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(Captioner standing by)
(Gavel)

>> CHAIR: Good morning, everyone. (Off mic) ha‑ha. Now we have sound. Good morning, everyone. I'm honoured to be here and welcome you for the fourth Study Group 15 Closing Plenary of the 2022‑2024 study period. This is the last one of the study period. As I said at the Opening Plenary, the first one ever outside of Geneva. I'm proud to have it here in Canada in Montreal. My name is Glenn Parsons, I'm with Ericsson Canada. I found this in‑person meeting of Montreal of this study period ‑‑ my opinion ‑‑ to be the best one yet.

We've had over 400 people register. Over 200 came here in person to Montreal. And I hope you enjoyed the experience of having a Study Group Plenary in a hotel where you sleep upstairs on the 30th floor and you just take the elevator down to the second basement like in Geneva, the meetings are in the second basement. And we have lunch together, receptions together. And we're just around. And we can have those impromptu meetings. It is a unique experience, I think for Study Group 15. I hope you enjoyed it.

We've had three workshops here. We've had two already. We'll have another one tomorrow. I hope that ‑‑ I think this is another first. I mean, that we had three during the same sort of Plenary. And I think the workshops provide a value. Not only for ourselves in understanding the rationale and get focused explanation of the work, but also perhaps newcomers or people that are not so experienced with some of the details of whether bit 6 should be (chuckling) ‑‑ or what the particular network management model should be. These sort of details, perhaps some people would enjoy the workshops more.

But we continue to get new work. We're going to have a more A1s at this meeting. And for some of these, we needed to take extra time to get consensus here during the meeting. I think that is possible because we're at an in‑person meeting and possible to have the side discussions where we can reach consensus. During a coffee break, where we had coffee for you during this meeting, now sometimes it ran out. Because maybe it is the first time where we had coffee or ran out. Or during the reception, we cannot run out of Montreal smoked meat sandwiches. I hope you enjoyed those. We had a jazz quartet. I hope you enjoyed the fireworks I arranged for you after the Opening Plenary on Canada Day .

Anyway, I think real progress can be made in person. I hope all of you enjoyed the effort. I think it was worth your effort. I hope you have seen the value as well. I want to thank the Canadian Government their tremendous effort in hosting this Plenary here in Canada.

I would like to invite Mr. Wen Kwan from the Canadian Government Delegation to bring remarks. Wen, please.

>> Wen Kwan: Mr. President, Director, good morning everyone. (No English translation) my name is wen Kwan from science and development Canada. (No English translation)

I trust you have had a successful meeting over the last two weeks, and also the chance to explore all that Montreal has to offer. Montreal is historically known as a place for many.

 First Nations. Today, the land we're gathered on is home to a diverse population of Indigenous and other Nations. As we come to a close of this Study Group 15 meeting, it is my privilege to extend my heartfelt thanks to each and every one of you for your participation and engagement. Over the past two weeks, you have had the opportunity to share ideas and forge connections that will last for a long time. And undoubtedly contribute to our collective growth and success. To our sponsors Ericsson and Ciena, thank you for making this meeting possible. In particular your dear Chair Glenn Parsons has been instrumental in organizing this event and we appreciate his commitment in fostering innovation and collaboration. Tomorrow I would like to extend our thanks to TSB, and the organizing Committee. (No English translation)

You're tireless efforts and dedication behind the scenes have ensured the smooth running of this meeting. Your hard work is greatly appreciated. And
(MyMeeting link just closed, captioner will try to reconnect.)

(Audio is silent)

>> CHAIR: Which I am very pleased that he is able to join us here in Montreal for this historic meeting of Study Group 15. I would like to invite him to please provide remarks.

>> Thank you, Chair, good morning colleagues and friends. I want to congratulate you on a successful meeting of Study Group 15. I want to thank our host Canadian Government Department of Innovation, science and economic development.

And the hosting meeting of SG 15 is demanding undertaking. We appreciate your support. I would like to thank our Chair Glenn Parsons for your instrumental part in bringing this meeting in Montreal. Study Group 15 is a source of great pride to ITU. This group is highly influential. Your successes are felt worldwide. Your reputation for excellence is very well deserved.

I would like to thank every expert that gives life to your work. For progress in ICT relies heavily on your work. I appreciate you delivering the work that the world has come to expect from Study Group 15.

This meeting welcomed 343 contributions. It aims to complete over 50 texts and there is progressing in important Study Group 15 work. This meeting has also finalized Study Group 15 preparation for WTSA.

Meeting your target to have great efficiency. I thank you for your commitment to success.

I am also glad to see that Study Group 15 collaboration with other expert communities remains in very good health. As demonstrated by your workshops held in conjunction with this meeting.

I also like to commend SG15 for how you are promoting your work at Conferences, workshops and exhibitions. Highlighting some of the tools already available as well as opportunity to contribute to your work. This promotion and developers and implementers alike.

I would like to recognize the leadership of (?) in this regard, recognizing this will be the final meeting as a Delegate to Study Group 15.

I am certain that I speak for everyone here today when I say that you your dedication to your work as an Ambassador for Study Group 15 has been outstanding. Thank you.

To our Chair Glenn Parsons, the management team and every expert that contributed to this work of Study Group 15, I thank you once again for the leadership that Study Group 15 provides and the bright future that we see for your work. I wish you a most successful Closing Plenary. Thank you.

(Applause)

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for the kind words and recognition of our valuable work and promotion as well that we do. Thank you to Jean Marie for his excellent work over this study period.

Now, if we can move to our Agenda for the meeting. This is available in TD 306 of plen that we're showing here. The introductions, the host remarks and Director's remarks we just proceeded with. The next on the Agenda is proceed with the reports of the Working Parties shown in the TDs indicated here. So we'll progress through item 13 here with all of the various TDs. If you can scroll down Hiroshi, we'll show the rest of the Agenda after we go through the big five of all the Working Parties, we'll look at the leadership appointments, WTSA 24 preparation, OUI assignments. And we have the report from promotion and coordination and the workshop reports. We'll have a look at the next Plenary. I'll tell you dates and plans for that. Finally, we'll conclude with the draft report.

But what I missed in there, there is the certificates of appreciation. So we'll be handing out certificates to all of the management team and Rapporteurs, Associate Rapporteurs to thank them for your work over the study period.

Now, from logistical perspective, we'll be doing that after the coffee break. And so at the beginning of the coffee break, what our intention is to take a group photo of everyone that is here. So at the coffee break, we'll invite everyone to sort of go out to the stairs as we come in here. And our photographer will take a group picture of all of us at the coffee break, which is near 10:45 or so, is when we'll do that.

And so after the coffee break, we'll come back and do the certificates of appreciation from like 11:15 or so, and once we finish the certificates, we'll continue with the rest of the Agenda. So we'll see how far we can get in our Agenda before the coffee break and we'll progress it in that fashion.

Are there any comments on the Agenda, ladies and gentlemen?

Not seeing any, so we'll take the Agenda as approved. Let me talk about some logistics. I introduced the head table already. At the Opening Plenary. I don't think we'll need to do that here this time. And of course, I know we're happy to have the Director here, he gave his opening remarks here at the beginning. There is no interpretation for this Plenary. But we do have captioning. And captioning is available on the ‑‑ should be on the screens here, that you can see. But it is also available on the web page. So Hiroshi will show you, if you go to the Study Group 15 web page, the link is near the bottom, I think. Right there. There is the captioning button there on the bottom. You can bring that up on your own screens.

Okay. Very good. So I think ‑‑ are there any other logistics, Hiroshi? Okay. I think we can proceed with the Agenda. So let's start with the main reports. We'll start with Working Party 1. With the main report in TD 301. Mr. Star, take us through that, please.

>> WP1: Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to thank our Vice‑Chair for Working Party 1 for his great assistance this week. Starting with Question 1, met for one day updating the web‑based access transport, standards overview and work plan Documents and web‑based Home Network Transport overview and planned Documents. The list of certification and interoperability applications were updated. I want to give special thanks to Jean Marie for his last meeting as our Q1 Rapporteur. Jean Marie, you have been outstanding. It won't be the same without you.

Question 2 met for four days. Working on passive optical networks. Three texts, four consent, two supplements for agreement were prepared. Question 2 plans to hold four interim meetings. 1A.1 and two A.13 statements were prepared. Question 2 prepared a liaison statement to TSAG proposing that Q4 of 9 be merged to Q2 of 15 for the next study period. We'll see how that goes.

Question 3 met for four days. Working on fiber indoor networks, G.fin and other aspects of home networking. Three recommendations were prepared for approval at this meeting. And one recommendation was prepared for consent. One supplement was prepared for agreement. Question 3 plans to hold three interim meetings. Two A.13 statements were prepared for new projects addressing premises network and small and medium enterprise and integrated sensing in the premises.

Question 4 met for one day. Addressing five contributions on broadband access over a metallic conductors. Question 4 updated its terms of reference in preparation for the WTSA and Question 4 plans to hold one interim virtual meeting.

All of the Working Party 1 questions met jointly to progress a new technical paper summarizing the work and products of Working Party 1. A13 justification for this activity was produced and a joint virtual meeting of all the questions is planned for December of this year. Thank you.

(Applause)

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Tom. Are there any comments or questions on this report?

Okay. Can we agree this report then? Okay. So the next set of ‑‑ is the next document for you? The.

>> The 302 plen.

>> CHAIR: Text for consent.

(Overlapping conversations)

(background chatter)

>> CHAIR: We'll talk about ‑‑ I'll introduce the patent statement here as recommendation A1 notes that ITU has a common patent policy with IOC and licensing Declarations that are relevant to the recommendations at this meeting and had been received prior to the Study Group meeting are listed in the ITU‑T website, for this Closing Plenary as Chair I will make the following query on IPR.

Anyone have knowledge of patents or software copyrights, the use of which may be required to implement recommendations being considered, which have not already been recorded in the IPR database?

Does TSB acknowledge that no patents have been received to what has been proposed.

>> There has been no Declaration received that would prevent approval of any of the draft recommendations. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Okay thank you very much. So let's proceed then with TD302. Mr. Star.

>> WP1: You see this in front of you. Yes, closer, closer. Very close. How is that? All right. Three for approval. Four texts for consent, three for agreement.

I guess I'll let you walk through them.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. (Off mic)

Okay. The first recommendation for approval is G9930. Point‑to‑point fiber in the premises. Document is in TD346R1. I presume there is no A5 references?

>> Correct.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Any comments on this?

Okay. It is approved. Next is G9941. High speed fiber based in premises transceivers. The G.fin recommendation. Again, no A5 for this one?

>> No.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Any comments on this? Okay. Approved.

The next one is G9942. High speed fiber based in premise transceivers, the data link. The text is in TD 342 revision 1 of Plenary. Comment says on this? That is approved. No nothing for determination. Next is text recommendations for consent.

First one is ‑‑ okay.

Okay. I'm sorry, do you need to ...

(Off mic)

So my counselor indicated there are discrepancies in the Working Party 1 report for what the recommendations are for consent. He's currently checking them.

>> HIROSHI OTA: The first one TD370, we haven't received revision 2. I think the latest one is revision 1.

Could you clarify?

>> CHAIR: Revision 2 is not posted, but apparently it has been sent in.

>> (Off mic)

>> CHAIR: I'm sorry. Can someone pass a microphone?

>> It appears the document posted as R1 on the website is internally marked R2.

So within the document, which is posted as R1, the title says R2.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So is that the document?

I just want to make sure that is the correct document.

>> It appears it is indeed the correct document.

>> CHAIR: So we're showing this document on the screen now, TD70R1 which shows as R1. At least from the counselor's machine.

>> I just went to the Plenary website. Downloaded document which is listed there as R1. And I see document marked as R2.

>> CHAIR: So I think this is going offline. We won't be approving this right now. So if maybe the counselor, the editors, Rapporteurs can assess this. And we'll come back to it later, please. Okay. Is there any issue for any other ones, Hiroshi?

>> HIROSHI OTA: (Off mic)

>> CHAIR: So the others are okay? They're all posted? Okay.

Okay. We'll put the first one on hold. We'll come back to that later, once it is confirmed what the text document is. So we'll go to G9802. Amendment 2, which is the multiple wavelength. The text is in TD 371R1 of plen. There are no A5s for either of these. Is that correct Mr. Star?

