroll down. So, there's nothing for TAP approval, nothing for AAP approval, despite there's a ‑‑ okay. So, and then we'll proceed with the recommendations for determination. And so, the first one is G.9901 Amendment 1, which is narrowband orthogonal frequency division multiplexing for communication tranceivers ‑‑ power spectral density specification for TD1. Any comments on this? Any objections for approving this for determination? Seeing none, so approved.

So, next is the recommendations proposed for consent. So, the first one is G.9903 Amendment 2. This one is in TD8R1, and the A.5 is in TD110 of Plenary. Now, I'll note, this particular A.5 was posted yesterday around, I guess in the afternoon, 3:00.

>> HIROSHI OTA: 3:00, yes.

>> CHAIR: And so, that was one day before. But if any member would like additional time to review that, we can take this later in the agenda. Otherwise, we can proceed now. So, was there ‑‑ is there anyone who would like to request that we take more time? Come back to this one later in our agenda? I'm not seeing any. So, then, we can proceed.

So, with the consent of G.9903 Amendment 2, can we agree the consent of this recommendation? Not seeing any comment, so it's so contented.

Next is G.9903 Core Agenda 1. The text is in TD9 Revision 1 of Plenary. Are there any comments on this one? Can we agree to the consent of this core agenda? So agreed.

Next is G.9901 Core Addendum 1. This text is in TD11R1 of Plenary. Are there any comments on this text? Can we agree to this text for consent? So agreed.

Next is G.9802.1 Amendment 1. The text for WDM PON is in TD22R1 of Plenary. Any comments on this? Can we agree to consent this amendment? So agreed.

Next is G.997.2 Core Agenda 2. The text is in TD33R1 of Plenary. Any comments on this document? Can we agree to consent this core agenda? So agreed.

The next one is G.997.3 Cor 1. Text is in TD34 Revision 1 of Plenary. Are there any comments on this document? Can we agree to consent this core agenda? So agreed.

Next is G.9711 Cor 1. The text is in TD71 Revision 1 of Plenary. Are there any comments on this document? Being none, can we agree to consent this core agenda? So agreed.

Next is G.9804.2 Amendment 1. The text is in TD73R1 of Plenary. Are there any comments on this new amendment? Can we agree to consent this amendment? So agreed.

The next one is G.987.2. And this is a revision of that recommendation. The text is in TD76 Revision 1 of Plenary. Are there any comments on XG‑PON? Can we agree to consent this revision? So agreed.

Next is G.9807.1. This is another revision. The text is in TD77R1 of Plenary. Can we agree to consent this revision? So agreed.

The next is G.988. Another revision here. The text is in TD78R1 of Plenary. Can we agree to consent to this document? Seeing no comments, so agreed.

The next is G.9701 Cor 3. The text is in TD79 Revision 1. Any comments to this core agenda? Can we agree to this corrigendum for consent? So agreed.

Next is G.9804.3 Amendment 1. The text is in TD86R1 of Plenary. Are there any comments on the 50 gig PON text? Seeing none, can we agree to consent? So agreed. And then the last one in this list is G.9962 Amendment 2. The text is in TD87R1 of Plenary. Can we agree this for consent? Okay. So agreed. Thank you.

So, next, we have several texts proposed for agreement. So, these are informational documents. So, the first one is a revision of G.sup45 on optical access systems power conservation. The text is in TD23R1 of Plenary. Are there any comments on this text? Can we agree to this text? So agreed.

The next is G.supFTTR4B. So, that will be the name of it? It won't be a number?

>> HIROSHI OTA: Yes, there will be a number.

>> CHAIR: There will be a number. That's just a temporary name. It will have the next number in the series, okay, which we will assign once we agree. Okay. And so, this is for Fibre‑to‑the Room for Small Business, in TD72R1 of Plenary. Any comments on this one? Can we agree this text? So agreed.

The final one in this seis is a technical paper, which is the Operation of G.hn over access and inpremises phone lines. The text is in TD88R1 of Plenary. Any comments on this text? Can we agree this text? So agreed.

Okay. So, next, we have texts for review. Is that for review or for our approval?

>> HIROSHI OTA: It's approval.

>> CHAIR: So, we're going to cover that under 16.1 under Promotion and Coordination. Is that how you'd prefer to do that? And then ‑‑ or we can approve them here, if ‑‑

>> That's fine.

>> CHAIR: Maybe I'll recognize Jean Marie and you can ‑‑

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. These are non‑normative text. It is the text from Question 1. It's HNT standards overview and work plan and ANT standards overview and work plan. And usually, we approve them during the session of Working Party 1, in the Plenary. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, yes.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Well, that's fine, then. We can approve them here. So, we have the revised work plans for home networking technologies in TD68R1 of Plenary, and then there is the access network technologies overview and work plan in TD66 of Plenary and TD67R1 of Plenary. Are there any comments to the revisions of these documents? Seeing none, can we approve these revisions of these non‑normative texts? Okay, thank you. So approved.

And I see there's no recommendations for deletion. Is that the ‑‑ I believe that's it, Hiroshi. Is that correct?

>> HIROSHI OTA: Yes.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Okay. Thank you very much. So, Tom, if you could continue with, I guess TD52 is next, on the status of recommendations in Working Party 1, please.

>> TOM STARR: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, TD52 of Plen has the working party 1 work programme, which I thank Mr. Horsley, the Vice Chair, for taking on the task of preparing this, as well as the liaisons. So, this was reviewed and provided for approval here. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. And so, if we can scroll through this, the revised work plan. So, these are the updates to the work plan. I don't think we need to go through them one by one. I think we can review all of them. Unless there are ‑‑ but perhaps we should review the new work items on the end. So, let's just scroll through the revisions to the work items. So, there's quite a few here.

So, before we get to the annexes on the new work items, does anyone have any comments on the revised work plan in the status of recommendations?

>> HIROSHI OTA: Includes the appointment of editors.

>> CHAIR: Just to note here, this includes the appointment of editors, or deletion of editors, as the case may be, as is indicated here in the final column. For all of these. Are there any comments on this revised work plan for Working Party 1 or any of the editors that have been proposed for appointment? Not seeing any, so this is agreed.

Now let's look at the proposed new work. So, the first one is, this is A.1 justification for a new recommendation for G.989.3 Amendment 1. And you see the scope and summary here and the supporting members. Are there any comments on this? Can we agree to start this new work? Any comments? So, we can agree that.

So, the next one is justification on proposed new Amendment 1 to G.9805, with the scope showing here. If you'll scroll down. And here is the summary that's indicated here and the supporting members. Any comments on this? Can we agree to start this new work item? Yes, we can.

And so, is there any more here?

So, the next one, this is an A.13 justification for a proposed new supplement on ‑‑ a supplement to the G‑series on point to multipoint access optical system requirements and transmission technologies above 50 gigabits. The purpose and scope shown here and the summary here. And then, if you scroll down, we'll look at the supporting members. Any comments on this proposed new work item? Can we agree to start this new work? Thank you.

And then, that's it? Okay. Thank you very much. So, that is the conclusion of the Status of Recommendations. And so, next is Liaison Statements, then, in TD53 of Plenary.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, TD53 was prepared with the kind assistance of Ian Horsley, Vice Chair, contains seven proposed liaisons. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. So, we have a number of liaisons here to approve. So, let's proceed through them here. So, the first one is ‑‑ well, how many are ‑‑ there's seven liaisons, okay. And they're summarized here. So, let's just start in the annexes and we'll go through them that way and approve them.

So, the first one in Annex 1 is Liaison to a number of different organizations, so let's scroll down a little bit here to Study Group 15 6802.3, MoCA. And if you scroll down, we'll see the text here. That's providing some information on the work plans, the standardization work plans that we just approved and sending them for information and comment. Any comment on this liaison text? Can we agree this? Thank you.

So, the next one is number 2. So, this is the new version of the Access Network Standards overview and work plan, again, to multiple bodies, including study groups, ETSI, IEEE, Broadband Forum. And if you scroll down, we can see the information on the access networks overview and the standardization work plan and the link to the documentation that's also available on the standards landscape on the web page that you see here.

And scroll down. I guess it's looking for comments and input as well. Any comments on this liaison? Can we agree this liaison? Thank you.

The next one is on the HNT overview and work plan. Again, to a number of organizations that are listed here, providing ‑‑ if you scroll down ‑‑ providing the link to where that is and seeking comments and input. Any questions or comments on this liaison? Can we agree this? So approved.

And so, the next one is a liaison on conformance and interoperability testing for Study Group 11. And so, if we scroll down a little bit here, we'll see that this is to update them on our activities that are carried out in other organizations on this aspect, and we have provided an updated list. I presume we're going to attach that? It doesn't say "please attach," but they will be attached in the ‑‑ okay. Okay. Thank you. Any comments on this liaison? Okay. Then can we agree this? So agreed.

Next one is a liaison on the new version of the ANT and HNT Standards Overviews and Work Plans. Oh, scroll down. Oh, this is specifically for Study Group D, okay. So, scroll down. This is to make Study Group 20, as well as the ITU‑D Study Groups 1 and 2 aware of this work, and so we have some information and background indicated here so that they can be aware of this activity and that we can cooperate with them on topics in this area.

So, any comments on this liaison? Can we approve this liaison? So approved.

So, the next one is Liaison to the 802.3 Working Group on 100‑gigabit bidi. And so, if we scroll up on the details here. So, there are some specifics here on G.9806, and this is going to be sending them the latest draft of that, draft recommendations. And that's the latest draft of Amendment 3. So, just for my clarification, this was not ‑‑ was this consented? Do we just consent this one, or this was not consented, I don't think. This is just a draft that will be consented in the future and we're seeking their input.

>> That is correct.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. Okay, thank you for that clarification. And so, the intent is to attach TD14 of Working Party 1, which is the current draft of that text. Okay. Any comments on this proposed liaison? Can we agree to send this liaison? So agreed. Thank you.

And so, if we move on then to the next one. This is liaison to the ETSI ISG F5G on use cases. So, if we scroll up a bit here, Hiroshi, to the text here. This is a reply on, I guess on their liaison on use cases. And we'll be attaching our document, which is specific use cases. So, just for clarification, is this the one we just approved to be a new supplement, this particular one here? Or is this a different one?