>> That's correct.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So any discussion on this? Okay. This one is consented G9802. And next is G9806 corrigendum 2, text is in TD372R1 of plen. Any comment on this one? Consented. Next is G9960 amendment 2, text is in TD386R2 of plen.

Any comments on this one? It is consented. Okay. The next is the text proposed for agreement. We have three supplements here, are these revisions all posted? Yes? Okay. So the first one is the supplement on use cases and requirements for fiber based in premises networking and home applications, in TD377R1. The discussion here. It is agreed. The next is practical aspects of security, TD387R2. It is agreed. Next is enhanced optical line termination with I.T. functions supplement, text in TD397R1. That is agreed as well. We have two texts for review. We have the HNT standards overview and work plan. Version 17. And TD318R1. That is confirmed. And then the second one is the ANT standards overview work plan version 40. In TD317R1. Okay. That is confirmed as well for review. Thank you very much.

So we'll come back to the first one later.

So the next document then is TD 303. On the Work Programme for Working Party 1. Mr. Star?

>> WP1: TD303 show updates to the Work Programme. Please take special note of the column on the right of editor assignments. There is updates there where we are assigning some now editors at this meeting. And at the bottom, you will find 1.A.1 for an amendment to a recollection and five A.13s for new supplements that we're starting work on. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. So we'll go through this one at a time. We'll start with the Work Programme at the beginning. Which contains the editors. So if you can scroll up to the top. So we'll sort of agree this in different sections. If we can look over the top to the editors are listed Hiroshi. Please.

Full table of editors. To let you know, when we agree in the work plan, we agree the editors that have been assigned here. Just to let you know, the ‑‑ to remind you that by default the Rapporteur is the editor. But in many cases, the Rapporteur would like to have less work and assign an editor to work on that. So this is what we're doing here. Any comments on the editors and work items listed here?

Okay. So go one by one in the new set listed in the Annexes on the bottom. So the first one is A.1 justification for new recommendation for G9804.1 amendment 3. Maybe you can zoom in a little bit?

Hiroshi, please. So I can see it. With the editor identified here. Scope, summary. Scroll down, please. Relations to the other standards, and scroll down further.

Showing the supporting members.

With no liaisons to Study Groups or standards bodies foreseen at this time. Seems odd.

Any comments on this one? Maybe I could ask why on this one of there is no foreseen liaisons with other Study Groups? Typically, most of the work has some interaction with broadband Forum or other groups.

>> WP1: I ask the Q2 Rapporteur to ask why no other Study Groups or standards bodies are involved in the A1?

 >> I think this is a slight update project. Not meant to development of entirely new set of requirements. So that is why there is during the inception of this refreshed project, it didn't seem like it needed to have particular liaison activity. That's all. Of course, it would be if people ‑‑ something comes up and we need to liaise, we would do that.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for that explanation. Any other comments on this?

Okay. Then this is agreed. So let's go to the next one, Hiroshi. Please. The next one is A13 justification for a new technical paper on broadband access and in‑premises network. With proposed editors here. It looks like various Rapporteurs.

Okay. This ... scroll down here.

Scroll down to the supporting members and text here. So this is a little odd having four or five editors. Maybe I could ask why is it the view that we need so many editors or cooks in the kitchen for this one as opposed to ‑‑

>> WP1: Right. This is sort of unusual. Because this spans all four questions.

>> CHAIR: I was wondering if that was the point.

>> WP1: It is truly trying to capture the entire breadth of Working Party 1. So it was decided that the various parts will be edited by the experts in each party.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you for that. Wanted clarity. That's fine. Any other comments?

If not, then we can agree that. Next is A13 justification for proposed new supplement on FGODU over point to multipoint network. The scope here. Scroll down. See the relations to other standards. And liaisons and the supporting members. Any discussion on this one? Okay. We can agree to start this work item.

So the next one is A13 justification for new proposed revision of the supplement on practical aspects on PON security.

With the editors noted here.

With the summary and if you scroll down ... the list here. Okay. Any comments on this one?

Okay. We can agree this. The next one is the proposed draft new supplement on use case and requirements of fiber in‑premises for small, medium enterprise applications.

Editors shown here. And then scroll down see the summary, scope, and the supporting members.

Any comments on this one?

Okay. We can agree that.

Next one is ITU‑T supplement on use cases requirements and technical vision of ISAC for in‑premises networks. Showing the editors here. With the supporting members listed here.

Any comments on this document here? Question that I have is if this is going to provide a technical vision for the future development of Wi‑Fi, first Question is that in our scope? The second Question is why is 802.11 not on the list of liaisons?

>> WP1: I can take a shot at that, but perhaps the Rapporteur wishes to speak. Do you want me to ... okay. I'll take a shot at it, and you can probably do it better than I can. I think this will focus on integrated sensing of the fiber in the premises more than the Wi‑Fi. I believe that is correct, correct me if I'm wrong. So perhaps that answers the Question. Perhaps this should be clarified.

Oh, here we are. No? Anyone want to speak further to this? Was that an adequate answer.

>> CHAIR: That may be an adequate answer, but you need to change the text here. If you scroll back up to the text. The future development of Wi‑Fi. You said integration, which is not what this says.

>> WP1: Yeah.

>> CHAIR: So you need to be clear that we're not doing the technical vision for the future development of Wi‑Fi. That is not in our scope.

>> WP1: I will ask the Rapporteur to update the A13.

>> CHAIR: We can do it on the fly. I think it is better to update this offline and we can come back to this one. I would also recommend adding 802.11 in the liaisons.

>> WP1: Thank you.

>> CHAIR: We'll come back to this one. Next one, please.

>> WP1: That's it.

>> CHAIR: That's the last one? Okay. That's ‑‑ next TD is ... 303. 304. Yeah. So maybe you can briefly introduce liaison set and we'll go through one at a time.

>> WP1: Thank you. TD304 provides seven outgoing liaisons from WP1.

>> CHAIR: Let's review the liaisons and progress them. This is the table of liaisons. Maybe you can go to the liaisons. The first liaison this is the title here, maybe you can scroll up here Hiroshi. If you can scroll up to the title, I'm trying to understand the title. This is the standard and work plan. ITU‑T Study Group 5 Study Group 9, 6A, 6B. ITU‑R 802.3. This provides if you scroll down ... this includes the work plan updates.

Okay. If you can keep scrolling.

Any comments on this? Can we agree this liaison? Okay. Thank you. The next one.

This is the update of it to all of the groups noted here. The link. Yes, okay. Any comments on this one? Okay, this is agreed to send.

The next one is the HNT overview and work plan to TSAG Study Groups 5, 9, 13, 16, 17, 1, 5, 6. So forth. Okay.

Link to the work plan and overview. Very good. Any comments on this? Not, if not, that's agreed. The next one, Hiroshi, please.

Conformance and interoperability Study Group 11. Scroll down.

This provides an updated list for Study Group 11. Any comments on this? This is agreed. So the next one ... the ANT, HNT work plans to Study Group 20 and ITU‑D as well.

Scroll down.

Provides the information. Very good. Any comments on this one? Agreed. The next one.

Liaison to TSAG. This one here is on the potential merger of Question 4 of Study Group 9 into Question 2 of Study Group 15.

This liaison notes that there ‑‑ the background of the Question in Study Group 9 suggests that it has a strong relationship with Question 2 of Study Group 15. And suggests that, that be merged into Question 2 of Study Group 15. That particular work item within ‑‑ currently in Study Group 9.

So the Annex that is included here shows a potential addition to the Question text for Question 2 to include this. So just to clarify. This is not in the Question text that we have agreed to send to TSAG. This is in addition to that.

>> That's correct.

>> CHAIR: Okay.

So this is sending this to TSAG. Okay. This is ‑‑ if Study Group 9 or Study Group 16 are meeting to discuss this? Or if there is a joint management team of Study Group 9 and Study Group 16. I don't know, are they receiving liaisons Hiroshi? If we sent this to TSAG, would that be sufficient? Or should we send it to this joint management team of Study Group 9 and 16 or to 9 and 16 as well? Or is TSAG sufficient for this? Probably.

>> HIROSHI OTA: Thank you, Chair. Since this consolidation, as we say is under discussion in TSAG, so I believe sending it to TSAG is sufficient. But also it should be noted that the joint management team of Study Group 9 and 16 are not requesting any external comment for the time being. And that they want to focus their merger only. So we should note that is the situation. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Okay. So then this is the ‑‑ we're sending it to the right place. So it is just so that they're aware of the interests here of Study Group 15 in Question 2. Okay. Thank you. Any comments on this liaison?

Okay. Thank you. We'll agree that. The next one is liaison response to questions on the role of power line telecommunications in home networking to ITU‑R. Working Party 6 A. If we scroll down. See some of the comments here. Okay. Any comments on this?

Okay. That's agreed.

Next that's it. Okay. Did we approve all the liaisons or one ‑‑ I think we did, right? Yes. Okay.

Thank you Mr. Star, is there one more document for you.

>> WP1: Yes, one last, which is the TD 305 on interim activities.

>> CHAIR: Okay. If you can introduce TD 305.

>> WP1: Yes, 305 mentions two face‑to‑face interim meetings and several virtual meetings, including this one on the technical paper involving all of the questions. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Any comments on the interim meeting proposals? I guess interregnum meetings, since this is the end of the study period. Any comments? If not, they're agreed. Thank you very much, Mr. Star. So we'll come back to your other points after coffee?

>> WP1: Let's check with Q2, they have been busy over there addressing the first matter on the numbering for 370, I think.

>> CHAIR: Okay.

>> Yeah, so 370R2 was sent to the TSB, it slipped through the cracks. It has been uploaded now. R2 is the correct number, was always the correct number.

>> CHAIR: But now it is available?

>> Yes.

>> CHAIR: Very good. So we can come back to that one then.

>> Mr. Chair?

>> Let him finish this.

>> CHAIR: Is it a different point?

>> The other point.

>> CHAIR: If you can hold it. We'll clear this and then we'll come to it.

You this is for consent. Go back to our table of consents.

R2. This is the first one. G.9804.2 amendment 2.

I'm waiting for my counselor to be comfortable that all of the documentation is in order.

Is it all good from your perspective, Hiroshi? Very good. Thank you very much. Are there any further comments on this?

Okay.

This is agreed for consent. Thank you. Was there ‑‑ what was the other?

>> Mr. Brown has something on the A13.

>> Yes, if you can come back to TD303, I think it was.

The A13 on ISAC.

>> CHAIR: This one here.

>> The simplest solution to fix this one is just delete the words "and Wi‑Fi" in the scope. Not necessary for deleting "and Wi‑Fi."

>> CHAIR: But the summary on number 3, study of integrating sensing of fiber and WLAN.

>> Okay. Delete "and WLAN" then. If we feel a necessity to liaise with IEEE. It is primarily sensing devices attached to the fiber.

>> CHAIR: This is sensing devices attached to the fiber, no intention for Wi‑Fi for this particular supplement.

>> I don't believe so.

>> CHAIR: Okay. How do we do that logistically Hiroshi. Do we need an updated R1 with these deletes? Or can we agree that he will do that?

>> HIROSHI OTA: This is a small change. We can agree on the amendment.

>> CHAIR: To be clear, the TSB will delete the two words? Is that correct? TSB will handle the deleting "and Wi‑Fi" "and WLAN"? Okay. Maybe you can highlight in red the section or texts that we will be deleting when we are approving this. In yellow. The two texts in yellow. And Wi‑Fi and WLAN will be deleted from this A13. Okay.

So with that modification and TSB will note that. So will you update this the? You will do the update to the TD and submit. Any comments? Can we agree? Okay. Thank you very much.

One more.

>> HIROSHI OTA: I notice that the concerning G dot sup it says revision 2. But on the web, I found the revision up to revision 3.

I wonder if revision 2 and 3 are the same? Whether you have further ‑‑ yet another new version? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Unless the Rapporteur tells me differently, I thought R2 was the latest and greatest.

>> So I have checked actually yesterday. R2 and R3 are the same. Just uploaded twice.

>> CHAIR: It is noted as the same document.

(Overlapping conversations)

>> CHAIR: In any case, we approved R2. So if approving R2 is sufficient, that is what we will do. Okay.

>> >> HIROSHI OTA: Thank you for clarification, probably we can delete R3.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you very much Mr. Stern.

So next move to Working Party 2. I think we can get some Working Party 2 completed before coffee. Mr. Dulin. This is TD311. Mr. Dulin.

>> WP2: Since we have two minutes before coffee I'll take the liberty of reading the report verbatim. The introduction is fairly ‑‑ Tom is telling me to get closer to the microphone. Or I could just speak louder. The Agenda was in 159 of Working Party 2, the objectives you have seen many times. Two changes in the leadership in Rapporteur roles. Mr. Mira Cammie can't continue with his work. We thanked him. He's sitting over there. We have two new Rapporteurs to take over the responsibility.

Mr. Pondillo is unable to continue with his liaison responsibilities and Mr. Ferrety has assumed those. Minor changes.

Two face‑to‑face activities, one in Berlin and e‑meeting of Question 8 for Working Party 2. The questions met in parallel. Joint meetings A between 6/11, 12, 13, 14. And report is in 21. Joint J with Q25 and 6. There is a report in this report, 3318 of this document and joint between Q6 and 11. That report is included. We have eight amendments, four texts for the agreement of this Plenary meeting. 7A1s and three outgoing liaisons. We have the plens and Work Programme and list of outgoing liaison statements and proposed interim activities in 315. That is the reason I had to revise this document. I apologize, I left the old Working Party 2 references in there.

Moving down to the report of Question 5. L.101 is a revision for consent. L.102 is something we were going to consent but we realized we need to refine the scope of this recommendation and we'll prepare an A1 at the next meeting in March of 2025.

103, that is here for consent. It is a revision of L.104 that we have an A1 for.

We will revise that. We'll do that by correspondence.

The same with amendment 1 for L.110. There is an A1. We expect correspondence in completing that in October 2025. Revision of L.111. Correspondence again. That will be completed slightly later in 2026.

Revision of 652. The famous 652 is here for consent. 654 is also here for consent. Revision of 657. Asking for consent of that G.supplement.40 as has G.supplement 47. The work on G.supplement G65X is the result of a liaison going out that we will ask for your permission to send out that we will see later on. We have new work items which I will address in Question 7's report. We revised as did the other questions in Working Party 2, the TROFCS and also looked at LSTPGLSR. A technical series. Moving to 32217. 652 is famous in part because of its great age. The 40th year anniversary of 652.
There was earlier this week a publicity or social media activity by the TSB to make the rest of the world aware of that.

Had a joint meeting with Q2, Q5 and Q6. And we had some outgoing liaisons in 3242. And outgoing liaisons we will see in a short while. We updated our Work Programme and we have a small number of interim activities proposed.

And again, we'll see them in a later document. Moving on down to Q6. If we go down please Hiroshi to 3 it is here for consent in 9.1. I think that work started in London several years ago. That has been progressed across several questions and I'm glad to see that progressed.

Draft or revised supplement G39. We thought we might get that done here. The work here is a result encourages us to think it is ready for agreement in November in the interregnum. We will see what the management team has for that. That work progressed very well. We certainly though are willing to entertain more contributions towards it in the interim meeting. That Q6 will hold. Satellite FFO in 3329, nothing is on it. It is interesting that work like that is popping up.

The item below it draft new recommendation GDFOS. That is going to be the subject of a future joint meeting. So expect at the next Plenary to be invited to one of those. It is clearly this sensing activity that is clearly spreading across multiple questions in this Study Group.

323‑11. Integrated fiber communication and perception. This is an expansion of the work or indicates interest in emerging innovative topics.

What we have done here is ask Mr. Wang to have a first cut at a technical report and if we like that or if the Question likes it, they will then decide to actually start a work item to really develop the technical report. And so we'll probably look at that in the interregnum meeting in Kong Hong. I hope we will be able to.

Draft recommended 661 work ongoing. And 663, work targeted at that, we feel is probably more useful in G sup 39 and all of the contributors were advised of that.

G671 work ongoing. G672 work ongoing. There is correspondence to take place on that. Mr. Caviary will work on that.

One of the items that is very visible outside of this Study Group 800GWDM, revision of 6982. A lot of work done on this during the meeting. And I'm grateful to the breakout. There was breakouts, multiple versions of working Documents. People agreed to continue progressing this aggressively, I would say.

And we're looking forward to continued progress on that in the interim meeting. We are sending liaisons, I think, on aspects of that work as well.

698.4 work is ongoing. The joint correspondence activity you have seen that mentioned previously. That actually will be mentioned tomorrow in the workshop with IEEE. It is important work and fine example of work amongst Question 2, 56 and us in IEEE. I'm grateful to the Rapporteurs, all of them for progressing that work.

TROFCS is a huge amount of work for the editors and Rapporteurs in Working Party 2 over the two years of this study period. And that document we're asking for group here. We agreed our terms of reference. That was reviewed in joint K, I think. Along with the other Working Parties and questions. We have two outgoing liaison statement for Question 6 along a well curated list of our prioritized work there.

And we have the joint interim meeting or interregnum meeting in Hong Kong to look forward to in November. See if we can move to Question 7, please. 3.4 to 2.2, LSTPGLSR. It is a guide to the old recommendations. We're asking for agreement for that. We have a revision of L.341 that we will do by correspondence. Revision of L360 by correspondence. And work on L.PCC will continue by correspondence. And in 3.4.2.6, we have a significant piece of new work initiated here. This is optical network infrastructure sharing L.NIS. It was significant interest in this. It has involved ITU‑D, I believe. It is difficult to build infrastructure in certain countries, it would be better to share that infrastructure rather than endure the cost of multiple builds. We have agreed to start work on technical and functional. And we have sharing with an A1. I thank Mr. Keto for the management of this topic during the meeting. 3.4.2.7 is interesting given the climate changes we see this to tell you when nasty weather events are happening.

This seeks to contemplate with how to warn people about freezing disasters.

3.91 is a revision we are going to do. There is an A1 for that in Annex F. We revised the Question text and we generated some liaisons going out of which we will see in the second document after this, I think. The important one, again, is the outgoing liaison on L.NIS network infrastructure sharing. As you can see, we're sending that to the ITU‑D and ITU‑T Study Group 3.

Moving on to Question 8, the last of our questions. You see the main work items there. LSTPGLSR we have seen this. That is here for agreement. The existing recommendations G.971, we're asking for consent on that. And 972 asking for consent on that. 976, the consent date for that is October of next year. 978, again March next year. Not October. 979 consent date for that is in October of next year. G.sup 41 design guidelines is here for agreement at this meeting. And here we come to two major achievements. Two new recommendations, G.9730.1, dedicated scientific sensing submarine cable systems. That is a new recommendation which we are asking for consent for.

And 9730.2, the scientific monitoring and reliable telecommunication submarine systems, again, a new recommendation. And I thank the editors and Rapporteur for their hard work developing those recommendations. Future interaction of the work. In connection with those two new recommendations, no sooner do you finish two recommendations than you decide, well there is other work intended on them. We reserved G.9730 for a future general information recommendation for sensing recommendations. And clearly the notion is there, there are going to be more sensing recommendations. 9370 is the guide to that series of Documents.

We have interim activities towards progress, 976, 978 and 979.

Go down please toward below Annex B. In Annex B, our Rapporteurs and Associate Rapporteurs remain the same. Grateful to all of those. And this now reflects the change in our Liaison Rapporteurs.

(Listing names) new Liaison Rapporteurs to TC86SC86C and vince taking the responsibilities towards IEC questions or Working Parties, whatever they are in IEC. That concludes my report. Slightly over coffee time. I'm sorry.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much Mr. Dulin for that report. Are there any comments on the Working Party 2 report?

If not, then we can agree that. And we'll take the rest of the ‑‑ I'm sorry. Could we get a microphone coming over. There is a microphone coming to you.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a simple thing. The next meeting, there is nothing there. Should that be deleted? Thank you.

>> Normally we put in the next Plenary meeting.

>> CHAIR: You can indicate the next Plenary meeting. It is the next Plenary meeting is the point. We will indicate the next Plenary meeting. Thank you for that. So we'll take coffee break now before we continue with the Working Party 2. And just to remind you, the intention is we'll take a group photo. And so our photographer, that is in the back here will take our picture on the stairs outside. So on the way up to the escalators, we'll take a picture there. So before you get your coffee, please everyone get up and we'll go out and take a photo at the stairs. And then we'll start back at 11:15 after coffee. And we'll start with certificate presentations after coffee. Once the certificate presentations are finished we'll continue with the Working Party 2 reports.

(Coffee break)
>> CHAIR: Okay. We'll start back up now, not the meeting, but we'll do the presentation of certificates.

To the management team. For their work during the study period.

And so what we'll do is take the pictures here with myself presenting, our Director will be on one side and we'll have the recipient in between us. We'll see how well this works.

And we'll take a picture, the photographer will take a picture here as we go. And these are sorted in order. Hiroshi told me there was an order. What was the order Hiroshi? Maybe you can remind us of the ordero ‑‑ order so people can line up on the side.

>> HIROSHI OTA: Vice‑Chair, then Working Party Chair, then Working Party Vice‑Chairs. The tricky thing is it is sorted in Working Party 1 Chair, Working Party 3 Chair. Then Working Party 1 Vice‑Chair, Rapporteur and Associate Rapporteur. Rapporteurs from Question 1‑14 first. Then society Rapporteur for Question 1‑14 starts.

So the first, Study Group 15 Vice‑Chairs.

>> CHAIR: You are first on the list.

(Calling names)

>> CHAIR: Moving to Working Party Chairs.
(Calling names)

>> CHAIR: Now to the Vice‑Chairs of Working Parties.

(Calling names)

>> CHAIR: Now move on to the Rapporteurs. (Calling names)

That was the Rapporteurs. Now to the Associate Rapporteurs.
(Calling names)

If someone knows where he is, or can find him, that would be great.

(Calling names)

>> CHAIR: Okay. I think that is the list. We have a few that are not here. (Listing names)

Okay. Very good. I will invite the management team back up to the head table, and then we can resume.

Okay. Before we get going, there is one more that we forget. There is no certificate ... but I still want to recognize Shen, the acting Associate Rapporteur for Question 6. I would like to invite you to come up for a photograph and express my appreciation for a picture with him and the Director here.

(Applause)

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. Let's resume our discussions and proceed with the next document from Working Party 2, Hiroshi, are you able to present? I think we're at 312, the text for determination, consent, agreement from Working Party 2.

Okay. It is sharing now. Please go ahead.

>> WP2: Thank you, Chair, these are the Documents sent to Plenary for consent. 10 Documents and four proposed for agreement. Mr. Parson is looking at the titles of the Documents, they're not particularly helpful. Those are the titles of the TD, not of the document itself. G.knife 9.1 is optical transport layer interfaces. Would you like me to provide the proper document title when you ask the meeting for its ‑‑

>> CHAIR: Yes. As we go, perhaps you can indicate that. And maybe we can ‑‑ maybe you can do an R1 of this, with the titles in it afterwards. To clean it up.

>> WP2: I will. Great point.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Let's progress and agree the four consent. First document is F.959.1. And text is in TD 343R1.

>> WP2: That is optical layer transport interfaces.

>> CHAIR: Agree for consent. The next is recommendation L.1001. In TD 351R1 plen.

>> WP2: Optical fiber for buried applications.

>> CHAIR: Any questions on this document. Agreed for consent. Next is L103. The text is in TD 353R1 plen.

>> WP2: Optical fiber for indor applications.

>> CHAIR: Any comments on this? Okay. Can we agree for consent? The next is G.657, the text is in TD 356R1.

>> WP2: Bending loss in sensitive fiber.

>> CHAIR: Can we agree for consent? The next is G971. Text is in TD 369R1.

>> WP2: General features of submarine cables.

>> CHAIR: Agree for consent. Next is G652 the first revision in a number of years, I think. In any case, the text is in TD 375R2.

>> WP2: Single mode cable and fiber recommendation.

>> CHAIR: Comments on this one? Can we agree for consent? Thank you. Next is G9730.1. The text is in TD 384R1.

>> WP2: Dedicated scientific sensing submarine cables.

>> CHAIR: Agree for consent. Thank you. Next is no.973.2, text in TD 393R1.

>> WP2: Title is scientific monitoring and reliable telecommunications.

>> CHAIR: Can we agree for consent? Thank you? Next is G972, TD three 94R1.

>> WP2: For optimal fiber systems.

>> CHAIR: Agree for consent. Thank you, next is G654, TD 395R1.

>> WP2: Cut off single mode fiber.