>> Yes, yes, this is ‑‑

>> CHAIR: This is the one that we just approved, that we just agreed as a supplement. Is that ‑‑ (off microphone).

>> CHAIR: Okay. So, just a clarification here, would we attach the TD Plen or would we attach the supplement? I mean, either way is fine, but ‑‑

>> HIROSHI OTA: For the sake of time, I think TD's better.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So, we'll just attach the TD here. Okay. Should we indicate that it's going to be a supplement? Is that relevant, do we think, or?

>> (Off microphone) supplement...

>> TD shows supplement ‑‑

>> CHAIR: Right. So, the TD itself says it's a supplement, a draft supplement. Okay, all right. Well, then that's probably sufficient. And for timewise, we can just proceed this way. That's right, okay. So, publication takes some time. And so, okay, so, we can proceed in this manner, unless there are any further comments? Okay. Can we agree this liaison? So agreed. Thank you. So, let's move ‑‑ or is that the last one?

>> Yes.

>> CHAIR: Okay. That was the last liaison from Working Party 1. Thank you very much. Mr. Starr, if you could tell us about your interim meeting plans in TD54.

>> TOM STARR: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. TD54 of Plen is our interim meetings. You'll see that Question 3 plans to hold one face‑to‑face meeting on 31 of January and then following is several virtual meetings from a Question 3, Question 4, and Question 2. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Starr. Maybe you could clarify. So, some are indicated as confirmed and some as proposed. Maybe you could clarify. You do not wish to confirm the proposed ones at this time? I see two Question 2 ones that are indicated as proposed. Maybe you could clarify that, please.

>> TOM STARR: Yes, thank you. Yeah, all of them are confirmed except for the last two, and I think those are just, sort of we're waiting to see how things develop, if we need them. We will confirm those when it's evident that those will be needed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Okay, thank you. So, we'll need to confirm those at the appropriate time in advance of the meeting through our normal process at that time. Okay. Then that's fine. Okay, so, noting that, thank you very much. Can we then confirm these proposed interim meetings for Working Party 1, both in person and these virtual ones? So, just the ones listed as "C" we're confirming here. Any objections to confirming these? Okay. So agreed. Thank you very much, Mr. Starr. And thank you to Working Party 1 and the rapporteurs and all the delegates for their excellent work in progressing your work and recommendations here at this meeting. So, thank you very much.

So, let's move on, then, to Working Party 2. The main report of Working Party 2 is in TD55 of Plenary. So, I would ask Mr. Doolan, who is the Vice Chair, since he's here in person, to present to this report on behalf of Working Party 2.

>> Paul Doolan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Working Party 2 met here in Geneva under the chairmanship of Mr. Noriyuki Araki assisted by myself. And this lists the main objectives, but more specifically, we came to Geneva, to this Plenary, with two documents proposed for consent and two for agreement. And I'm pleased to report that the closing plenary of Working Party 2 chose to send them here to this Study Group for consent and agreement. All of the questions met during the plenary meeting under the guidance of Nakajima of Japan and (?) of Corning, USA, worked on characteristics and test methods of optical fibers and cables and guidance on their installation. They agreed to forward new recommendation L.109.1, and that's ex L.oehc, which deals with cables for access points for consent. That work was conducted in cooperation with SC 86B. Q5 also agreed on a new report for space multiplexing transmission and that's come here for consent. It was mentioned during our closing plenary, and so I'll repeat it here, that this is an industry first. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first document from a standards body dealing with this topic ‑‑ space division multiplexing, and it's an important tool to increase transmission capacity. We hope the working party 2 and Study Group 15 can derive some publicity from this. And Mr. Ferretti will present on this as part of the Study Group 15 presentation next year.

There is a joint liaison from Q5 and Q7 being sent, part of ongoing alignment and harmonization between our two organizations on essentially joint works. Q5 will have no interim meetings, but they are going to have three correspondence activities. The revision of G650.1, a revision of G.654, and they intend to prepare an A.1 justification for revision to G.657 during correspondence.

Moving on to Q6. Q6 met under the guidance of rapporteur Mr. Fabio Cavaliere, an associate rapporteur Bernd Teichmann and made progress on of the recommendations and have new drafts as TDs of working party 2. They agreed to a new work item on 100‑gig per lane application code in G.959.1. That's in the updated work plan and there's an A.1 for it there, as required. Provisional optical parameters were defined for GOWDM, and GOWDM2 and they'll complete that material by correspondence. A provisional list of requirements for point and multipoint systems, there were three contributions on that. So, Q6 can evaluate. It will occur by ‑‑ it was actually done during the meeting and there will be a correspondence activity to progress that work with the intent of establishing whether we can create a work item for it. That work's done in collaboration with Q2 and there's a joint statement from the rapporteurs of Q2 and Q6 in TD 80 of GEN about that work.

Q6 intends to hold an interim rapporteur group meeting here in Geneva in February, face‑to‑face. The highest priority items are the 25‑gig application codes in 698.1, 698.2 and 698.4, all focused on the needs of 5‑gig mobile access applications.

Moving on to Q7. Q7 met under the leadership of the rapporteur Chihiro Kito of NTT, Japan, and associate rapporteur Xionng Zhuang to work on the maintenance of optical and physical infrastructures. The main objectives of Q7 were the consent of L.ncip, and that's now L.210, requirements for passive nodes, optical wall outlets and extender boxes. They also agreed a revision of LSTPGLSR, guide on the use of the ITU‑T L‑series recommendations related to optical technologies for outside plant. And both of those documents are before us today. So, Q7 completed its task.

As I mentioned earlier, there's a joint liaison from Q7 and Q5, consent to IEC, C.86B. Q7 also agreed to do a revision of Recommendation L.312, L.68, and A.1 is in the updated work programme. That's concerned with optical fiber maintenance and support monitoring and testing systems for systems that are carrying high total optical power.

Q7 will have a correspondence discussion to make progress on revisions to L.250, L.430 and L.312. They intend also to prepare an A.1 justification for new work items, but access network design with preconnect drive solutions. They're going to do that during correspondence. And they also intend to make a draft questionnaire about optical infrastructure sharing. That last item came out of an interesting contribution we entertained from Rwanda in this meeting.

Moving on to Q8. Q8 met under the guidance of Ait Sab of ASN France and worked on optical cable systems and made progress for revision of G.sup41 and prepared A. 1 justifications for 971, 972, 976 and G.978. They also discussed and made progress on new recommendations ‑‑ G.dsssc, so that's dedicated scientific sensing submarine cable systems ‑‑ and G.smart, scientific monitoring telecommunications submarine systems. They don't intend to meet before the next plenary, but they have decided on a number of new correspondence activities to progress the G.sub41 and the two new recommendations I just mentioned, dsssc and G.smart.

I'd like to take this opportunity to thank the rapporteurs and delegates for the excellent work during this meeting and the TSB and staff for their help. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Doolan, for your report on Working Party 2. And are there any comments from anyone on this report? Not seeing any. So, can we accept and approve this report from Working Party 2 before we proceed to the rest of the documents? Seeing no comment, so that is approved. Thank you.

So, can we move then to the Text for Determination, consent and agreement and approval for Working Party 2 in TD56 of Plen? Mr. Doolan, please, could you introduce this before ‑‑ is there anything to introduce before I go through ‑‑

>> Paul Doolan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. No. I mentioned these in the introduction of the report. We have four documents here, two for consent, two for agreement. They're present as TDs of Plen.

>> CHAIR: Okay.

>> Paul Doolan: You can proceed.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. Let's proceed with these texts for consent. The first one we have is L.109.1. This is a new recommendation on Type II optical/electrical hybrid cables for access points and other terminal equipment. The text is in TD84 Revision 2 of Plenary. Any comments on this document? Can we approve this for consent? So approved.

The next one is L.210. This is requirements for passive optical nodes: Optical wall outlets with extender boxes. The text is in TD83 Revision 2 of Plenary. Can we agree this text for consent? No requests for the floor, so it's so approved for consent.

The next is text proposed for agreement. The first one ‑‑ so, I believe these are technical reports?

>> Yes.

>> CHAIR: These are both technical reports. And will they get numbers as well, or do they just get the names like this? Maybe, Hiroshi, you can clarify. Thank you.

>> HIROSHI OTA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The first one is technical report sdm. Second is a technical paper. LSTP means L‑series technical paper. And this publication will get an acronym, but not a number. And LSTP does a GLSR is already the acronym that we will use. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: And so the first one would be TR.sdm?

>> HIROSHI OTA: Allow be LSTR, dash, some acronym, including "sdm."

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you for that clarification on the naming of the technical report and technical paper. So, then, let any comments on the first one, which is the technical report on space division multiplexing. The text is in TD85 Revision 1 of Plenary. Any comments on this? Can we agree this new technical report? So agreed.

The next one is the technical paper on the guide on the use of the L‑series. The text is in TD25 Revision 2 of Plenary. Any comments on this? Can we agree this technical paper? So agreed. Thank you very much.

So, that concludes the texts for approval in Working Party 2. So, perhaps we can then proceed to the Status of Recommendations and Working Party 2 and TD57 of Plenary. Mr. Doolan, please.

>> Paul Doolan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, if you scroll down, Hiroshi. Okay. We have ‑‑ I think it's seven A.1s in the back of the document and the normal tables showing adjustments to the work plan, which are highlighted in yellow. I think I would propose that, as you did with Working Party 1, it's probably not appropriate to go through all of that detail but to look at the A.1s at your discretion. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. And thank you for zooming out. Again, noting in the right column, this indicates the editors as well, and whether editors have been changed, and the changes are noted in yellow. And so, you can see that with the additions and the cross‑outs of the new changes, new editors and such. If you scroll down, Hiroshi, we can see all these changes here. So, are there any comments before we move to the A.1 for the new work items on the status of recommendations and the editor changes as indicated? If not, we see that as approved.

So, let's move to the annexes here. And so, we have several A.1 justifications. The first one is for the proposed addition of application codes to G.959.1. And so, is this a revision or is this an amendment? I presume there's an ‑‑ I propose this is a revision ‑‑

>> That would be a revision, yeah.

>> CHAIR: Since it doesn't say amendment, the intention is this is a full revision to add these application codes. So, if you scroll down, we'll see the summary and the supporting members for this. Are there any comments on this A.1? Can we agree with this new work item? So agreed.

The next one is A.1 justification for revision to L.312/L.68. This is just for clarification ‑‑ is that one recommendation with two numbers in the L‑series?

>> Yes.

>> CHAIR: Okay.

>> HIROSHI OTA: They renumbered.

>> CHAIR: Maybe you can ‑‑ maybe, Hiroshi, you can clarify.

>> HIROSHI OTA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to clarify the meaning of this double numbering. This is a recommendation used to use the numbers sequentially, starting from the 10 or some other very small few years up to almost 100. But several years ago, Working Party 2 decided to reorganize the numbering according to their technical content. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So, then it retains an old number and a new number, is that it?

>> HIROSHI OTA: Yes. Officially, the new number is the official correct number, but for the sake of easy searching, we retain ‑‑ we added the old numbering so that, you know, people can find what is L.312 and so that we can understand it. This is a revision of L.68. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Very good. Thank you for that clarification. So, given that, if you can scroll down and let's look at the scope and the summary here as well as the supporting members. Are there any comments on this new work item? Can we approve this new work‑in? So approved. Thank you.

So, let's move to the next one, revision to G.971, general features of submarine cable systems. And if we scroll down, we can see the scope and the summary of this proposed revision here, as well as the supporting members and liaisons with other groups in IEC. Any comments on this? Can we approve this revision? So approved.

So, let's move to the next one. This is A.1 justification for revision of G.972. Again, this is for terms for optical submarine cables. And we see the summary and the scope here and the list of supporting members, liaison with IEC. Any comments on this one? Seeing none, can we approve this new work item? So approved.

So, the next one is a revision to G.976, which is test methods for optical fibre submarine cables. We see the scope here as well as the summary. Liaison with IEC and then supporting members. Any comments on this? Ladies and gentlemen. Seeing none, can we approve this new work item? So approved.

The next one is the A.1 justification for proposed revision to G.978. Characteristics of optical fibre submarine cables. Scope and summary shown here. With the liaisons and supporting members. Any comments, ladies and gentlemen? Any objections to approving? So approved. And I believe that's it. Thank you very much. So, that concludes the Status of Recommendations.

So, if we could move now to the Liaison Statements proposed from Working Party 2 in TD58 of Plenary. Mr. Doolan, please.

>> Paul Doolan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Can you scroll down, please, Hiroshi? So, we have two. You see them there. They're reply liaisons to IEC in both cases, and you can see the text below in Annex A and Annex B.

First of the two is the joint liaison from 5 and 7 that I mentioned introducing the report. The second one is from Question 8.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. So, let's continue with approving these, then. So, first one, as noted, is for information to IEC. The two different SCs in IEC. And this is providing information. Scroll down to the attachments that are ‑‑ what are we attaching?

>> Paul Doolan: If I may, Mr. Chairman. It appears that we sent a liaison to this organization in the last study period, and somehow, somewhere, the attachment that was forwarded at that time got lost, and this is simply resending it for their convenience.

>> CHAIR: But could you clarify, what is the attachment? Is it a draft recommendation? Is it a work plan? Can someone clarify what is in ‑‑ this is TD33 ‑‑ this is from the last study period, right?

>> Paul Doolan: Mr. Nakajima appears to want to convene to help.

>> Nakajima: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This document includes a draft for L.991 (?) that was approved during this meeting. Thank you.

>> Paul Doolan: That's the document we've just approved here, we've just consented.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So, this is the document we've just consented in this meeting. So, should ‑‑ is the one we consented in this meeting a new text compared to this text, and should we send the new text, or are they the same?

>> Paul Doolan: We have two ‑‑

>> CHAIR: Mr. Nakajima.

>> Nakajima: The original draft included a description for the optical and hybrid connector and the request is partial initial proposal on this topic. So, we attached all documents. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Very good. Thank you for the clarification. So, that's sufficient. Thank you. So, are there any further comments on this proposed liaison? Okay. Can we approve this liaison, then, to IEC? So approved.

The next one, then, is another liaison to IEC. This one is on the scientific monitoring. If you can scroll up. This is a response to them. Okay, so, in this particular case, we're attaching contributions. Maybe you could explain why we're attaching contributions as opposed to a TD, a draft text. Mr. Doolan, please.

>> Paul Doolan: Thank you. I don't see the rapporteur for Q8 here, but Nakajima‑san?

>> CHAIR: Mr. Nakajima, please.

>> Nakajima: These contributions provide the initial draft for new sensing recommendations. So, as I replied to IEC, we'd like to share what we are discussing now, by sharing to these two contributions. That is our main purpose of this liaison. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Yeah, okay. So, I think it would be appropriate to amend this liaison to indicate that we've approved a new work item on this topic. It was because, in this liaison, there's no text to introduce the attachments. So, there should be some short text to introduce the attachments, or for example, a new work item has been approved, the attached are contributions to that new work item for your information, something to that effect.

>> I'll do that.

>> CHAIR: So, we can agree this, based on the addition of what I just suggested, or you can go make the update and we can come back.

>> (Off microphone).

>> CHAIR: Okay. So, let's hold this one until after coffee, and we can do an update of this liaison and we can review that when we come back with that minor addition, I think. Yes, that's a minor clarification. So, if we can do that in an R1 and then we can approve that after coffee. Okay.

So, then, let's continue. That was the last liaison statement, though, right? Yes. So, let's continue with TD59, which are the interim meetings for Working Party 2. Mr. Doolan, please.

>> Paul Doolan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This should be brief because there's only one, right? It's the Q6 meeting that's scheduled for 13th to the 16th of February. It's confirmed. And the list of the ‑‑ the terms of reference are listed there under Topics. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much for this one proposed interim meeting for Q6. Can we agree this interim meeting? Seeing no comments, so it's so agreed. So, thank you very much, Mr. Doolan. And so, we'll come back to a revision of TD58 after coffee break to finalize that liaison.

>> Paul Doolan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. So, we still have some time before coffee, so do you think we can start, Mr. Betts, with perhaps just the main report and do an introduction of that? And maybe we can do that before we break for coffee. Mr. Betts, please. And TD60 of Plen.

>> Malcolm Betts: According to the clock on the left, I have six minutes to introduce the document?

>> CHAIR: Yes. That should be fine.

>> Malcolm Betts: So, we met under my chairmanship. I was assisted by Mr. Tom Huber of Nokia USA. If you could scroll down a little, please. Thank you. We had a number of joint meetings, which are described in detail in the report below. One thing ‑‑ yeah. So, if you could maybe go down a little further to the Question 10 report. The Question 10's responsible for packet transport networks. We have one draft amendment for consent in Plen for July. We noticed that the abbreviation MCC is used extensively. In most cases, it's management communication channel. In a few cases, it's maintenance communication channel. We decided to align the abbreviations. This has resulted in a number of corrigenda and implementers guides. We decided to use corrigenda when we're not anticipating a revision to the recommendation in the future. We have implementer's guide to the cases we're expecting a revision or amendment next year. I think that's covered the main points for Question 10.

Question 11 had a very busy and extremely productive meeting. We've agreed a direction forward for the evolution of OTN beyond 400 gigs, specifically, the agreements on what we will be doing for 800 gigs.

The other thing we've agreed to do in Question 11 is to update the OTN handbook. As I hope everyone in this room knows, OTN provides the backbone for transport networks globally, and the handbook was last issued in 2010. So, it's time that we updated it, and we will update that as a technical paper.

The other major achievement in Question 11 was to finally break the logjam we've had on addressing sub1G, and we have two new work items on that topic that we are going to be moving forward with.

Moving on to Question 12. They're continuing to work closely with Question 14 on the management control. We've consented ‑‑ we're proposing for consent an amendment to G.7703, which is describing ASON, automatically switched optical networks. It really is time for a coffee break.

We're also continuing with work on 7701, which is the common aspects of management control and 7702, which is targeted at SDN.

Question 13 have been, as usual, extremely busy, continuing to refine the recommendations on precision time distribution across the network, and they have proposed a large number of recommendations for consent and a significant number of new work items to continue the evolution of this important work.

Question 13, working in close cooperation with IEEE 1598, and they've also started liaison relationship with a new project in IEEE on the security for synchronization distribution.

Moving down to Question 14, which is focusing on the management aspects. Continuing to work to develop the management recommendations. And Question 14 is continuing in its role as the focal point for coordination across a number of bodies, and we'll be seeing a liaison starting up the usual series of e‑meetings to facilitate that coordination.

Before I close, I would like to thank all of the rapporteurs and editors for their hard work. I'd particularly like to thank all of the delegates who made the effort to come to Geneva, in particular those from China who have some early onerous travel requirements particularly to return home. Their participation was really essential in terms of moving our work forward. As Mr. Parsons indicated, we've been running on the momentum of things we have had agreements on, but that was somewhat declining, and we're having difficulty getting new work items started. And I think you'll see in the number of new work items we're proposing, that is fairly evident. So, that concludes the presentation of the Working Party 3 report, and I will note that by the clock on the left, it is now exactly coffee break. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Betts. I was confident that you could make it before coffee. So, are there any comments before we approve the Working Party 3 report? Seeing no comments. Thank you very much. And so, we'll approve the Working Party 3 report. And we'll come back to the rest of the Working Party 3 documents after coffee break. So, we'll take a break now until quarter past the hour, is what we would normally do. So, we'll resume at 11:15 Geneva time. Thank you very much.

(SG15 will return after coffee break)

>> CHAIR: Okay, ladies and gentlemen, let's continue with our Closing Plenary for Study Group 15. We're still waiting for the revision for TD58 to be posted for Working Party 2, so we'll come back to that after we finish Working Party 3. So, let's continue with Working Party 3 documents. And we'll continue with the text for determination, consent, agreement, approval, and deletion, as well. So, that's in TD61 of Plenary. So, Mr. Betts, could you introduce TD61, please?

>> MALCOLM BETTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll just wait a amendment for it to appear. This is a fairly long list, so just a little background. There is a number of corrigenda and implementer's guide originated by Question 10 to clean up the MCC issue, and we're also proposing the deletion of a supplement, Y.sup4, which was published in 2008 and has not been revised since, and A.13 states that if a supplement hasn't been revised in eight years, the responsible study group should consider either a revision or deletion. We're proposing a deletion of that supplement. So, maybe we should just go through one by one. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Betts. So, let's review and go through these documents, then, for consent, agreement, approval, and so on.