>> CHAIR: Agree for consent. Thank you. Next is proposed text for agreement. The first is G sup 40 revision. The text is in TD 368R1.

>> WP2: Optical fiber and cable recommendations and standards guideline.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any comments on this one? Okay. That is agreed. The next is technical report on optical fibers, cables and systems. The text is in TD 374R1. Any comments on this one? No? That is agreed. The next is G sup 41, revision, with the text in TD 385R1.

>> WP2: Design guidelines for optical fiber submarine applications.

>> CHAIR: Comments on this one? Agreed. And the next is revision of this technical paper. What is the title of this one? The guide on the use of the L series recommendations. In TD396R1. Is that the end of this document? Yes? Okay. That's the end of that document. Thank you very much. The next we can move to the Work Programme in TD 313 of plen.

>> WP2: In the Annexes we will come to them. If you scroll down, please, Hiroshi. See the updated Work Programme, yellow highlights, things to pay attention to. As you are asked to do, look closely at the editors. Especially if you are named, make sure you are not assigned the wrong document. If we move down, most of the changes in fact, in this document are around timing. So the first one, for example, G.65, the timing has changed to 2025. One below, timing changes. I think the priority was changed as well. L.102 is an A1, I think for that. 202510 and similarly down through this. I hope you don't require me to read all of them.

>> CHAIR: No.

>> WP2: If Hiroshi scrolls reasonably slowly you can look if there is a problem. L.27.

>> CHAIR: A clarification, is the yellow highlighting the changes?

>> WP2: Yeah.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you.

Okay. Any comments on ‑‑ any comments on the list of editors then? Before we go through the A1 justifications?

Okay. We can take the editors as agreed.

Let's go through the A1 justifications. Maybe you can zoom in Hiroshi. The first A1 justification is for proposed revision of L1004, small count optical fibers for indoor applications. Going into the editor here, the scope. Scroll down then. The liaisons and supporting members. Any comments on this? Can we agree this A1? Okay. Thank you.

So next is the A1 justification of L105 optical fiber cables for drop applications. Text is there with the editor indicated. Scroll down, we see liaisons and supporting members. Any comments on this one? Can we agree this A1? Thank you.

So the next one is the revision of L110, optical fiber cables for direct surface application. Base text noted and the scope. Summary, relations. And supporting members. Okay. Any comments on this one? Can we agree to this? Thank you. The next A1 and Annex D is proposed revision to L111 optical fiber for in‑home applications. Base text is the existing standard. Scroll down. See the supporting members. Any comments? Can we agree? Thank you. Next one.

Annex E is proposed recommendation L.NIS practical considerations for network infrastructure sharing. Base text in TD176 of Working Party 2, texts here. Summary indicated here. Keep scrolling down.

And the supporting members.

Okay. Any comments on this? Okay. That's agreed. Next is A1 justification for proposed revision of L391/L81. Monitoring systems for outside of plant facilities. Scroll down. See the summary of the revision work would be. And scroll down here any comments on this one? Okay. That's agreed.

And then the next one is proposed revision for G.979. Characteristics for monitoring optical sur marine cable systems. ‑‑ submarine cable systems. Revision includes these items.

And indicating that supporting members and liaisons. Any comments on this one?

If not, this is agreed. Was that the last one? Okay. Thank you very much. So that concludes the new A1s and work items. Next would be the liaison statement from Working Party 2 in TD 314. Maybe you can provide a summary of those and then we can approve them one by one.

>> WP2: Thank you, Chair. You see (off mic)

We have five liaisons proposed out of here to revision of 652 we talked about to IEEE, armonized work, now on multiplexing and asking IEC to coperate with us on that. We're informing ITU‑D Study Group 1 and ITU‑T about the new L.NIS. Telling OIF about the splendid progress we made on the 800 gig here and on techniques we're developing to deal with transmitter characterization. And we're sending very similar liaison to the IEEE.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Let's progress through each of the Annexes for the liaison. The first one is to the 802.3 Working Party of IEEE. This is on G652. You scroll down, we'll see the text. This is to give them information on the chromatic dispersion studies that we have been doing. And we're attaching the Documents here. This is for information I presume? Okay. Any comments on this liaison?

This is approved. And TSB would note it would be helpful to be sent before the 802.3 Plenary starts Monday.

Next is in Annex 2. This is a liaison to IEC, SC86 with information to 86B and C on the request for harmonized work item on the space division multiplex.

Okay. With an attachment of one of our supplements. Okay. Any comments on this?

Okay. This is agreed. So the next one is to ITU‑D Study Group 1. And ITU‑T Study Group 3. On new work item on practical considerations for network infrastructure sharing. If you scroll down on this, this is to let them know about the new work item that we just agreed. And attaches the A1. Any comments on this? That's agreed. Next is the ‑‑ no, that's the attachment. Next is liaison to OIF on 1600ZR plus. Scroll down. Further draft, providing an attachment of work. Okay.

Any comments on this? This is agreed then.

Next is liaison to 802.3 on beyond 400. If you scroll down on this one. This is on the 400, and 800 gig and attaching TD 214 to this as well. And also reminding this needs to be sent before Monday as well. Right? Okay. Any discussion on this one? This is agreed. That was the end of the set, I think.

Okay. Next document then is interim activities.

>> (Off mic)

>> CHAIR: The projection is not working. Where is our stage vision projector?

Is it back now? Yeah, well there was ‑‑ the cable was loose up on the stage here. I thought they had fixed it.

I don't see them back there.

Emmanuel, can you find the stage vision folks? The projectors are not working.

>> (Off mic)

>> CHAIR: So which one was the R1 we were just talking about? Was it the liaison statements the 314R1. Or maybe clarify.

>> WP2: I'm sorry for causing the extra work for the TSB, I changed the water mark on the document, because it was showing the water mark for a TD of Working Party 2.

>> CHAIR: Headers and footers, editorial point. That is fine.

Emmanuel, you called them? All right.

So next is TD315, the interim activities.

So maybe Mr. Dulin, you can introduce the interim activities. Maybe extraverbaly since there are no screens available.

>> WP2: We list our face‑to‑face meetings confirmed about two months before the meeting start. We have but one of them, Question 6 at the invitation going to Hong Kong with 11 and 13, I think, between 18 and 22 of November. They have a long list of as I said earlier well curated topics that they intend to work on. Those are the same topics listed in the Question 6 part of the Working Party 2 report. I can read them if you want me to? It is on the screen now I don't need to.

>> CHAIR: Yes.

>> WP2: Beyond that, two virtual meetings proposed. Both of them are confirmed. The second of them on G.FSO, the date hasn't been finalized yet. And we have several correspondence activities, four to be proposed here. As I mentioned, Q8 wants to work on the G976, 78, 79 Documents. Q6 wants to progress the work we sent liaisons on before the meeting in Hong Kong and a couple of other items as well. Actually several other items. And as usual, Question 5 will conduct a lot of its work by correspondence, the revision of the documents towards looking for consent meetings in 25 and 26.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much Mr. Dulin, any comments on the proposed interim meeting and correspondence activities for Working Party 2?

Okay. Not hearing any, so then this ‑‑ these activities are then agreed. Okay. Thank you very much Mr. Dulin for your work on Working Party 2. So let's proceed now to Working Party 3. And so I'll ask Mr. Betts to introduce I guess 321, which is the main report first.

>> WP3: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hiroshi you may find it easier to use the document map feature to navigate through the document. I should warn you, it is 65 pages long.

>> CHAIR: And lunch is only a half hour away, is it?

>> WP3: Yes.

(Chuckling)
Going through the report very quickly. The interim activities outlined in Annex B. In terms of the work at this meeting, just in case you are thinking we'll get finished before lunch, we have 33 recommendations of consent, two Documents for agreement, two Documents for review.

We have 19 liaison statements and 36 new work items. So moving on to Question 10 and I really am just giving the absolute top‑level highlights. So Question 10 is initiated work on new recommendation to simplify the referencing of the IEEE at 2.3 landman standards. Q11 is continuing to revine and enhance the suite of OTM recommendations. And refine. And starting the work on the definition of beyond one terabit interfaces. They plan to hold an interregnum meeting face‑to‑face in Hong Kong hosted by haway. And the digital applications, Question 12 also updated the OTNT standardization work plan.

And they're planning to hold an interregnum meeting in Geneva jointly with Question 14. Question 13 as usual, we're very busy, continuing to enhance the accuracy and robustness of time and frequency distribution. One of the interesting things that they're starting on is the work in cooperation with a number of IEEE Committees. On applying or extending the ITU defined sync frameworks and protocols to synchronization in data centres. There is a lot of interest not just from network operates but from the data centre operators to harmonize this work.

Question 13 is interregnum meeting in Hong Kong. And an e‑meeting to coordinate the synchronization work.

Question 14 is continuing to work in cooperation with the whole list of other standards, organisations, to provide consistent information models and data models for transport networks. Focusing on Ethernet and network synchronization. Working closely with Question 13 to advance the work of the synchronization models. They will be having an interregnum meeting in Geneva joint with Question 12. There is a series to coordinate with the management recommendations. And three series of E meetings to advance work on management. That is a quick summary of the work in Working Party 3, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Malcolm. Any comments on the report from Working Party 3?

Comprehensive set of work. Okay. If not, we can ‑‑ can we agree to this report? Thank you very much.

Next Malcolm, if we can proceed with the document for determination consent agreement and approval in TD 322.

>> WP3: As usual, nothing for approval or determination. We go straight to consent. I have no particular comments on any of these. If you would like to just take them one at a time?

>> CHAIR: I'll take them one at a time and we'll go through. Okay. So these are the documents for consent from Working Party 3. The first is G8121. Cor 1. The functional equipment blocks, text in TD 404. Any comments? This is consented. The next is G8121 cor two. On the OAM mechanisms for the SMTP. Text in TD 405.

Any comments on this? We agree to consent? Thank you. Next is G709.1, amendment 1. This is flex OTN common elements. Text is in TD 338R1. Any comments on this? Can we agree to consent? Thank you. Next is G7095 amendment 1, the short reach interface TD 339 plen. Comments? Thank you. Next is G79 amendment 2. Characteristics of OTN hierarchy functional blocks. Text in TD 341 revision one with A five justification in TD 347.

Any comments on this? We can consent that. Next is G808.4 linear projection for FGMTN and FGOTN text in TD 334R1. That is consented. Next is G8312 amendment 3, amendment 3, TD 340R1. We agree to consent that. Thank you. Next is Q8312.20 amendment 1, overview of FGMTM amendment. Text in TD 380R1. We agree to consent. Thank you. Next is G8321. Equipment MTM amendment. Text is TD 376R1. Can we agree to consent. Thank you.

Next is G807. The architecture of the optical media network, TD 336R1. Any comments on this revision? It is consented. Next G7701. Common control aspects, text in TD 335R1. We agree to consent. Thank you. Next G7701SDN control. Text in TD 337R1. Can we agree to consent? Thank you.

Next is G7703 amendment 2, architecture for ASON and TD 344R1. Can we agree to consent? Thank you. Next is G781 amendment 1. Synchronization layer functions for frequency synchronization based on physical layer. Text is in TD 378R1. Can we agree to consent? Thank you, G8251, control of jitter and warer TD 379R1. Consented. Next is G8262 revision. Timing characteristics, TD 361R1 and A five in TD 357. And next is G8265 amendment 1. PTP profile for frequency. Text in TD 362R1 of plen.

Consented. Next is G8271 amendment one. Time and phase synchronization. Text in TD 366R1 with A five in TD 398R1. Can we agree to consent? Thank you. Next is G8272.2 amendment 1. Timing characteristics of boundary clocks with full‑timing submit. Text in TD 364R1 and A5 in TD 359. Consented.

Next is G8273.3 amendment 1. Timing characteristics of telecom industry clocks, text in TD 363R1 and A5 is in TD 360. Can we agree to that for consent. Next is G8273.4 timing clocks, text in TD 358R1. Agree to consent here? Thank you.

Next is G8275 amendment 1, architecture for packet based time distribution. TD 382R1. Can we agree to consent.

Next is G8275.1 amendment 2, profile for network, TD 383R1 is the text. Agree to consent. Next is G8275.2, partial timing support of the network. Text in TD 367R1. Can we agree to consent? Thank you.

Next is Q875OTN protocol, neutral management, TD in TD 391R1. Mr. Betts is this requesting extra time?