So, let's start with this ‑‑ there's no table above. Oh that was the determination. Is that ‑‑ okay. And approval. So, there's nothing for approval or determination, so let's start with the documents for consent. So, the first is G.8121.1/Y1381.1, corrigendum 1. And the text is in TD107 of Plenary. Any comments on this? Can we agree this corrigendum for consent? So agreed.

So, the next one is G.8121.2/Y ‑‑ that's Y dot ‑‑ those are both Y.1381.2, Corrigendum 1. Text is in TD108 of Plen. Any comments on this one? Can we agree this for consent? Thank you.

The next one is G.709 Corrigenda 2. The text is in TD32 Revision 1 of Plenary. Any comments? Can we agree this one for consent? So agreed.

The next one is G.709.1 Amendment 3. The text is in TD81 Revision 1 of Plenary. Any comments on this one? Can we agree this text for consent? So agreed.

The next one is G.709.3 Amendment 1. The text is in TD82 Revision 1 of Plenary. Any comments on this one? Can we agree this text for consent? So agreed.

The next is G.806 Amendment 1. The text is in TD7R1 of Plenary. Can we agree this text for consent? This is agreed for consent.

The next is G.8321. The text is in TD6 Revision 1 of Plenary, and the A.5 justification for references is in TD102 of Plenary. This is the MTN equipment recommendation. Any comment on this? Can we agree consent? So agreed.

The next one is G.7703 Amendment 1. The text is in TD16 Revision 1 of Plenary. Can we agree this amendment for consent? So agreed.

The next one is G.781 Amendment 1. Text is in TD4 Revision 1 of Plenary with the A.5 in TD98 of Plenary. Can we agree this amendment for consent? So agreed.

The next one is G.781.1 Amendment 1 with the text in TD3R1. Can we agree this new amendment for consent? So agreed.

The next is G.8251. This is a revision that's in TD5 Revision 1 of Plenary with the A.5 in TD97 of Plenary. Can we agree this revision for consent? So agreed.

The next is a G.8260. This revision text is in TD19 Revision 2, and the A.5 justification is in TD91 of Plenary. Can we agree this revision for consent? So agreed.

The next is G.8262.1/Y.1362.1 with the text in TD12R1 of Plenary and the A.5 justification in TD93 of Plenary. Can we agree this text for consent? So agreed.

The next one is G.8265.1 with the text in TD80 Revision 1 of Plenary. Can we agree this revision for consent? So agreed.

The next is G.8271.1/Y.1366.1. This revision is in TD20 Revision 1, with the A. 5 justification in TD94 of Plenary. Can we agree this revision? Thank you. So agreed.

The next one is G.8271.2/Y.1366.2 Amendment 1. The text is in TD21RS of Plenary and the A.5 is in TD95 of Plenary. Can we agree this? Amendment for consent? So agreed.

So, the next one has an asterisk, and maybe you can remind me what the asterisk is for. Is it to indicate maybe, Mr. Betts, you can clarify?

>> MALCOLM BETTS: Yes. It's requesting a hold for 30 days for editing before we initiate AAP. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. That's noted. So, noting that, can we ‑‑ so, this is G.8272/Y.1367. Text is in TD18R1. And so, editing. So, presumably, there will be a part 2 with further editorial editing, is that the intent?

>> MALCOLM BETTS: Yes, if it's necessary, we will update R2. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. That's noted. And the A.5 is in TD99R1 of Plenary. Any comments on this, ladies and gentlemen? Okay. Then can we agree this one for consent? So agreed.

Next is G.8273.2/Y.1368.2, Amendment 2. The text is in TD13R1. Can we agree this for consent? So agreed.

The next is G.8273.4/Y.1368.4, Amendment 2, text in TD14R1. Can we agree this for consent? So agreed.

The next is G.8275/Y.1369, Amendment 3. Text is in TD74R1. Can we agree this for consent? Thank you.

The next is G. 8275.1/Y.1369.1, with the text in TD75R1. And the A.5 in TD90 of Plenary. Can we agree to consent this revision to G.8275.1? So agreed.

Revision G.8275.2/Y.1369.2. The text is in TD70R1. Can we agree this revision? So agreed.

The next is G.7710/Y.1701 Amendment 1. The text is in TD28R1 Plenary. Can we agree this new amendment? So agreed.

The next is a revision of G.7716. Text is in TD17R1. Can we agree this revision? To consent. So agreed.

The next is G.7718 Amendment 1. Text is in TD35 of Plenary. Can we agree this amendment for consent? So agreed.

Can we then look at G.7721 Amendment 1, with text in TD31R1, and the A.5 is in TD100 of Plenary. Can we agree this amendment for consent? So agreed.

Next is G.8052.1/Y.1346.1 Amendment 1. The text is in TD29R1 of Plenary. Can we agree this for consent? So agreed.

The next is G.8152.1/Y.1375.1, Amendment 1. This also has an asterisk, so again, to hold 30 days for editing. So, there may be an update to TD30R1 of Plenary. Any comments on this one, ladies and gentlemen? Can we agree this for consent? So agreed.

G.8152.2/Y.1375.2 Amendment 1 with the text in TD27R1 of Plenary, also given 30 days for editing, so this may be an R2. And the A.5 is in TD109 of Plenary. Any comments on this one? Can we agree this for consent? So agreed.

The next one is G.8350. So, this is the management for MTN, and the text is in TD26R1, and the A.5 justification in TD101. Can we agree this for consent? So agreed.

And the last one in the consent set is G.874 Amendment 1 with the text in TD24R1 of Plenary. Can we agree this for consent? So agreed. So, that concludes the set of documents for consent.

Let's move to the set of documents for agreement. The first one is Implementer's Guide for G.8013, I believe, yes? So, it will be numbered like this ‑‑ G.imp ‑‑ okay. So, the text is in TD104. Can we agree this text? So agreed.

The next one is Implementer's Guide for G.8021 in TD105 of Plenary. Can we agree this text? So agreed.

The next is Implementer's Guide for G.8121. Text is in TD106 of Plenary. Can we agree this Implementer's Guide? So agreed.

The next is G.Sup58, a revision to the optical transport network module framer interfaces in TD15R1 of Plenary. Can we agree this? Thank you.

And then, the next one is for deletion. And so, Mr. Betts already explained the deletion rationale here, and this is for Y.sup4. And this is already non‑normative text, and so, we can agree to delete it here in Study Group 15, as this is under our responsibility. So, are there any comments, ladies and gentlemen, on the deletion of Y.sup4? Okay. Thank you very much. This is agreed for deletion.

The next, the final one here, I guess, is the OTNT Standardization Work Plan. The latest issue is in TD69 of Plenary. And so, we will review this and ‑‑ well, we'll approve this Work Plan, like we approved the other ones. Any comments on this Standardization Work Plan, ladies and gentlemen? Okay, thank you. So approved.

So, thank you. So, that concludes the text for determination, consent, and agreement, for Working Party 3. So, next is the Status of Recommendations in TD62. I believe there's a Revision 1 to this? So, TD62R1. Is that now posted as well? It is, very good. So, we can continue with the Status of Recommendations from Working Party 3. Mr. Betts, please.

>> MALCOLM BETTS: Yeah. Just wait for... To the top of the document. We have a table of the new work items. There are 29 of them. Saw you counting. And you can see the minor editorial issue we had. It was Annex T, which we can come to when we get to Annex T. Maybe we should just go through the tables and the work items, new work items. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. So, these are the new work items here. And so, if we scroll down to the status of recommendations here. So, just on this, just to highlight ‑‑ maybe you can make it smaller ‑‑ that this includes the updates as well as indication of the editors. The updates, they're not highlighted here in yellow. They're in change bars, I presume. Is that ‑‑ so we can see the change marks here and the new editors, as indicated. So, if you can just scroll down to all the questions here, and we'll just approve this. Okay. Very good.

So, that's the set of recommendations of editors in Working Party 3. Any comments on this set, ladies and gentlemen? So, this is approved.

So, let's then proceed with the new work items in reviewing these A.1 justifications. And so, the first set of ‑‑ the first one here is a proposed Amendment 1 to G.7701, where you see the scope and summary here indicating liaisons and the supporting members. Any comments on this proposed new work item? Can we approve this proposed new work item? So approved.

The next one is Amendment 1 to G.7702, with the scope and summary shown here, with liaisons and supporting members. Any comments on this, ladies and gentlemen? Seeing none, this is then approved.

The next one is a revision of G.8013/Y.1731, shown here with the purpose and scope, showing the liaisons and supporting members. Any comments, ladies and gentlemen? Can we approve this? So approved.

The next one is proposed amendment to G.8021/Y.1341, with the purpose, scope, and summary shown here. And if you scroll down, we can see the supporting members. There's no liaisons shown here, though. Was this G.8021? Perhaps there should have been some liaisons similar to G.8013, perhaps? But that's a minor point.

>> HIROSHI OTA: There was. That (?) somehow.

>> CHAIR: Okay, thank you. So, was it the same as ‑‑ could you scroll up, Hiroshi, to the previous one? Was it the same as the G.8013 set with 802, 1588, and ‑‑ what was the other one ‑‑ MEF?

>> HIROSHI OTA: That would be a good start, very (?) which was entered.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Well, then we can make that editorial addition and then approve the new work item with that editorial addition, if that's agreeable. Is that appropriate?

>> We had included Q11 and Q14 as part of the meeting this week.

>> CHAIR: Well, so, this is liaison with other study groups, so ‑‑

>> That would be fine.

>> CHAIR: Or other standards bodies.

>> Except for 1588.

>> CHAIR: Remove 1588? So, 802 and MEF.

>> Yeah, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Okay. Very good. Thank you. Can we approve this new work item? So approved.

Next is G.8121 with the purpose, scope, and summary as shown. Scroll up to see the liaisons and supporting members. Can we agree this new work item? So agreed.

The next one is G.7718, Amendment 2, with the scope and summary shown here with liaisons and supporting members. Can we agree this new work item? So agreed. We'll move along.

The next one is Amendment 1 to G.7719. The scope and summary are shown here with the liaisons and supporting members. Can we approve this new work item? So agreed.

The next one is the Amendment 2 for G.7721. Scope and summary shown here with the liaison to 1588 and supporting members. Can we agree this new work item? So agreed.

The next one is an amendment to G.8051. And this has update to A.1 justification. So, just a clarification, is this ‑‑ did we approve this as a previous Study Group 15 meeting, or is this just editorial?

>> At our December 2021 meeting, we approved an A.1 for the Amendment 1, and we're now expanding the scope of the work in the amendment, and the changes are shown in red text.

>> CHAIR: Thank you.

>> If you scroll down just a little, you'll see the things that have been added. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you for that clarification. That's very helpful. And so, any comments, ladies and gentlemen, on this? Okay. Can we agree this text for new work item? So agreed.

So, the next one is G.8052.1, proposed Amendment 2, with the scope and summary as shown. And the liaisons with the number of other groups shown with the supporting members listed as well. So, can we support ‑‑ agree this new work item? So agreed.

The next one is proposed Amendment 1 to G.8151. And the scope and summary shown here, liaisons to IETF and the supporting members indicated. Can we agree this new work item? So agreed.

The next one is Amendment 2 to G.8152.1 with the scope and summary shown here. Then the liaisons and supporting members. Can we agree this new work item? So agreed.

The next one is proposed new amendment to G. ‑‑ Amendment 2 to G.8152.2, with the scope and summary shown here. And liaisons and supporting members. Is there any comments? Can we agree this new work item? So agreed.

So, next we have proposed Amendment 1 to G.8350 with the scope and summary shown here, with the liaisons and supporting members. Can we agree this new work item? Thank you. So agreed.

And the next one is the revision of G.709.1 with the scope and summary shown here. And then, if we scroll down, we'll see the liaisons with other groups and the supporting members listed. Any comments? Okay. Then this is agreed new work item.

Then the next one is the revision of G.798 with the scope and summary shown here and supporting members indicated here. Can we agree this new work item? So agreed.

And then, the next one is an A.13, a justification for a revision of G.Sup58. And this has red text again. Didn't we just approve G.Sup58? Is this another revision, I believe, is that correct? Or is this an update to the Scope of Work for what we just approved? Mr. Betts, please.

>> MALCOLM BETTS: Thank you. No, it's another revision to G.Sup58. We don't do amendments. Over time, we updated it. So, revision and the text in red is what we're going to add at this new revision. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much for that clarification. Any further comments? Can we agree this new work item? So agreed.

The next one is an A.13 justification for a proposed new technical paper on the Evolution of Optical Transport Networks, with a scope and summary shown here. And if you scroll down, these are the supporting members. Can we agree this new work item? So agreed.

And if we go to the next one, this is now back to an A.1 justification for a proposed new G.osu for mapping sub1G paths onto OTN. And if we scroll down, there are ‑‑ we can see the scope and the summary. And supporting members listed. Any comments on this new work item? Can we agree this new work item? So agreed.

And then we have A.1 justification for a new fgMTN ‑‑ fine‑grain MTN, for mapping sub1G paths into MTN with scope and summary shown here. And the supporting members indicated. And there's no liaisons here, right? Okay. Any comments on this one? Can we agree this new work item? So agreed.

And then we have this justification for Amendment 2 to Recommendation G.781. And we have the scope shown here and then the summary. Scroll down. We can see the liaisons and the supporting members. Any comments on this one, ladies and gentlemen? Can we approve this new work item? So approved.

And the next one is a new work item for Amendment 2 to G.781.1 with the scope shown here and the summary. And if we can scroll down to see the liaisons and supporting members. Any comments here, ladies and gentlemen? Can we approve this new work item? So approved.

And the next one is Amendment 1 to Recommendation G.8271.1 with the scope shown here and then the summary, a number of liaisons to other standards bodies and supporting members indicated. Can we agree this new work item? So agreed.

And the next one is the proposed Amendment 2 to G.8273 with the scope and summary shown here, as well as the liaisons to other bodies and supporting members indicated. Can we agree this new work item? Thank you.

And almost to the end. We have proposed revision to G.8273.2 with the scope shown here and the summary, liaisons with other bodies, and the supporting members indicated. Can we agree this new work item? So agreed. Thank you very much.

And then we have the revision to G.8275. The scope is indicated here with summary, and the liaisons with other study groups or other standards bodies and supporting members indicated. Can we agree this new work item? So agreed.

Then we have, moving into double‑letter annexes, for all the new work in Working Party 3. This is Amendment 1 to G.8275.1, and showing the scope, of course, base text, and the summary. And then the liaisons and supporting members. Can we agree this new work item? So agreed.

Next one is the Amendment 1 to G.8275.2. Base text indicated, scope summary, and then liaisons, relationship, and the members supporting. Can we agree to this new work item? So agreed.

And then, we have A.13 justification for a new supplement on FTS. This may be... oh, full‑time in support, of course. And the summary ‑‑ I mean, the scope shown here, and the summary and liaisons with other study groups ‑‑ I mean, with other groups indicated here ‑‑ and the supporting members. Can we agree this new work item? So agreed.

And I believe that's the end. And Working Party 3 is going to be very busy with all these new work items, so I wish you a very productful time until our next Plenary, when we hope to see great progress on these.

So, we'll probably ‑‑ we did one change in this, I believe, right? So, we want ‑‑ so, this was already in R1. So, we should do an R2 to include ‑‑ because it was just ‑‑ you know, I believe it was the liaisons that we added for one of them.

>> HIROSHI OTA: Yes.

>> CHAIR: So, will you do that, Hiroshi, with the one that you were keeping track of, or should we ask Mr. Betts to do that? This is it here.

>> HIROSHI OTA: If it is okay, then, yes.

>> CHAIR: Okay. TSB will handle that update there. Okay, and that will be in a Revision1 of TD6 of Plenary.

Let's move on to the liaison statements from Working Party 3 and TD63 of Plenary. Mr. Betts, can you just introduce these generally, I guess, and then we can go through approving each one?

>> MALCOLM BETTS: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, at the top of the document is the table of all of the liaisons that we have responded to. And then, below is the annexes, and you'll be relieved to hear there's only nine.

So, maybe just a brief word about Annex A and Annex B. So, Annex A is the standard liaison we send to a lot of bodies for the OTNT Standardization Work Plan. Those with really harp eyes will spot, we haven't included 802.1 in this liaison because they asked a specific question which has been answered in the liaison in Annex B to A.2.1, so I think that covers all that I need to for the liaisons. So, if you could approve the annexes ‑‑ no, no, no, there's no change to make, Hiroshi. There's no change here. This is deliberate.

Want to approve the annexes one by one? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. So, let's proceed with the liaisons here in the annexes. And so, the first one is the OTNT Standardization Work Plan, and sending this to the number of groups that are indicated here. And if you scroll up, we'll attach the Standardization Work Plan that's in TD69 that we have approved previously. So, any comments on this, ladies and gentlemen? Can we approve this liaison? So approved.

And then, so, Annex B is the same thing, but this is just 802.1 and this is also attaching it, but if you scroll up, it's answering a specific question as well to 802.1. And also attaching TD69. Okay. Can we approve this liaison? So approved.

So, then the next one is a reply to liaison to the O‑RAN alliance and if you scroll up with the description here. And are there any attachments? I saw references at the bottom. Is that... And so, please attach TD, et cetera, et cetera. I presume those are the noted references? He is nodding, so thank you. This is the liaison to the O‑RAN Alliance. Any comments on this one? Can we agree this liaison? So agreed.

The next one is Liaison to 3GPP SA2. And if we scroll up, we'll see what the text is here. So, there was some questions that they had asked and we're providing some answers. So, if you scroll down, some detailed answers here with tables and such. But in addition, we're attaching the revised recommendations to ‑‑ well, so, are there three attach ‑‑ there are three references, but only two attachments. Is that because 8264 is approved? That's the in‑force version, is that ‑‑ so, the other ones ‑‑ okay. So, the new ones are attached, but the in‑force one does not need to be attached, although he didn't mention that. Perhaps they'll figure it out, I suspect. Okay. Okay. Any further comments on this one, ladies and gentlemen? Can we agree this liaison? Okay. So agreed.

So, the next liaison is to 802.1 and 1588 and to a bunch of different ones for information on modeling coordination. If we scroll up here, this is an indication of joint ‑‑ well, these are the meetings, I guess, that we haven't yet approved. So, okay. So, assuming we approve the meetings, we'll approve this here, contingent on us approving these meetings, as indicated here. And so, if we change that, we'll have to come back and fix this.

And so, what we have to add here is the e‑meeting links, and that can be added by TSB afterwards, when that's configured. Okay. So, this is, I guess, a conditional approval, assuming that we're approving the meetings that have not yet been approved. We'll do that in the next TD. Can we agree this liaison, then, ladies and gentlemen? Okay.

I believe that was the last one. No, there's more.

Next is to IEEE, 1952 Working Group. So, if you scroll up, this is a reply liaison on a particular question. And so, they've provided the answer here. All right, this one's styled differently. So, this one says "attachments" instead of "references." And so, attachments is the Work Plan and 8275 Amendment 3. Okay, so those two. And says please attach those. Okay. Any comments on this one? Can we agree this liaison? So agreed. Thank you.

The next liaison is to OIF and OpenROADM. And if you scroll up, this highlights that we have now a new work item, I presume, is the intention here, and to make them aware that we're working on 800 and 400. But there's no attachments here, is that correct? No. Okay. Can we agree this liaison? Okay. So agreed.

The next one is to ONF. And this one is information on our current set of documents. And oh, these are a lot of attachments here. Please attach ‑‑ okay, so, if you scroll up, does it say we're attaching these? Is that what it says? Scroll up. The approval process has been initiated for ‑‑ okay. So, these are the ones that we sent for consent earlier. I presume these are all the ones that were for consent. Then these are the consent text that needs to be ‑‑ and so, two of these are on 30 days, and so, we'll hold the liaison until that has concluded, is the point. Okay. That's fine. Okay, so, that is noted. Okay, so any comments on this one? Is this one okay, Hiroshi? Please.

>> HIROSHI OTA: From (?) point of view, either way is fine. If editor prefers to wait until the last call, version for last call is finalized, then, of course, we can wait. And if, otherwise, then we can send it using the current TD. So, it's up to the Working Party. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Hiroshi. We will prefer to send the last call version. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. So, we'll proceed in that manner with this one. Can we agree, then, this liaison? Okay. So agreed.