>> WP3: Requesting 30 days for editing. There are two more we will come to.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Noting that extra 30 days for this revision, can we agree to consent? So it is consented. Amendment 2, management requirements information model for the optical media network, text in TD 348R2. That is consented. G7718 amendment 2, framework for the components and functions. Text in TD 373R1. That is consented. Next is G7721 amendment 2. Management requirements and information model for synchronization. Text in TD 388R1. The request for 30 days here. Can we agree to consent? Next is G7721.1 amendment one data model for synchronization management TD 389R1 and A five are requesting 30 days for editorial review. Comments here? Consent this.

Next is G8051. Next aspects for Ethernet transport. Text is in TD 349R1. That is agreed to be consented. Next is G8051. Management aspects and text in TD 3 five 0R1. Agree to consent. Next is G8152.1. OAM. Text in TD 354R1. Agree to consent. Thank you, final for consent, G8152, resilience information data models. Text is in TD 355R1. Consented.

Next is texts for agreement, that is the G sup 58. Text in TD 333 of plen. Any comments on this?

That is agreed. A new supplement on the full‑time support from the network for PTP profile. This is the telecom profile of PTP. Any case, the text is in TD 381R1. Any comments on this? We agree to that. Thank you.

For review we have the OTNT standardization work plan. In TD 319, issue 34. Any comments on that? All right. We can accept that for review. And then updated A5. Mr. Betts, you can clarify what this point is here for review?

>> WP3: At the last meeting, we consented ‑‑ I didn't see the recommendation. We consented 709.20 and we updated a reference. That required us to produce a new A5, this is simply documenting that A5. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. So this particular one was ‑‑ that was part of the AAP. Has the AAP concluded?

>> WP3: It has.

>> CHAIR: This was updated during the AAP during the process? This is just for our noting.

>> WP3: Yes.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. This is noted for review. Thank you. Okay. Thank you very much Mr. Betts. Those are the Documents for all the Documents for Working Party 3 for consent, agreement and approval. Next would be the Work Programme. That is in TD 323 of plen. Mr. Betts, please.

>> WP3: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So once again, if Hiroshi can show the document map, you will find the whole list of Annexes. So at the top we have the tables for the Work Programme. And organized by Question. So the changes to the Work Programme are shown with change marking, change tracking. And the highlights for changes to editors. So maybe just scroll through fairly quickly through Question 10, 11, you will find ‑‑ yeah. Question 11 then. Spans over a couple of pages. Question 12. Question 13. Very long list. You will notice some changes to editors or changes to affiliations. Last but by no means least, Question 14. You will see inserted rows for new work items and changes to editors. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Betts. Maybe you can clarify. There are some highlighted in yellow. And some with change marks and strike‑throughs. Maybe you can clarify what's new? What is the difference in the yellow and I guess revision marks for new editor text?

>> WP3: Some of the editors aren't changed, they're underlined because they're hyperlinks and we use highlighting for the editors. So that it becomes obvious which are changed and which aren't.

>> CHAIR: Okay. I see the bar along the left, the whole rows have been changed. Other text has been changed. The only new editors are the one in yellow?

>> WP3: That's correct. Yes.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Any comments, ladies and gentlemen, on the editors in the Work Programme of Working Party 3?

Okay. Seeing none, we can agree that. So now then, I will proceed down through the A1s, I presume. Malcolm, I'll go through one by one. And there are how many did you say?

>> WP3: 38, I believe.

>> CHAIR: See if we can get through these before lunch ... or not. We'll see. We'll see how far we go. Okay. The first one is new recommendation G.ETH. Ethernet. This is the one in the Opening Plenary introduced by IEEE. And so this is the text showing right here. For the scope and summary relations to other recommendations. Liaison with other bodies and a list of supporting members.

Okay. Any comments on this proposed new work item. Was there a base text? I'm sorry I missed it. Scroll back up.

>> WP3: Yes, base text.

>> CHAIR: In a TD 373. Thank you.

>> WP3: Yes.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Any comments on this? Okay. We can agree to the new work item. The next one is the justification for draft amendment to G8121 on MPLSTP equipment functional blocks amendment 2. Showing this here. And then showing the supporters there.

>> WP3: One minor correction to the very top of the table, where it says draft new, it should say proposed amendment to.

>> CHAIR: Yes, it is not new. It is amendment.

>> WP3: We thought we caught all. But one escaped us. Apologies.

>> CHAIR: You can make the note Hiroshi and change. That should be the same as that.

Another comment on this, it still has Y series numbering. Were we going to update it without Y series.

>> WP3: When we do a revision we can't change it.

>> CHAIR: Oh, yeah, this is just the amendment. Okay.

Okay. Thank you. Can we agree this new work item? Thank you. Next one then Hiroshi. Annex C. Draft amendment to G.8013Y1731. Hold on. The base text is the corrigenda. That correct?

Corrigendum is full text ‑‑ okay. All right. This is amendment 1 to Y1731 noting the supporters and such there. Any comments on this Mr. Original editor of Y1731, any comment? Okay. This can be agreed.

Next in Annex D is the A1 justification of draft amendment to G8021. To address editorial issues as shown here. Any concerns with this? Comments? Okay. This is agreed. Next in Annex E. Proposed amendment to G709. This is amendment 4 for G709. The base text is the enforced G709 and the proposed additions are listed here.

Scroll down Hiroshi to see the supporters.

Listed there. Any comments? Okay. This is agreed. Next is Annex F, which is a proposed amendment to G709.3, base text is in force, this amendment is here. Scroll down. We'll see the supporting members listed here. Thank you, any comments on this? Agreed.

Next is the proposed amendment to G709.6. To align to the latest G798 model. Scroll down. The liaison and supporters. Comments on this? This is agreed.

Next one is proposed amendment 2 to G8312.20, which is overview of FGMTN. Additions to be added. Scroll down. List of supporters. This is agreed. Next is the justification for ‑‑ that was all the A1s. Now we're on A13. For a new technical paper on the description of MTN. With the supporters shown here.

Can we agree to the new technical paper? New work item? Thank you.

Next. Back to A1s. This is proposed amendment to G8023. Base text is amendment 2 and showing the adaptation will function relationship clarification. Noting the supporting members.

With this one, there is no liaisons to 802.3. But it is noted as what this is updating the reference to 802.3. Maybe you can clarify why there is no relation to 802.3 on this particular ‑‑ this is an A1?

>> (Off mic)

>> CHAIR: It is mentioning the relationship, but not mentioned in the liaison. Is there no intent to liaise? So it is just intention to look at the document and make the alignments and that is sufficient?

>> WP3: Yes.

>> CHAIR: Okay.

Internal housekeeping. Very good. Any other comments on this? Okay. This is agreed. Next. A14 amendment 1 to G70920. Overview of FGOTN. Scroll down. You see the borders. Okay. Any comment here. We agree to this new work item.

Next is proposed new recommendation 8274. Architecture and requirements for packet‑based time and phase distribution. With the base text in the TD showing there. This looks like a rearranging of some text from current 8275 and splitting it in two. Okay? Very good with supporters noted here.

Okay. Can we agree to the new work item? Thank you. Okay. So the next one is A1 justification of the proposed revision to 8275, showing the revision contained in the items here. If you scroll down, you can see the supporters.

Any comments on this? So agreed.

Next in Annex P is proposed revised revision to G8275.1. With the base text in the noted TD with the following topics that are open based on the living list. It could be addressed in this amendment. Scroll down, we'll see the list of supporters.

Okay. Can we agree to this new work item? Thank you.

The next one is justification for the proposed revision of G8275.2. Showing the text here and the proposed supporters and such. So any comments here? All right. We'll agree to the new work item.

We'll continue maybe another 10 minutes into lunch to see if we can get through this list here.

So the next one is the A1 justification for proposed amendment 2 to G781. Indicating the items here. As in the scope and summary scroll down, we can see the relationship liaisons and supporters. Can we agree to this? Thank you.

Next new work item is A1 justification of the revision to G8264. So we'll do some harmonization with G781 as well as a few other items on the living list. And liaisons and supporters listed here. Can we agree to the new work item? Thank you. The next is now A13 justification for A new technical report. On optical clocks and their networking. The scope of the technical report shown here. We scroll down. See the supporters listed here. Can we agree to this new work item?

Thank you. The next one is A1 justification for amendment 2 to G8273.2, covering topics noted in the scope, scroll down. With the liaisons to other bodies and the supporters. Can we agree to this new work item. The next one is revision to G8273.3. Did you skip? Did we do that one? We just did that one, didn't we? Okay. Next is A13 justification for the proposed revision to the supplement on FTS. Scroll down. With these supporters. Can we agree to the new work item? Thank you.

The next one is the justification for revision to G77 ‑‑ I'm sorry. Okay.

>> Looks like you missed Annex T.

>> CHAIR: Yes, I thought we were missing one. But Hiroshi said we did it. T as in Tom. No we didn't do this one. Yes. There are so many. I'm relying on Hiroshi to scroll through them here. I thought he skipped one. But ... A13 justification of a new supplement on synchronization with data centres. Oh, yes, can't skip this one. Oh, yeah.

So following the scope as indicated here, and if you scroll down, we'll see the summary and the liaisons with the other activities. And a long list of supporters.

Okay. Can we agree to the new work item? Thank you. Thank you for keeping us on the ball here Sylvana. Hiroshi, what is the next one?

So next is amendment 2 to 8273.2. Showing the items here. With the supporters. Can we agree this new work item? Yes, we can. Next one I thought we did this one. And 8271 as well. Yes. Did we do 7711. This is where you rupt interrupted me. Yes. I read the title. This is revision of G7711. Scroll down, the liaison and again, another long list of supporters. Can we agree to this new work item? Thank you.

The next one is then draft revision of G sup 72 modelling considerations for optical media. As indicated here. With this list of supporters. Can we agree to this new work item? Thank you. Next. Revision of G7721. Management requirement information model for synchronization with the base text listed here. And list of supporters indicated. Can we agree to this new work item?

Yes, thank you. The next one is the A1 justification for the revision of G7721.1 data model for synchronization management. Models to be updated. Screen down. List of supporters and liaisons. Any comments on this one? Thank you.

Next is justification for the revision to G874. Management aspects. Scroll down we have a list of supporters listed here. Can we agree to this? Thank you.

Next is the A1 justification for draft amendment to G875. Protocol neutral management model. Scroll down for the list of supporters and liaisons. Can we agree this new work item? Thank you.
this next one is amendment to G151. Updating the requirements with the supporters listed here. Can we agree to this new work item? Thank you.

Next one is the amendment to G8152 protocol neutral management model for STMP. Supporters listed. Can we agree to this? Thank you.

Next one is justification for revision to G8152.2. Protocol neutral information model for MTP ‑‑ resilience information model. Showing supporters here. Can we agree to this? Thank you.

Next one is the amendment to G8350. Management and control for MTN. Can we agree to this?

Thank you. Next one is the A1 justification for amendment 2 to G8310. Scroll down showing ... okay. Any comments on this?

Can we agree to this new work item? Thank you. Is there one more? Hiroshi? Or is that the last one? This is the last one. This is AK. Justification for new recommendation on flex OTN beyond 1 terabit. Long reach interface.

This recommendation complements existing flex OTN beyond IT long reach interface. Very good that we do this. With this number of supporters listed here. Can we agree on this one.

No base text. Okay. Any comments on this? It is agreed to start this new work. That's the end of this document here. That's the ‑‑ that was the list of new work items and the Work Programme. Perhaps we should break here for lunch, because there is probably a long list of liaisons in the Working Party 3.

>> WP3: Only 19.

>> CHAIR: Well, maybe we should break for lunch here anyway at this point. So we'll ‑‑ thank you for this morning. We'll break here for lunch. We'll resume at 2:30 for ‑‑ Hiroshi, do you think we will be able to manage the rest of the Agenda before the first coffee break? We need to get through a number of things. It depends on how many liaisons Jean Marie has. We can go later now and do a couple of liaisons for Working Party 3. Do you want to try to get through a few of them perhaps, Malcolm or break for lunch now.

>> WP3: I think it will take 15 minutes to get through them all.

>> CHAIR: Let's break for lunch now. Break for lunch now, and we'll come back at 2:30 sharp! We'll be starting at 2:30 to resume the rest of the Agenda. And my expectations we'll be finished certainly before coffee break this afternoon. And we'll have a little surprises at the end. So don't leave yet.