The next one is to the MPLS Working Group on IETF, and this is to update them on progress of our MPLS‑TP documents and to attach. Again, these are all the ones that have been consented. So, how many documents? Just scroll up, please, Hiroshi. There are five? So, we're not sending the ones with the new work items; you're just sending the consented documents, I believe, right? Okay. And again, this one needs to wait for the last call text as well, yes. Okay. Any comments on this liaison to IETF, ladies and gentlemen? Okay. Hearing none, this is approved.

And that was the last liaison, so thank you very. And we didn't do any changes in these.

>> No.

>> CHAIR: No, right. Okay. Okay, so, that was the liaisons from Working Party 3. So, now if we could continue to the interim meetings proposed by Working Party 3 and TD64 of Plenary. Mr. Betts, please.

>> MALCOLM BETTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If you could scroll down a little, please, Hiroshi. So, we have three face‑to‑face meetings. There's annexes giving details. So, Question 11 will meet here in Geneva, week of 13th‑17th of February. And we would like to confirm that meeting.

Questions 12 and 14 plan to meet in Europe the week of 6th‑10th of February but we don't yet have confirmation from the host. So, we can approve that, but we can't confirm it. We can confirm it as soon as we have the host.

The third meeting is Question 13, who will meet the week of 5th‑9th of December, hosted by Ericsson in Stockholm. We can confirm this. One thing I will note ‑‑ and it's clearly stated in the annex ‑‑ is that this will be a face‑to‑face meeting without remote participation. The first two will be face‑to‑face with remote participation.

So, if we now scroll down to virtual meetings, we have Question 13 the week of February 6th, hosted by ITU. And Question 14 has its usual series of four parallel tracks of virtual meetings. The first one is the ones we mentioned ‑‑ the liaison, the IMD and the coordination meetings. And because there were external bodies, we used Zoom. The remaining ones are ‑‑ it's the date shown using My Meetings, hosted by ITU. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. And so, we have these sets of meetings that are proposed to be confirmed. And if you scroll up, there was some that were just proposed to be approved. No, back to the top of the table. Right. So, the Question 12 and 14 one is just approved because we're still looking to confirm a host for that one. Okay. So, we'll need to announce that in the appropriate time beforehand, once the host is confirmed. Okay.

So, are there any comments on these, ladies and gentlemen, for the interim meetings of Working Party 3? Okay. Then, these are then approved. Thank you. So, thank you very much to Working Party 3 for your excellent work, and I look forward to all the new work that's under way and the progress that can be had here.

So, before we continue with the rest of the agenda, we need to go back to Working Party 2 and TD58, which is now posted with an R1. And let's review the liaison statement that's been revised. So, Mr. Doolan, perhaps you can highlight the text that you've added.

>> PAUL DOOLAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's adjusted to say R1 at the top, of course. And the new text is just at the bottom of the screen there. We explain the two contributions that are attached. If you just scroll up a little, Hiroshi. Yeah, the other way. We mentioned at the top that we started new work. G.smart, and we explained them in the introduction of the report and at the bottom explained that these two contributions that are being sent to them from information actually contain material that is intended to be used as input to the base text for those new recommendations. We don't have any TDs of the new recommendations. The work's just started on them. The question thought it would be important or valuable to send this material to IEC.

It's been looked at by the rapporteur Saab and by Mr. Nakajima and yourself, of course.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. Are there any comments on this liaison statement, then? Okay. Seeing none, can we approve this liaison statement to ‑‑ this is to IEC, right?

>> MALCOLM BETTS: Yes.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Seeing no comments, it's so approved. Thank you.

>> PAUL DOOLAN: Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So, that concludes Agenda Item 13. And so, we've completed all of the 13 items as we've gone through all of the reports of the Working Parties. And so, now we do not have any items under 14 or 15.

Oh, but before we go on, I just want to ‑‑ maybe I'll ask if there's any other matters for resolution at the Study Group level from the Working Parties? Just to confirm that there are no other issues for resolution. And so, then we'll continue, then, with Item 16 and 16.1.

So, Item 16.1 is promotion and coordination and the report from the Promotion and Coordination in TD65 of Plenary. So, Jean Marie, please, will you introduce that?

>> Jean‑Marie FROMENTEAU: Thank you. It was held on Tuesday, 27 September, evening session and in the session, we discussed the promotion of the work of Study Group 15. We discussed also topic about bridging the standardization gap, conformance and interoperability testing and responses to incoming liaisons in TDs from TSAG, TSB, and several other ITU Study Groups, JCAs, focus groups and other SDOs. These are addressed to QAll. Some are only for information, but some of these liaison requests really are addressed for action and request, basically, a response from Study Group 15.

So, in this meeting, we reviewed the last promotion that we did since the last meeting, basically, the news that we have set out in preparation, also conference that our experts attended. And of course, we discussed the next item to promote resulting from this meeting. You can scroll down, Hiroshi, to promotion B. The new promotion items that we have identified that is first news, you know, led by our Study Group 15 Chairman related to the kickoff of the new study period and these promotions that ITUs will have an embedded video interviews from Study Group 15 chairman. We also think we should prepare something regarding the new release of Q2 and Q4. It's really a multigigabit broadband use and we know they will finalize the news on packet synchronization technology. And during, let's say yesterday afternoon and this morning, we decided also that we would promote the technical report on SDN for Question 5 because that is the first official document in the industry.

So, we identify a list of conference that we will attend, also the ITSF conference attended by Q13. Our participation, Study Group 15 participation on the OFC 2023 is confirmed, and we have the official title, we have speakers and moderators. It's only a matter not to continue to liaise with the organization to formalize participation. We will participate as Q13 in the WSTS in March and we plan again to participate in the WSIS Forum in 2023. We participated last time, and it was quite successful. And the WSIS Forum really wants to have participation from Study Group 15.

We have identified two topics that can be really interesting in terms of importance of ICT standards and the role of Study Group 15 here, and maybe we can contact several team for Working Party 1, Working Party 2 and Working Party 3 to participate in this panel. And some in the industry are not quite sure, what is the relationship between ITU and ICT. So, the due date is the deadline for really submitting a proposition is first of February. And in general, we all know this topic by email exchange.

We have been invited also by the Smart Grid Forum to participate in Smart Grid Tech Week in 2023 in March in Amsterdam. Also here, since it is ongoing, we are changing May with Smart Grid Forum organization led by Q3. We have one minute to answer.

And we learned that the e‑clerk is changing topic and tend to go something similar and we decided we would recontact the organization and try to see if they can arrange this for Study Group 15.

So, we are moving forward with the removal of technical fliers and that is a good thing. Also, Q2 did a lot of work, and that is a good example. We, at this week, and also during these two weeks, several interview, video interviews, are arranged by TSB communication official also from our Study Group 15 Chairman from Q2, Q12 rapporteur, Q13 and Q14 rapporteur, and I think that was successfully done. This video interview will be posted at our website, and I'm quite sure that ITU Communication will distribute this interview.

To record that it's always nice to have a small article from the question, you know, in the ITU communication question and to record that, basically, you know, TSB is ready to always arrange something original. You know, it could be a webinar, a podcast, videos, interview, website, workshop. Many things are possible to do. It's only to contact us and we will arrange it, okay?

So, to recall a little bit what our objective is. The objective for promotion is really to try to have one ITU in use and participation in conference, one conference per quarter on average, okay. So, that is if we could really maintain this objective, that would be a nice thing.

Another topic that we are dealing with in the coordination and promotion that is bridging the standardization gap, and we mentioned to ITU‑D sector how many contributions we received from the repping country and we explained a little bit and we explain and of course report how we deal with this contribution and we drop liaison to ITU‑D.

We are another liaison to ITU‑D regarding documents we found on ITU‑D document regarding the guideline, the connectivity where we wanted to comment this document because we found a little bit strange things, so, okay.

On conformance and interoperability, also to create a new focus group led by Study Group 11 on use case for testbed federation. We have been requested to respond.

And on future direction on Study Group 15, there was no new city omitting and ITU is to respond. We got several liaisons from TSAG and TSB. We have no liaison specific on the use of inclusive language, but we use a liaison to as a committee to remember that we took position on that and that we need to really go. So, simply, too, we have to respond also to decide on consideration for accessibility meeting. We have also to respond to, okay, to TSAG. I think that is your TD37 and TD39.

And of course, we have another liaison from TSAG regarding the quantum key distribution. In total, we have also, of course, a liaison also that we regularly receive from GCA in 2020. In total, we have nine liaisons, and there is a table at the bottom of this report that summarizes the liaison. The other liaisons that you receive for action but that are really not in relation with our scope of work, we simply considered this liaison as for information.

So, that's all, I think you can go liaison by liaison and I take the opportunity to thank, really, all members, all experts, all of our experts that used part of their time to promote our Study Group 15 work in conference with presentation, spending that time to work on text for you because that's extra time on top of their job and I know that is not so easy sometimes, too. It's always based on voluntary. Thank you very much. Thank you very much. And thank you to all people that helped me to create all of the liaisons that we have to respond. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Jean‑Marie, and we do appreciate your excellent work in the Promotion and Coordination Group, and it is a lot of work, and I hope now during this study period with your new Vice Chair, that you'll have less work to do yourself. But certainly, the amount that the group is doing is quite laudable, and we do appreciate that.

So, ladies and gentlemen, are there any comments on the report from the Promotion and Coordination Group? Can we accept their report? Yes, we can.

And so, now let's review, then, the annexes of the liaison. So, there's a number of liaisons that are being sent to various groups that they have reviewed. So, the first one is to ITU‑D. If you can scroll down here. This is to Study Group 1 and Study Group 2 in ITU‑D and contains some information about the contributions that we had received from developing countries at this meeting and provides them some indication of our progress and what we will be doing with these. Any comments on this liaison, ladies and gentlemen? Can we agree this liaison? So agreed.

The next one is a liaison also to ITU‑D, Study Group 1 and 2. And provides some comments on, specifically, some ITU‑D documents that they have posted on last‑mile procurement equipment. So, we have indicated that we have a number of technical expertise in this area, referring to our Standardization Work Plan, the Standards Overview and the access area, our fliers, and the supplements, and so on. And then there's a list that we provide in this table here.

So, then, I think this is for information, I believe, was it? Or was it for action?