Okay. We'll ‑‑ we're in recess, we'll resume at 2:30 p.m. Enjoy your lunch.
(Lunch break)

(Gavel)

>> CHAIR: Welcome back. Hope you had an enjoyable lunch. We will continue on our Agenda. We're up to the liaison reports, liaison statements from Working Party 3. And TD 324 will be the next document we're going to look at.

Mr. Betts, you want to introduce this generally and then we can go through one by one.

>> WP3: We will see the liaison statements, and then we should probably go to the Annexes. And if you would like to take them one by one. ?

Okay. This is the first liaison statement in Annex A here from Working Party 3. This is on the OTNT standardization workshop ‑‑ I mean work plan, issue 34 going to ITU‑T, TSAG, number of Study Groups and other groups as noted here. If you scroll down, please Hiroshi, we'll see that attached is the issue 34. For your review for these groups, please update and attach. So for ‑‑ I think was this one of the ones that needs to be issued? Urgently. Perhaps not so urgently. This can be sent out later so they can review it later. Okay. Any comments on this?

Okay. And this is agreed to send.

Next is Annex B is liaison on the initiation of new work on Q.FGNS. This is to Study Group 11, replying to their liaison. So if you scroll down, there's some information here provided.

And there is please insert ‑‑ maybe you can advise them what this yellow, please insert LS number.

>> WP3: We are sending two related liaison statements. There is this one. They started work on signalling for fine grain. When you read the details, they're actually trying to define a new fine grain data plane. And we're pointing out we have already done that and listed a lot of recommendations. And the TSB please insert the liaison statement number is the next liaison statement we're looking at where we're making proposals to change the Question text that will go to TSAG.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Hiroshi, have you taken note of what you need to note here for that? Okay. All right. Thank you very much. Any further comments on this liaison here? Can we agree? Next one in Annex C. It is also to Study Group 11 as indicated. So if you scroll down here, provides some additional detail on the Question text.

>> WP3: If I could Chairman?

>> CHAIR: Yes.

>> WP3: Study Group 11 had the last meeting. So only TSAG can take action on this. We have given background and the first point is in Question D11. They haven't recognized that Study Group 15 is been doing work on SDN mentioned extensively in the text of QD11. Suggesting in the relationships, they recognize the work that Study Group 15 is doing. And then in the last item is where it says Question K11, we should say questions D11 and K11.

>> CHAIR: Okay.

>> WP3: And they've both shown ONF as the body that they're liaising with. ONF ceased operation of 31 of January this year. So we're pointing to the location where the work has moved. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. If you scroll up, this liaison is for ‑‑ is this ‑‑ oh, for action to TSAG and information 211. I see.

Okay. Just to scroll down here again.

Proposed changes, any further comments on this liaison statement? Can we agree to this? Thank you. The next one then in Annex D ...

This is 802.3. This is on the G.ETH new work we had. Scroll down, please, Hiroshi.

Is this the A1? This is the draft text?

>> WP3: This is the draft text. And we have colour‑coded the highlighting.

>> CHAIR: Yeah, this needs to be sent before Monday.

TSB to attach or do something. You noticed this one needs to be sent before Monday. Okay. Any further comments on this one?

The next liaison statement. (Call from tech support in room)

>> CHAIR: Again, this needs to be sent as from. Yes, we haven't agreed to Question text yet, but we'll come to that. But this should be fine.

Okay. That's agreed. So the next one is the same thing, but to Study Group 5. Okay?

Noting that their work at K.147 may take advantage of this.

Thank you.

Next? Further development on MEF standards.

This is to confirm, yes, the update to the Question text for that. Okay? Any comments on this?

Seeing none. Agreed. The next one work related to MPLS. To the Working Party MPLSIETF. Sending them updates on Documents MPLSTP.

Okay.

Any comments here? That's agreed. Next.

This is to OIF. And this is on the flex O work. If you scroll down here.

This indicates that we have published. And they're available at these links.

Okay. Any comments on this? Okay. This is agreed. The next liaison to ETSIISG5G thanking them for the liaison and making them aware of the published work. Any comments on this?

We agree to that. Thank you.

Next one is to the ORAN Alliance. Working Group 4 and 9 to make them aware of newly approved Documents. And we're attaching will the text. Is that what we're attaching all of the todays? These are the ones that were consented at this meeting and we're sending them the text. Yes. Agree? Thank you.

Next one is to a number of IEEE groups about the synchronization and data centres, informing them that we have created a new work item. And that we'll be having a coordination meeting for these activities. Starting in September. And we need to create a Zoom meeting for this and send them the link. And then in yellow, this is just the people to send it to. Yes. Okay.

>> WP3: That's correct, yes. And we're approving this liaison on the assumption that we approve the e‑meeting.

>> CHAIR: Yes, okay. Okay.

Any comments on this? Okay. That's agreed.

Next is IEEE P1952 on resiliency.

This is a request to review their work, I presume. That's what this looks like.

Okay? All right. Any comments on this?

Okay. That's agreed. Next ... this is liaison statement on IMDM modelling coordination. So this is the typical coordination that Question 14 has been doing. Again, with inserting the Zoom link and a various set of dates indicated here. Okay, can we agree to this? Thank you. Next is Annex O with a set of items for information on Question 14 work. So we're updating them on the newly approved work that was consented this week. With attachments thereof. So can we agree to that? Thank you.

Next is the Annex P, which is to Study Group 17. Coordination on identity management adjusting ‑‑ suggesting text for inclusion in their work. Any comments here?

Don't see any. Moving along. This is liaison to ORAN on PTP and sync E and data model. Scrolling down here. Indicating that the work is consented, attached. Scroll down. Is the list of who it is going to indicated here? No. So maybe scroll up. Maybe Mr. Betts, is this ‑‑ ORAN is big, is it going to one particular Working Group in ORAN? What was the intent for this one? Clarify if this is for all of the ORAN or one particular Working Group.

>> Nine.

>> CHAIR: I will ask Hiroshi to add information for Working Group 9 to be clear here.

Thank you. Any comments on this? Further comments? Then we can agree that.

The next one is to broadband Forum and net mod on ‑‑ this is a reply on the scalable yang. If you scroll down here. Very short liaison.

Okay. Can we agree this? So agreed.

Next, this is last liaison, I think. Okay. This one is for Study Group 11 on their 23700 series. Network softwarization Roadmap. Scroll down here. This is an update to include this information in their Roadmap.

Okay. Can we agree to this liaison? Okay. Agreed. Thank you very much.

I think that's it for the liaisons from Working Party 3, Mr. Betts.

>> WP3: Yes, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Next we'll move to the interim activities in TD 325. Of plen, then, please. Is it showing? Yes. Go ahead, Mr. Betts.

>> WP3: Thank you. This is the three face‑to‑face meetings being proposed. And the meetings, referenced in Annex A and C have been confirmed, included them in this document for completeness. And the other one is a joint meeting of Question 12 and 14 to be held in Geneva, hosted by the ITU. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Those are the face‑to‑face meetings. Are there virtual meetings out here as well.

>> WP3: There are as well.

>> CHAIR: A long set here.

>> WP3: We have the usual four track meetings. The first of which is the interstandards coordination meeting we just approved the liaison on. And the final one is the Question 13 meeting on synchronization in data centres.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Any comments on the interim meetings and virtual meetings? Okay. Can we agree to hold those? Thank you.

Thank you very much Mr. Betts for your introduction of all the Documents. I think that concludes Working Party 3.

So next on the Agenda ... is I guess Agenda Item 16. I think we made our way through all of the ‑‑ there is no ‑‑ nothing for TAP and we have done all of the ‑‑ there is nothing 14 and 15, I don't think we had anything. Oh, no, we covered 15 with ‑‑ yes. Yes.

So the next item is item 16, which is leadership appointments in TD 307. But this is ‑‑ just a note here, that this remains unchanged. So there are some vacancies, that some Associate Rapporteurs that have indicated to us that they're no longer able to continue. But one of the things that happens at the end of the study period, which we're at the end of the study period, when the Study Group Chairs are finalized, then all of the Question Rapporteurs and leadership positions are all up for reappointment. So what we'll be doing is reviewing all of those positions together, making sure that we have equitable balance across all of the members and all of the Regions in that set of appointments. And so we're not going to propose any additions before the end of the study period. This will be all done before our first meeting of the next study period, which will be next March.

Any comments or questions on that? Okay. So next is item 17, which is WTSA 24 preparation. So there are two TDs here that we had reviewed in joint K when they were TD gens and they have been updated as TD plens. So we can look at ‑‑ I'm not sure which is which. TD 403. I think that is the general one. So maybe we can open TD 403 plen first. And Hiroshi, I think that was the one that you had prepared. Maybe you can summarize it briefly with the changes that were made as well as a brief summary of this document.

>> HIROSHI OTA: Thank you, Chair. I corrected minor points as pointed out during the joint K. In general, it is more or less the same. There is a bit more, you know, cleaned up format. As you can see, there are lots of things which we did and also a list of Rapporteurs, Associate Rapporteurs, chairmen, Vice‑Chairmen, like this. And still I haven't included the output from this meeting since it is still a moving target. But we'll update at some point, at least before some meeting of WTSA.

Something to discuss is section 4. Sorry. Section 3, results from this study period. Under section 4 about the future items. There is not much change from the last meeting, but it is substantial thing. So maybe it was right to have a look. And then after that Annex 1 has not changed. But one thing I need to indicate is that this currently is just capturing general aspects. The other TD I capture two elements on the new questions. But when we submitted to WTSA, Resolution 2 elements will be moved to this document. Which is part 1. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. Any comments on this document? Okay. We can agree this text that will be sent to TSAG and the liaison. We'll come to that in a minute as well as to WTSA. Once it's ... the next document then is TD 322. Which is the revision 1 of TD 322. So once you show that then I'll ask Jean Marie to summarize what ‑‑ do you have a Question on one of the other?

>> I think there is a typo in the report. It should be TD 322.

>> CHAIR: My apologies, it is 332. A typo. Yes. Revision 1. Yes, yes. I'll recognize you to ‑‑ Jean Marie, do you want to have any comments on this particular one? There was a few things that we had?

>> Jean Marie: It is a few things that we review during the K session. And later you have the edit or typos or something like that. And the text are absolutely authentic. And the content is indicated. You can scroll down. The title, mandate, lead Study Group, points, not changed, compared to the last November meeting. Everything is correct. And the Study Group, the Question of the Study Group and you insert text that we had under the review in this K meeting. And Hiroshi has the Question number, into the Question number used by WTSA. So that is the reason why you have R1. Should be okay. So there is no change after our K meeting. Only very minor. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So reclarification. This is TD 332R1. There is a typo on 332. This is 332R1.

>> HIROSHI OTA: Okay. After Jean Marie and I change the Question numbering, Malcolm also kindly fixed several formatting issues. It is further cleaner than the original 332.

>> CHAIR: All right. Okay. Excellent. Any further comments on this revised Question text that we will now send to TSAG and also to WTSA? For Study Group 14? This is agreed. Thank you very much.

Next on the Agenda is the OUI assignment update. This is in TD 400. Don't know if Leah is here. Maybe Stefano, can you just give a brief introduction of what was updated in this, please?

>> Stefano: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We have updated all of the PTP profiles. As usual, we have the new revisions. 65.1. You see you have the period of updates. There is one for 20008 and one for the 2019 version. Two new rules, for 65.1. Two for 75.1. And additional two new rules for 72.2.

So this is the addition to the OUI table.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. Any comments on this? Okay. We can ‑‑ can we agree to this? Yes, that's agreed. So this will be updated on the web page. The Study Group 15 web page with the new revision of this one. Okay? Thank you very much. The next item is item 19, this is reports on promotion and coordination of other roles. The first item under here is the reports from the workshops. So I asked each of the coordinators from the workshops to prepare a report. We have two reports here. Because we had two workshops. There will be a third report to be made available after our workshop tomorrow. Which will be in sort of a similar style to this.

Any case, let's start with TD373 gen. Which is this? The 60 transport one? So for this particular one will it be Paul or Malcolm who will just give a brief summary?

>> After you. Ha‑ha‑ha.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman, this is a brief overview of the workshop that gives introduction that says what we're trying to do. And once at the workshop web page, it provides the Agenda. And then there is a brief summary indicating that we had done work on 5G. We started three years before the release date. This time, we are six years before the release date. And unsurprisingly, the recurrence is still evolving. We had presentations and network operators and provided a number of different perspectives. But there was common themes. I won't go through the whole thing. One of the major themes was complexity and power consumption, what can we do about it. So maybe I will just leave it at that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. I appreciate the efforts that you did to help create this workshop, I think it was an excellent interaction with the operators to give us some view on the future requirements. Any comments on this workshop? Thank you. We can accept this report. So the next one is TD 374.

It Tony ... he'll be here shortly? Maybe Les you can talk to it?

>> (Off mic)

>> CHAIR: Okay.

Well, we can come back to it, if ... or we can just scroll through it.

So again, just a similar style of highlighting the speakers and providing a summary at the end.

In this case, it is a more detailed summary of each one.

Okay. Very good. And then thanks to Tony and Les and everyone involved in organizing the workshops. Comments? We'll get you the microphone.

>> ATTENDEE: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, just a Question of clarification. The document, it says plen. And the Agenda says G, general. What is the correct one, please?

>> CHAIR: I think this should be gen.

>> ATTENDEE: It should be general.

>> CHAIR: Yes.

>> (Off mic)

>> CHAIR: Yes, this is a gen. It should be gen, yes.

Yes. So maybe you can make that editorial correction. Yes? Okay.

>> (Off mic)

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Tony.

We just ‑‑ we were just thanking you for the excellent work in organizing the workshop.

>> Tony: My pleasure.

>> CHAIR: We went through your report. I don't know if you would like to give some summary highlights of takeaways from the workshop this week?

>> Tony: Sure. Thank you for the opportunity to have this great place to holding this workshop. We had three workshops online, as webinar. But this time we had a chance to organize face‑to‑face to have more engagement with the other experts, like the other questions together to discuss the technology. And I think that by learning the 6Q workshop, we're learning that we have a different Roadmap there to satisfy different requirement for different technology to achieve different service there.

So I think for the FDDR, we still have our own Roadmap for the Q3 and to match the excess network light when to deploy 10GPON or 50GPON in the future. We have this technology and the Roadmap together and develop the technology together.

This will be a very great chance for us to align the work between different Qs in ITU and also invite different SDO experts so we work together in the future to achieve different perspective like management perspective and align different requirements from different Regions. We have ITU here and CCSA. So we can have this ITU send up more impact in different local Regions there. So I thank the Chair give me this opportunity to organize the workshop in this Plenary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Tony. Okay. So we have already accepted this report. And so the report from the workshop in the future, which is tomorrow, did we assign a TD number for that. So the next one, TD 375 gen will be posted shortly after the workshop tomorrow as a brief summary similar to these summaries. And I'll thank in advance Tom and Jessie for their excellent work in organizing the joint workshop with IEEE 802 tomorrow. It will be quite an excellent workshop. Really looking forward to it. We have quite a full Agenda, and as I said before, it is our ninth workshop with IEEE 802 over a decade or more, continuing our cooperation and collaboration with IEEE 802. Let's proceed with the promotion and coordination report. And review the items in there. Jean Marie.

I think TD 316 of plen. Take us through that, please.

>> Jean Marie: So the report consists of two part. One part correlated exclusively to promotion and second part related to all TD gen addressed to all questions that we sorted out with our topic. And conduct our review. If it is for action, if it is for information, knowing some TDs are addressed for information, but require some action. And knowing some TDs addressed for action will be considered as for information. So it is a work that promotion and coordination go through together with of course the workshop Chairman and SG. So at the end of the report, we have eight liaisons, they're at the end of the report we will go through the liaison later.

First, I would like to pass the word to our Vice‑Chairman to talk about the promotion.

>> Thank you. So as far as the promotion, I'm not going detail into the promotion that happened between study periods because we did that at the meeting. I want to point out the one that was very important, which was the industry engagement workshop that we had in April. That was super important to help us to figure out how to be more relevant and engage industry. So very important.

Now I will go to section 3.2 and talk about, you know, what's going to happen, proposed items between now and the next Study Group meeting. And I'll start with news items, we talked about it several times, 40th anniversary of ITU‑T G.652 and celebrating that. With a press release. And also the FT fiber to the room team will also be working with Matt to create a press release. Planned future participation and Conferences between now and the next meeting. We have had multiple Ad Hoc meetings during these two weeks to help us plan and get ready for these. They are e‑COC in September. And we had some challenges, but Derrick from Question 2 helped us get better contacts and he will mention us in the 50GPON high speed work item. And we learned we could participate in market focus sessions.

Frank, Tony and Fabio have all applied for a spot. We should hopefully get three slots at ECOC in September.

We have network X coming up. And Markus is applying for a speaker spot. We should get confirmation in September. And ITS24 in September. And coordinated by Question 13. The left one is OFC. That may seem 25 a long way out. It is the week after our next meeting. We needed to plan for that this time. What we have done is had several Ad Hoc meetings to talk about it. We usually have a technical session, have a booth and last time we had a demo. We want to continue with that.

So for the technical session, we actually have to have our proposal to OFC by the end of July. So the Working Party Chairs are reviewing last year's text in deciding how they want to modify it for what we'll talk about. So they'll get that to us by the end of July.

For booth content, we discussed depending on how many screens we have, including updates from the workshops from the planned major work items for next study period as well as accomplishments from this study period. Other ideas continue to be welcome.

For the booth, live demo, we had multiple discussions and reached out to a lot of experts and got good feedback. The potential demos that were eventually decided on during this meeting and still in progress to see if we can get them complete are a demo of 50 gig GPON with ad trend and we hope to hear back from them in August. Visible light communications would signify. And we have a call into them in the next two weeks with the other U.S. affiliate to plan that.

If neither of those works out, we have as backup plan with calnex potentially to do another demo. If we do two demos we may need more booth space. That will be dependent on whether or not we can afford it. Also shying away from Q2 and Q6 is on the office working team. She will work with us on the net requirements to see if we can take advantage of putting some of the demos across OF CNET.

As far as technical fires, there will be five coming out of this meeting. Thank you to all the experts for providing. Two from Q3 and three from Q5. So we're very appreciative. No video interviews because we're in Montreal and not Geneva. As usual we continue to ask for IEEE communication standards magazine opportunities for people to put some Articles forward.

So we appreciate that. And then we have already talked about the three‑week workshops that we had this week. So I'll skip that.

The rest of the report from promotion really looks back and says what did we do. We covered this in the last study period. We covered this a lot at the meeting. I won't go over it in detail other than to say well done.

And I am with Jean Marie retiring in September. I will be during this interim period continuing promotion activities up until the next study period to make sure we have good linkage. Thank you.

>> Jean Marie: Thank you. Without your support, it would be very hard. Maybe some people will ask what is doing promotion and coordination doing in the interim period? During the interim period, I have calls with Yoshi. I have calls with Matt from communication and plenty of actions with Vincent in the U.S., especially as we organize the Visa. That was really extensive work together. I have to say thank you to TSB, and Yoshi and Matt. And thank you also the Director for your nice remark in the introduction. And thank you to Glenn for your open mind. And able thinking and lot of brainstorming as we had this week.

Let's continue with the report. We have eight liaison. And I think you can drop down to the table liaison result you know, from this meeting. Keep going. Keep going.

I think maybe we can go directly. We have a liaison to ITU‑D. Study Group 1.

We need to meet with the contributions from development country and to help them to go to the right that attend the meetings in the right Question which is relevant for them. And we inform the ITU‑D Sector. That is basically a summary of the content of each contribution and what are the action. And Study Group and promotion and coordination we sit together with them and give them advice on how to download document and access to different Documents. Okay?

>> CHAIR: I'll take them one at a time to approve them? Any comments on this liaison. This is to ITU‑D development Sector, Study Group 1. Any comments? Okay. We can agree to send this. The next one, please.

>> Jean Marie: We have three liaison now regard the preparation of WTSA 24, three liaison to TSAG. The first one is response to the liaison 32 from TSAG. Maybe you can open it. Yes. And it is basically ‑‑ could you scroll down? Okay. We repeat again, recall we have been requested to review also Resolution and to provide numbers of Resolutions that we already have in the mandate. And we have identified Resolution 90, 92, and 93. Regarding Resolution 92 related to the IMP Study Group 15 has a lot of activities. We attach here as the list of recommendation and technical reports that we usually provide to GCIA2020 as improvements.

On top of that, we had also, we wanted to add the report of the workshop on IMT2030G, in that role, I will have Yoshi complete ‑‑

(Overlapping conversations)

>> Jean Marie: That was one liaison. Next liaison is now a big part of the work that we have done regarding the preparation of the WTSA 24. That is the report that you just mentioned regarding the activities of the Study Group 15. And also Question text that we work. Scroll down. Move to the next liaison please.

>> CHAIR: We'll do one liaison at a time. I want to approve it. So this is the one where we're attaching TD 373 of gen, right?

Workshop report. We have that noted. Can we agree to send this liaison? Okay. Now go to the next one. Scroll down to Annex 3.

>> Jean Marie: We have TD 403 plen. It is part of Study Group 15 to the WTSA. And we attached TD 332 plen that we now Question text what we just saw as a result. That is the big part of the WTSA work.

>> CHAIR: Okay. That's it. That's the end of it, right? Okay. Can we agree to this liaison? Okay. So agreed. The next one, please.

>> Jean Marie: Next one, again a liaison to TSAG regarding liaison ‑‑ it is basically a repetition of the streaming activities that were identified in the Resolutions we have mandated. And we did already and we'll repeat it simply to be clear. Okay. We basically respond to all significant liaison from TSAG regarding WTSA process. Such as format, particularly.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Any comments on this? Okay. This is agreed. So the next liaison?

>> Jean Marie: The next liaison is the liaison we send to GCIA2020. That is the ‑‑ JCAIMT2020. It is the Study Group Roadmap. The liaison approved consented and already existing regarding IMT2020. And the JCA that has activity and that was the last update that we provided to the JCAIMT2020.

You have to attach of course.

>> CHAIR: This attachment is it in a TD?

>> Jean Marie: I posted yesterday.

>> (Off mic)

>> CHAIR: Very good. Okay. Okay. As long as you know what to attach is the important thing. Excellent. Go back to the liaison that we're looking to agree.

Can we agree this liaison? Okay. Agreed.

The next one.

>> Jean Marie: Liaison to Study Group 2 to term to use the term enforce in reference that when you enter reference for recommendation in your recommendation instead of putting a date of approval. And here we had very short and very effective discussion we say no. No way. Very politely of course. And we justify why we cannot change ‑‑ use "enforce" instead of putting the date of approval of the recommendation. Basically it would be fair to authorize that every Study Group use this inside the ITU‑T Sector.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Any comments on this strong rejection of the proposal from Study Group 2?

>> Jean Marie: We don't want to give any reason to think we agree. That is why we said strongly.

>> CHAIR: Very good. Can we agree to this? Okay. So agreed. Was that the last one?

>> Jean Marie: Study Group 12 liaison regarding impact assessment and here is this liaison. I receive also Question 10 provide detailed ‑‑ detailed comment on this liaison. But the Question 2, Question 6 and the other Question did not have time to go through the technical report. And we politely ask at the end, okay, we took note of your December 24 deadline and also Study Group 15 recommendation and work item related to back hauling need more time and we provide a complete formal answer after our next meeting if they accept it.

If they say no, we need feedback from Study Group 15 before December, it is a related Question, we will have to work together, whatever. Okay. We decide to provide at least part of the response that we have. (Off mic) you will find the text in Question ten.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. It says at the bottom here, yes, that we may have other ones. Yes. Okay.

Any comments on this? Can we agree this liaison. And the last one.

>> Jean Marie: This is a response to Study Group 2 again. They sent an incredible list of OAM project to update. The list consist of 108 page. I have to say that every time, I'm struggling to sort it out. Recommends from Study Group 15. I know that many of you say oh, my god, how to update this list. And this time, you receive this list very late. We sit together with Yoshi and say what to do. We decide we do nothing. But to avoid such a senseless list, we say we definitely want you to change this process of updating. And we try to respond politely. Please use a web paged ITU landscape, that is used by many other Study Group for many other topic and to concert our website for our Working Party. I think sometimes we have to say no because I'm a bit afraid that they continue to send that. It is a very difficult list.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Very good. Thank you very much. And this is ‑‑ we'll suggest them to use the web‑based tool, which I think we found very useful. And you have done a fantastic job in bringing up all of the different Work Programmes that we have and putting them in. So I think it is very good use of the tool and we should encourage other Study Groups to use the tool.