>> It's for action.

>> CHAIR: It's for action. So, what's the action request? Let's scroll down and see what the... And so, the action request is to take this into account.

>> Exactly, yes. Because the tables that you see, as a similar structure of a table that's used in that document, and basically, we make some corrections.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much for that clarification. Okay. Given that, can we approve this liaison to ITU‑D? Okay. So approved.

The next liaison is to the focus group. This group on testbeds for ‑‑ this is, like, testbeds on federation, is that what it is? Testbeds on Federations, okay, for IMT‑2020 and beyond. Okay. So, this is for information. And we're providing a description of use cases. But we don't have any I think is the conclusion. Right. Okay.

So, any comments on this liaison? Seeing none, this can be approved.

Okay, so, the next liaison is ‑‑ this one is to ‑‑ this one is to TSAG on accessibility, and this is identifying Mr. Taesik Cheung, our Vice Chair of Study Group 15, who has graciously offered to be our liaison representative to the JCA on accessibility. Any comments on this one? Can we approve this liaison? Thank you.

So, the next one is also to TSAG. This is a reply on the outcomes of QIT4N focus group. So, this is on the ‑‑ is this the QKD one or ‑‑ is this not the ‑‑ this is related to it.

>> Jean‑Marie: That is the story with the QKD, yes.

>> CHAIR: Okay. And so, if we scroll down ‑‑ so, this is some of the suggestions that they had. And then we have our suggested actions indicated next to it. And we will conduct some consultations before our next plenary and report back to TSAG. Okay. Any comments on this? Okay. Hearing none, this one's approved.

So, the next liaison is to JCA‑IMT 2020 on updating the roadmap. This is the roadmap that we normally do for them and that we have provided in an attachment, yes? Is the attachment attached, or is it ‑‑ it's in the attachments.

>> Yes.

>> CHAIR: So, this is what ‑‑ you're scrolling through the attachment right now, which is the long list of our documents. Okay. Thank you. Thank you. Any comments on this liaison to the JCA? Okay. It's approved.

So, the next liaison is to SCV. This liaison indicates that we have identified Mr. Mohamed Benziane, who is our Vice Chairman of ITU‑T, to be liaison and we note the plan in regards ‑‑ well, first of all, we remind them of our previous liaison statement, which we'll attach, and then of our intent on the terms master/slave, what we intend to do on that based on previously. And we will report back. So, is this to SCV copy to TSAG, or is it to TSAG? It's to TSAG and SCV. Okay. Okay. Good. Okay, very good. Any comments on this? Can we agree this liaison? Yes, so agreed.

And there's one more. Two more. Two more. So, this one is for Study Group 2 on their management project plan. And so, we have reviewed it and we have some ‑‑ two attachments here with our list of recommendations and our contact information that we're providing to them. Okay. Any comments on this? No? So, this is approved.

And then the last liaison is to Study Group 17. This is on security‑related matters. We summarize for them the security‑related items in each of the relevant questions. And identified the associate rapporteur of Question 14 to be the contact on security topics. Okay? Any comments on this? Okay. We can approve this liaison. Okay.

I believe that's the end, then?

>> Yes.

>> CHAIR: Very good, thank you. That concludes the Promotion and Coordination activity. I thank you very much again, Jean‑Marie, for your excellent report and excellent work.

So, just to note ‑‑

>> (Off microphone).

>> CHAIR: I'm sorry, yes.

>> I just noticed a typo in the last paragraph. Near the end, M. Scott should be "Mr."

>> CHAIR: Well, that's a little ‑‑ that's a French ‑‑ and that's throughout the document.

>> Okay, sorry.

>> CHAIR: The editor has taken the liberty of using the French version. I noticed that as well, but I'm ‑‑ that's fine with me, but. I mean, that's editorial. If you want to change all the "M" s to "Mr." Thank you very much. Mr. Hiroshi, please.

>> HIROSHI OTA: Just a clarification. TDs and other documents can be sourced from ‑‑ for example, in this case, promotion and coordination group. But when we send out the liaison, the source will always be Study Group 15. And this is just for clarification. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. And, okay. And so, no further requests for the floor? Just to note that we're at typical lunch break, but I propose that, instead, we continue for another half an hour and then not meet this afternoon. That's my proposal, if everyone is in agreement with that. And we probably won't need another half an hour, but that's my proposal.

So, let's then continue with item 16.2, Electronic Working Methods, which is our report on that, which is in TD103 of Plenary. And I believe Mr. Doolan, you'll be giving us a brief introduction?

>> PAUL DOOLAN: You want a brief one?

>> CHAIR: Please, yes. Well, you don't need to go through all the details. Summarize the key points.

>> PAUL DOOLAN: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, you can see it on the screen. This is the first of our EWM Coordination reports out of this meeting, this study group period. If you move down a little, please, Hiroshi. We've listed the contacts in working party order there at the top. You will remember the three individuals listed, of whom I'm one. We were appointed at the Opening Plenary. The team nominated me as the rapporteur, so it's my job to read this, even though I have to admit that Mr. Rouyer did most of the work to write it. We get input from email. We solicit it from the questions, and of course, we get input from discussion with colleagues, especially in a face‑to‑face meeting, it's been useful to be able to do that. And if you can scroll down again, please, Hiroshi.

So, it's been wonderful to be here, again, and to be able to use these excellent facilities. The ITU is fantastic. CICG is good, but less good. There were some difficulties in the rooms that we got to ‑‑ we were grateful for the rooms, but there were some difficulties ‑‑ lack of microphones, difficulties for rapporteurs as well as people presenting. The hybrid meeting thing causes some difficulties. You're all aware of that. But we note that the availability of staff here and their helpfulness has really facilitated those and overcoming the meetings.

We provided one suggestion of a good way to try and use your computer to display and run meetings, but we think that, given that at the start of many meetings, we were ‑‑ various of us were needing assistance from the ITU staff, it might be a good idea to have some sort of premeeting training or best current practice for the people who are going to be driving meetings.

And we note here two of the ITU staff who were particularly helpful, and we're very grateful to them. Ilia Londo and Carlos Munoz. In particular, Working Party 2's closing plenary wouldn't have happened if not for Mr. Munoz helping me at the start.

Coordination for ITU ICT staff. We think it would be helpful for EWM coordinators to dialogue directly with ITU staff. Hiroshi did that at the beginning of the week with excellent results. The sync tool is used by a lot of people. Mac users, again, it's been an issue for a while, report difficulties using it. And we had an extremely technically aDetroit observation about the FTP protocol supported in the sync tool. Someone who knows more than me about this suggested that we need to use SFTP, and that would make it work better with corporate firewalls. So, we passed that observation on.

The IFA is used by probably the majority of us, I would say. We like to use that. But the smaller number of people who have to maintain the index files there find it troublesome, and it's been suggested that there may be some tooling, some automation that might help in general the rapporteurs or the ARs who have to maintain those documents. So, we need to look at that.

Again, if you can scroll down for me, please, Hiroshi. There's been this interesting SharePoint, and we keep getting pointed to SharePoint as a potentially useful tool. Mr. VanderPutin gave a tutorial at this plenary on SharePoint, the experience of Q4 with it, and we thank him for that. The TSB reposted an older document from the last study period that also provides some information on that.

There's an observation from ‑‑ I assume it's one of the people who already uses it ‑‑ saying that permission to upload documents needs to be authorized by the TSB, and the complaint, or suggestion, was the rapporteur should be able to directly assign permissions to a new editor. So, if you appoint an editor, you ought to be able to say, okay, you can upload things. And apparently, you need to get a TSB to do that.

There were some ‑‑ some people have found the MyWorkspace screen randomly ceasing to operate and there was an observation it appeared to be more stable in Google Chrome, but it should operate with all of the supported platforms, and also it's probably pretty hard to tell exactly what's causing that problem.

One thing that caused a problem in CICG at the start of the week was the inability to raise hand as a point of meeting discipline. And it appears that that is tied to having your microphone enabled. And people in the room didn't have their microphone enabled and couldn't raise their hands. And it's been suggested that fixing that might be a good idea.

The web pages ‑‑ there's a minor complaint that ‑‑ and again, I don't know if this is the ITU or the search engines, but if you go search for ITU‑T Study Group 15, you go to a page which has a link on it to the new study period in red, and you have to double click, and some people don't like doing that. That may just disappear in time.

There's another observation about the email lists. And some of you may have seen, Jessy and I did some experimentation yesterday to try and work out what this was. And this was a complaint that if you send to multiple lists, you only get ‑‑ you as the sender ‑‑ only get a response back from one of those. And older and wiser people who have been here longer than some of us said, oh, no, that's a feature. It's always been like that and everyone knows. But obviously, everyone doesn't, because they complained to us, so we think it should be documented.

There's, I think probably the last thing at the bottom there. There's an observation that if you try and revise a DDP submission that you've made ‑‑ so you target it to Question 6 and 7 and 8 or something, and you wanted to remove one of those because you've realized you've sent it to the wrong place; you can't do that. And so, that ought to get investigated and sorted out, if it's true.

The last statement at the bottom is that this report, EWM report, goes as a liaison to TSAG. And in the appendix, we've filled in the bare bones of the boiler plate to ask TSB to send this to TSAG for us. That's it, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for that report and for the work on the electronic working methods experience here at our first in‑person plenary, where I guess we get to notice new things, like how the MyWorkplace tool works in a hybrid setup. Any comments or suggestions on this report from EWM Rapporteur? Can we accept that report? Yes, thank you. And so, let's then focus on the liaison statement. So, we will be sending this report to TSAG in a liaison for their information. So, can we agree to sending them that liaison? Okay. So, agreed. So, thank you very much.

Let's move then to the next agenda item 16.3. This is an update of our OUI subtypes registry. So, we have an OUI from IEEE that we use in a number of recommendations, and Study Group 15 maintains that. And the editor of G.8275.1 has done an update of what we have posted on our web page. And if you scroll down, Hiroshi, you can see the change marks somewhere, where they have added new version numbers for the various new amendments that were approved, or I believe consented at this meeting. So, that's the intent here. And so, we will update this document on the ‑‑ or TSB will update this document on the Study Group 15 web page after we agree this update here. So, are there any comments on this document, ladies and gentlemen? Hiroshi's going to show us where on the Study Group 15 web page this is. Maybe, Hiroshi, you can talk us through where the link is.