>> Jean Marie: Absolutely. Yes.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Any comments? Connie, please. Can someone got him the microphone.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It says approval to 2023. That should be changed to (off mic) Thank you.

(Off mic)

(Overlapping conversations)

>> CHAIR: Hiroshi, Connie has the eagle eye. He's looking for all the Easter eggs.

Ha‑ha‑ha.

Thank you. Thank you for reading them.

Okay.

So Hiroshi has taken note of that. So with that minor change, any other comments on this liaison? Okay. And we can agree this.

I think that is the end of the report.

>> Jean Marie: That is the end of the report. Thank you to all, basically, because this liaison cannot be made without your contribution. Without open discussion with a way to respond. Thank you to all really who helped with the liaison and in general for supporting this sorting out of all this TD gen. And again, thank you.

>> CHAIR: All right. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

>> CHAIR: Okay. Moving on in our Agenda. In TD 306. Next is future activities. Just to mention the next Study Group 15 Plenary as we had noted before, the next Study Group 15 Plenary of the ‑‑ which would be the first Plenary of the next study period will be from the 17th to the 28th of March in Geneva. And so that is confirmed. It is unfortunately not the dates that we had requested. So unfortunately, it overlaps with ITF, which is disappointing from the management team because we strive very hard to avoid overlap with the groups that we liaise with and where we have common participation. We think the common participation is important. So for the second Plenary of 2025, we have requested October 13‑24, 2025. This is not yet confirmed. This is again Geneva. TSB is only allowing booking for 2025. And so as a result of that, that's our first request.

This date does not overlap with any groups that we work with from IEC to IEEE and IOF. This is a good date for us. Shifting a little bit either way would not be good. We're looking for TSB's support to make sure we can get the dates we're looking for here.

Now, for the third Plenary of the next study period in 2026, TSB is not yet letting us book in Geneva. So that is one option. But the second option is that in July of 2026, IEEE 802 will be back in Montreal. In this hotel. And if you thought that this week was good. We could look to see if we could do it again in 2026. So maybe if I guess to provide us some feedback, what would the Delegates think? Would you like to come back to Montreal in 2026? Should we look at that? Or should we just continue in Geneva?

Would anyone like to have an opinion of what the management team should look at? Express an opinion.

And no one wants to take the floor to say anything. But ... well, so how was the experience? Was this a good venue? Yes, this was good. I mean, if someone could take the floor and express either you know, next time no fireworks or ... ha‑ha.

>> It was definitely a very good meeting, I think it worked really well. It was very nice to be at the same hotel and just be around all the time and talk to our colleagues and resolve ‑‑ not resolve issues but work out disagreements or technical issues. So it was definitely a very good meeting. Thank you Glenn for hosting it.

>> CHAIR: Well thank you. I'm glad that there is some appreciation for it being here. Okay. Anyone else like ‑‑ I see people nodding that they like it. But Emmanuel would like to come back. Ha‑ha‑ha. Emmanuel, please.

>> I think that it was very well organized. I would like to thank two persons that you can thank I'm sure. But I think it would be nice to have it again in Montreal because it has been really nice to be hosted by your team, Glenn, and also the Canadian Government. So thank you very much.

Especially with the colocation of IEEE to have this joint workshop in the industry and our society. Very good, we look forward to coming back if possible. So thank you for that feedback. So we'll take that back and see what's possible for 2026. So thank you very much. So let's move on in the Agenda. Miscellaneous is certificates of appreciation that we handed out. Then there is one missing the EWM report in TD 320. So perhaps Mr. Dulin, could you walk us through the items in that?

>> Dulin: I applaud the Chairman for projecting it without probably having read it. The abstract is the usual one. EWM coordinators we remained the same since the start of this study period. I love to point out that they appointed me as the EWM Rapporteur because then Mr. Parsons can tell me they couldn't do that and I'm not. So the main thrust of this is automation and idea whose time has come. And the close of the meeting for me, I can't remember who it came from, but someone said if everyone is talking about AI, how come I'm spending all my time cutting and pasting?

>> CHAIR: At least it is not with scissors anymore? .

>> True we moved beyond scissors. Frustration with the tool chain and often specifically with Word arises outside of the context of the responsibilities. What I mean is that it is not that people come to us and say Mr. Study Group 17 on the use of tools, other than Word to produce recommendations. Mr. Evenburger almost before we got here sent some suggestions to a wide audience on what I would describe or we would describe as automation towards producing uniform meeting reports. One of us is personally aware and that would be me of about half a dozen people who with varying degrees of sophistication scrape the website. It is fundamentally ridiculous. It goes on.

There is push back on the complaints, some people say, look, it is just that you don't know how to do it. It is because your workflow is a mess. If you did it look Working Party X and X is there to anonymize the guilty ‑‑ if you did it like us, there would be no problem. That same person later in the meeting said to me, I spend far too long fighting Word over this. That was one of the reports that you saw earlier today. Not in this morning's meeting. In this afternoon's. It is not clear, however, that any other potential solutions are without their own problems. In the tutorial deck in 285, I encourage you to look at it. It is authored by arnod, a force of nature. If I see something or you see something by him, you should probably pay attention to it. He's a very smart guy. One of the deck slides says some limits of using only Word because standards are too important to manage in Word.

And he provides a link to this tool, meta‑Norma.org. And that can be apparently used to create ITU Documents. I found the link, I followed it, I got this 404 page.

It is clearly something in development. But I think something needs to be done. Exactly what that is, I don't know. I don't think any of us know. But you might claim that Mr. Even burger's input is a reasonable precise definition of at least one thing that could be done. Given that Rome wasn't built in a day we could use the interregnum to clarify what we might TSB IT to do. And what we can do ourselves. We would be happy to facilitate that discussion. And I mentioned two other experiences here. The Chair of JCAIMT2020 that was setting in the back a minute ago mentioned an experience with automation in connection to their work and just poked his head in the door over there again. Scott actually sent me the source code of at least one of the tools. So I can play with that between now and the next Study Group meeting.

The Vice‑Chair of Working Party 1, I think may have left also reminded us of the experience with using collaborative editing tools. We might encourage them to talk about that at the start of the next study period.

As soon as you finish doing a report like this, you haven't posted it, someone comes knocks on the door with more input. Study Group Working Party 1 apparently sent these two inputs last night. The Rapporteurs are asked to prepare report containing a list of contributions. Some questions have lots of contributions. Is it possible for the software to implement a tool with the table from the Plenary website information to facilitate the Rapporteur to quickly prepare the report.

I have done it myself. The answer is yes. The second one in addition to how it currently lists TD by TD number, it is a Question I stated. It is useful to have the option sorted by most recently posted. That can be done because I checked while Glenn was talking earlier. The date and posting metadata is there in the HTML. Web standard interviews, I think the Chairman alluded to this a few minutes ago. Hiding on our web page, it is actually on the right‑hand side under the tab saying documentation in our web‑based standard of reviews. And Jean Marie has been instrumental in many years in developing these. Developing the technology I understand to some extent that allows us to produce those things. He has kindly passed the responsibility from maintaining on Home Network Transport standards to Mr. Zang, I'm sorry. And provided a brief tutorial on how to create those things.

So we have that knowledge now and perhaps in the next study period we can use it more extensively and make other people aware of it. We thank Jean Marie sincerely for the inspiring work in this direction. Again.

(Applause)

I met the gentleman that sent this small request for enhancement this morning. Sitting there. Markus. Who are you? I have seen you all week and I don't know who you are. Markus, oh, you're the guy that sent the comment last night. Apparently when you are using My Meetings, you can get a list of the people attending the call. I did not know this. I take screen shots of the list of people. Markus is smart enough to know you can get a list out of it. Apparently you don't Git the affiliation of the people, Hiroshi. That would be a useful improvement if you can do that.

Moving on, Montreal is not Geneva. This is why I did not intervene Mr. Glenn Parsons when you asked for comments. I have them here.

We offer special thanks for our TSB colleagues for offering this different environment from the home one. From the EWM perspective and certainly from my perspective, trying to run meetings, the in‑room audio visual, it is hard to tell that we're remote from Geneva. So merci. When we say something needs to be done. These things take time.

We think it should be a goal to make significant progress in the matters in the next four‑year study period. To do that, you know, even if preparations are just brainstorming, we should try to do that before we get started there at least at the beginning of it. Finally we thank all of you who took time out of this meeting and the rest of the study period to provide us input. We will accept it during the interregnum and my hope is that in the new study period we would be a little bit more proactive and perhaps provide input to Opening Plenaries suggestions rather than wait figure for complaints or ‑‑ waiting for complaints or suggestions.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Mr. Dulin. Previously we gave liaisons to TSAG with this report. Now we instead talk directly to the TSB staff on the suggestions here. I think we should continue to do that. I definitely like the idea of let's get in front of this and have some ideas and let's look at how we can use AI for good. Which is ITU kind of tag line. And use it to help us here in our work. To make our lives easier within the Study Group. I think that would be a good idea. That is something that I can certainly take to TSAG for discussions on that point. Thank you very much.

So let's move on to the ‑‑ unless there are comments or questions on this one? We'll move on to the last thing to discuss is the Study Group 15 report. Which is in TD 300. I won't spend too much time going through this. And this is the draft report just to let you know that we'll be producing the final report after this meeting with Hiroshi's help here to make sure that all of the Documents that are various supports are prepared. So do you have TD 300 up?

We'll just scroll through it quickly. So we'll just go a couple of minutes over time here. Maybe another five to 10 minutes and then we'll be finished.

Do you need me to put it up?

It is not posted yet?

Unfortunately, it is not posted yet. So we'll show you a preview. TD 300. To show in the beginning. Eventual posted as report 15 within Study Group 15. So the preamble here in this report in section 1 thanks our host for the opening remarks. Thanks for those joining us here in Montreal in providing remarks. He'll be joining the workshop, the joint workshop tomorrow with IEEE. So that will be great. Summarizing all of the things that I mentioned during the Opening Plenary as well. My highlight on how I think in‑person meetings are the way to get the job done. And we can certainly build more consensus doing that way. Thanks to the Government of Canada for hosting this meeting here in Montreal. As well as appreciation to Ericsson as the lead sponsor as well as the contributing Ciena and tourism Montreal for their assistance in hosting here as well.

And the various status of the meeting that we have throughout here listing the workshops, future work and perhaps in 7.4 which is the. So to have it on the screen in case you didn't take it down, this is what we're currently proposing. I didn't include in here it may be possible to come back to Montreal, but that would be the proposal. We'll look into that and let you know.

Any comments on this draft report? It will be available as TD 300 shortly after the meeting.

If not, then I would like to thank all of you for being here. I would like to thank the management team for all of your support. The Study Group 15 Vice‑Chair Working Party Chairs, Vice‑Chairs, special thank you to Mr. Betts. I think this is might be his last Study Group Plenary meeting. I want to recognize the incredible contribution Malcolm has done over the decades I have known him here in Study Group 15. I think he was in Study Group 15 when it was Study Group XV. That was a long time ago. When it was CCITT. So thank you very much, Malcolm.

(Applause)

Special thank you to the counselors and Rapporteurs. And Hiroshi for being here and Nora for Emmanuel. And Ilya of course. You know, I wasn't expecting all of you to be here. It is a pleasant surprise to have all the support here. And of course, thank you to the Director for being here with us as well.

I want to especially thank the meeting planners, typically we don't have meeting planners in Geneva. But I especially want to thank face‑to‑face events, which is Don and Stephanie who are in the back, who are the meeting planners that made this meeting very smooth.

And of course, thank you to the captioners who are captioning us in the background here.

And a final thing, maybe I should thank my students who have come here from Carlton University to help me out.

(Applause)

So thank you, everyone. I look forward to seeing you in person, again at our next Plenary next year. I hope to be the Study Group 15 Chair at that meeting as well. And we'll see what happens at WTSA. So I'll look forward to seeing you back in Geneva in March. But what I'm going to do now. There is no coffee break out here. But instead what we're having is a reception in my room 722 and Jean Marie's room 716 close of the Plenary reception for you all. Thank you for waiting. That is the surprise for you.

We'll have a toast to the end of the study period and to Study Group 15 and have a chance for a chat and relax before the workshop tomorrow.

Thank you very much everyone. We're adjourned.

(Applause)

(Concluded)
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