>> HIROSHI OTA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, yes. It's on the Study Group 15 web page. On the right‑hand side, the very bottom. There is a tab called "Special Topics" and then it contains registration and assignment. And it has the URL for the URN mod yeging and the unique identifier is here, which is OUI. So, you can always see the latest version from this link. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. And so, what we will do is, once this is approved, a clean version, without the change bars, will be uploaded there.

So, are there any comments, ladies and gentlemen, to the revision, to the OUI registration document? Can we approve it? So approved. Okay.

So, the next document ‑‑ there are two additional liaisons. I had introduced these at the opening plenary, and there was an opportunity for discussion, if any, there was no discussion, so we'll agree these as proposed liaisons ‑‑ we'll agree them as liaisons to TSAG. So, the first one is in TD37 Plenary. This is on A.8, and it identifies our concerns with the changes and the deadlines in recommendation A.8 for AAP. So, any comments on this, ladies and gentlemen? Can we agree this liaison? So agreed.

The next one is in TD89 of Plenary. This one in TD89 shows ‑‑ describes the situation on e‑meetings, and basically highlights our interest ‑‑ well, highlights our guidelines that we have on e‑meetings, and so they need to be attached, of course, that we approved at the beginning. But it also indicates that we have some comments on the work under way currently in ‑‑ oh, I only have them aattached in this one. Okay. Already attached. But it also highlights the work on the ad hoc group of TSAG on e‑meetings and provides some comments on their work, basically, that we'd like them to not change our way of working in Study Group 15 that has been so successful.

So, any comments on this liaison, ladies and gentlemen? If not, can ‑‑ oh, Mr. Betts, please.

>> MALCOLM BETTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I see at the top of TD89 the source of this document is Chairman of Study Group 15. I assume the source of the liaison will be Study Group 15.

>> That's correct.

>> Yes, just a clarification. So, the source of this TD is sourced from the Chairman, but when we send the liaison, then the source will be Study Group 15. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, thank you. Yeah, the Chair omitted to put in the additional template for the liaison looks like, like everyone else did, so the Chair will take lessons from the Working Party Chairs and the rapporteurs on how to write a liaison. So, thank you. So, in any case, the intent is, as Hiroshi indicated, this will be a liaison from Study Group 15 and will be appropriately formatted for that purpose.

Okay. So, can we approve this liaison, then, ladies and gentlemen? Okay. So approved.

The next one is on liaison rapporteurs, as was indicated earlier. We have a suggestion for a new liaison rapporteur that we did not approve at the opening plenary, and so, we have a revision of TD41R1. And did you show it as a change here for FSAN? And so, we have added here the addition of a new liaison rapporteur to FSAN, which is Mark Laubach, to indicate him here. That's the only change in this document. So, are there any comments on this new addition of a liaison rapporteur to FSAN? Can we approve this? So approved. Thank you.

So, next, then, let's proceed with Item 17. So, this, what I have done in TD46 of GEN ‑‑ or we have a second revision of this. And so, what I've done here is ‑‑ so, I guess two things since the opening plenary. While Hiroshi brings it up, I'll mention the two things. The first thing is, as was suggested in the opening plenary, we added an annex or an appendix that describes the typical Study Group 15 logistics. And so, what the ‑‑ and this is the average from the last study period.

So, what we have here is, these are the average numbers. What we've collected this week is some feedback on this. I hadn't provided this here yet, though. But what I've indicated, though, for potential hosts, this is some initial information. And if you're interested, this is what you can use to gauge your interest and your ability to host. And then we have additional information for you if you contact Hiroshi for that additional information, because some of the question sizes may be going up or down as I have indicated.

In addition, I have clarified the options that we have for hosting study group meetings, as I've indicated in the beginning. But the main thing I wanted to highlight was the dates. So, we discussed, as many of you know, some options with TSB to identify what space we could get in the CICG. Because as I said at the beginning, the ITU facility here is closing because they're renovating it from early next year. And so, our current understanding is it will be closed from the end of March, and we don't know if that's going to be delayed or if it will proceed, and so, we have multiple options based on that.

But what we do have confirmed is the last two weeks of November in the CICG building next door with sufficient room for all of us to meet in person. So, we thought it was prudent for us to confirm that. And so, we'd like ‑‑ we've already confirmed that and we'll indicate that, that that meeting is confirmed.

However, our second Plenary is to be confirmed. So, we have several options there. One is based on whether we may or may not be able to meet in the ITU building, if there is some delay. The other one is, I've chatted with a number of members who are potentially offering to host us. Certainly, there's interest in one host per working party concept that we had indicated, and so, that may be an option for April. And of course, the last option is that we will have a virtual meeting. And so, we'd rather not do that, but we'd rather to go for one of the in‑person options. I would hope that that would finalize after the Plenipotentiary concludes, so sometime in the next month or so we should be able to get some clarity on that and what we will be able to confirm. So, that's our intent, and that's the dates, so that's the updates here in TD46 that I've provided for you.

So, are there any comments or questions on hosting or future Plenaries? One thing to note here. The fourth Plenary, which we have in July/August, also not confirmed. The CICG availability isn't available for much more than a year in advance, unfortunately for us. And so, we're not able to book that yet. But we're also looking at other host opportunities for this meeting as well. And so, we're exploring some of those and we'll be able to come back to you, hopefully, the next plenary, with some final details on that one. Okay.

And so, one of the things that I had mentioned as well for hosting was to give us an opportunity for the hosts, is in the next TD. In Item 17.2 ‑‑ this is in TD92 ‑‑ one of the things that has been perhaps a burden for hosts to host study group plenary or working party meetings or plenaries is that they face the full burden of the cost of the venue. Perhaps that's not such a big cost for question meetings when it's just one room that you have, but when you need to have ten simultaneous ‑‑ ten or more simultaneous rooms available, that's typically a convention center or a hotel that you need to pay for that.

And so, one of the guidelines that we have from Recommendation A.1 is that if there are exceptional circumstances, a study group can exceptionally request or indicate that hosts can charge a meeting fee when they host a plenary or a working party meeting. And so, as I indicated at opening Plenary, I'd like us to do that so we can get some hosts to offer to host the closing, or the Study Group 15 Plenary in entirety, in one location.

So, as a result, what we'd like to propose is this exception. So, recognizing the exceptional closing of the ITU Headquarters buildings until at least 2027 for the new construction, and that Study Group 15 is the largest ITU‑T study group in attendance and ming room requirements, we allow hosts to charge participants meeting fees for hosted study group or working party meetings while there are no ITU facilities available. So, that's what we propose for this exception. Are there any comments? On this. Can we agree this exception? So agreed. Thank you very much.

The last agenda item is under Miscellaneous, is 18.1, is the Draft Study Group 15 Report. So, this is in TD49 of Plenary. So, this is just to give you a flavor of what we have, what I've put in the report of the Plenary. And this is not ‑‑ the final report, of course, will be an R document. So, if you scroll down, this is the structure of the COM 15‑R documents that we will have. The main report will be inR1, and each of the working party reports in 2, 3, and 4, and then our determined G.9901 Amendment 1 text will be in R5.

So, this is then what I have here. We can just scroll through. You can review this at your leisure. And I'll just give you ‑‑ it's just some highlights of my introductory remarks. We indicate how many contributions and such. And then I introduce the agenda and that we approved the previous reports.

The items in yellow are things that I need to update, because either the numbers are not correct or the ‑‑ if you can keep scrolling down, Hiroshi ‑‑ either the numbers are not correct, or they need to be ‑‑ like, they're not approved.

And so, then the organization of the meeting. So, this is just our structure that we agreed with the Working Parties and the appointments. And so, if you keep scrolling down. And the questions and the liaison rapporteurs that we'll need to update, as we just updated, how many meeting documents we had, our work program. Keep scrolling down.

The IPR announcement. And then we insert in all the approved ‑‑ I mean, the consented, determined, or approved texts that ‑‑ and of course, the deleted ones as well. That's all covered in annexes. The annexes aren't attached here yet. We'll compile that afterwards.

And then, a summary of the promotion and coordination. I just have a high‑level summary in here. And referring, of course, to the document. Maybe we want to add in more details of promotion and coordination than I have here. But anyway, we can talk about that offline.

And then, if you continue scrolling, the OUI assignment we just talked about, the Standardization Work Plans, and then the liaison statements, links to those, and then future work. We approved the meetings. And networking events, noting that we had a networking event at this Plenary. I hope that we will have hosts for future networking events at future Plenaries, which I also hope we get hosts for future Plenary events so that we meet in person.

And so, again, noting what I just indicated on that exception, that we indicated and approved, and our future meeting dates, which we're requesting hosts for the second and the fourth Plenary, and we've confirmed the dates for the third Plenary. So, that's a quick summary of my report, my draft report, which we'll be preparing in the weeks after this meeting, working with the management team to finalize those reports. Any comments or questions on this? Before I proceed.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At the start of this meeting, you made some very useful remarks on the value of having participants actually face‑to‑face in Geneva. I think it would be useful if you were to capture those in the report, in the meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, thank you. I think they're in there somewhere, perhaps not at the beginning. They're perhaps near the end. Maybe you can ‑‑ so, I think there's something in there, but we can review it and make sure it's in the appropriate place. So, I agree. I think there is extreme value in attending ‑‑ I mean, in having in‑person meetings. I think we've seen that here at this meeting, and I think it will be very useful, very productive, if we are able to continue in‑person meetings for the rest of our study period. Okay. Thank you.

Is there any other comments on this? No? Okay. So, the last thing I'd like to do, for those of you who may not know ‑‑ or maybe you do know ‑‑ Plenipotentiary is under way in Bucharest, Romania, and I'd like to congratulate the new Director of the TSB, Mr. Seizo Onoe, who will be our new director to succeed Taisub Lee. And I'd like to thank him for his support as I did at the opening and welcome our new director, Seizo Onoe, who will be helping us in Study Group 15, and we look forward to his support.

So, I'd also like to thank the captioners. Thank you very much for staying extra time, just up until 1:00 here. And that, I believe, is the end of our agenda. And unless there are any further things, then we can adjourn this first meeting of Study Group 15 for the study period. So, thank you. Thank you, everyone. We are adjourned.

(Session concluded at 1:00 CET)
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