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>> CHAIR: Good morning, everyone. Welcome. I'm honoured to Chair this first Closing Plenary for Study Group 15 in the 2025‑2028 study period.

My name is Glenn Parsons. I'm with Ericsson Canada, and I'm your Study Group 15 Chair.

I think we kicked off this study period quite well. We had a lot of contributions. We had over 400 registrants and over 200 of those joined us here in person in Geneva. We continue to have lots of new work proposals that require, of course, A1 and A13 templates for today.

For some of these, of course we needed compromises to get consensus. But that is possible because we're here at an in‑person meeting. As I said, at the in‑person meetings is where you can have the side conversations, whether during a coffee break or networking reception. Thank you, again to ETRI for hosting the networking session. This is where the real progress can be made.

I want to thank all of you who made the effort to come in person to this meeting and also for you, those of you who stayed to come to the Closing Plenary.

I think it was worth your effort to be here and I hope you have seen the value as well.

Now, before we get started on our Agenda, I'd like to recognize the Deputy Director of TSB, Dr. Bilel Jamoussi, who is joining us here today. And I would like to invite him to bring us some words of greeting. Bilel, please.

>> BILEL jamoussi: Thank you very much, Glenn. Good morning to all colleagues. Study Group 15 is a special Study Group for me to join, having worked will in this Study Group before, joining ITU and focused on a lot of the carrier Ethernet work we have done back in 2007, 2008, by having the joint IEEE Study Group 15 meeting to match the Ethernet to the optical carrier. And then over the years, here, of course, as Chief of Study Groups department, I have had the pleasure to work with many of you to really advance our work and essential with our Chair Glenn, whom we have worked together since when, Glenn?

>> CHAIR: The 90s at least.

>> Bilel JAMOUSSI: '94, '95, something like that. It is a pleasure to join you in this first meeting of the new study period. We have a high number of attendants in person. 245 colleagues joined us over the past two weeks. 109 were remote from 36 countries. We note a significant increase in Developing Countries participation. This is quite encouraging because we still have 2.4, 2.6 billion people that are not connected. The work of this Study Group is very much in providing that infrastructure. The broadband infrastructure that is much needed.

In addition to the regular work we do, the networking reception was quite a highlight. And we thank the Chair for having initiated this tradition back in 2022 and all the hosts that have hosted receptions. In October, you have a host confirmed. That is good news. We can continue that trend. We had 13 countries over 13 Delegates from 13 Developing Countries participate. From the Vice‑Chairs, I think eight out of the nine Vice‑Chairs were here in person. And the ninth jointed remotely. That is a good statistic.

Bridging the standards gap remains a high priority for the ITU to ensure the 194 Member States of the Union take part in this important work of standardization.

I congratulate you on a very productive meeting, as usual. 384 contributions, 50 per consent, one approval, nine agreements. That is a lot of work, as usual for SG15 especially on new and hot topics like higher speed PON, fiber based home networking, fiber optic sensing, free space optics, beyond 1 terabit, OTN and fine grade OTN for efficient handling of services, synchronization, of course is quite important, and network element management. A lot of the work that spans all of the connectivity and basic infrastructure.

So we have taken an active role with the leadership team, Glenn and the management team, to really promote the activity of this Study Group beyond the walls of ITU and the walls of Popov and the Delegates that are here.

This year we have taken extraordinary steps toward OFC to make sure we're very visible. We will see and take feedback, take stock after this OFC and how our efforts are ‑‑ what is the return on investment. And if it is positive, we plan to do more in the future. We'll have two staff from ITU join OFC, so Hiroshi as usual. But this year will be augmented by our membership Officer Emil. So two of the TSB staff will be on‑site.

We have expand the booth at OFC, doubled the size, I believe in terms of questionnaire footage or metres.

MOPA will be one of the participants on the ITU booth. This shows our collaboration with other partners, working in the same direction. As of Sunday, I think we will have our staff on‑site in San Francisco. We'll have also regular workshops to stimulate ideas and exchange information. I think we had workshops in July in Hong Kong and as part of the interregnum meeting.

And then potentially other meetings in June in Paris. The coordination in terms of enhancing coordination with other organisations, we have also a breakthrough with the young models. We worked that with our legal colleagues, the Secretariat to make sure that, that works for you and for this joint venture with the ITF.

We also value our strong partnership with the IEEE. 802.1 and 802.3. And I understand new recommendations and a new series is to facilitate this coordination and collaboration. So it is really important to get that right and continue that momentum.

Future meetings of October here in Geneva. And I understand next year, going back to Montreal. And next year, I plan to join you, Glenn. Ha‑ha.

So we plan to have workshops possibly a CXO meeting, if we can manage that. So we're looking forward to continued momentum. Our work is really a partnership between the management team of the Study Group, the Delegates, and the TSB to support your effort, promote your effort and really make your journey of standards development as smooth as possible. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Bilel, for the words of encouragement. I appreciate working with you over the years and decades. We have done lots of great stuff together. I hope that will continue with the workshops. We'll be continuing with workshops at our interim meeting coming up in Paris as well, we'll probably have some at our meeting in October this year.

And then of course, in July of next year, we'll be back‑to‑back with IEEE 802, and we'll have the 10th workshop that you helped initiate so many years ago back when you weren't with ITU. We'll have the 10th one there.

As you mentioned, back‑to‑back with IEEE 802 and as you suggested a CXO meeting. I understand ITU‑R is trying to position Working Party Working Party 5D also in Montreal, but before our meeting. So we'll see if that all lines up. But it is part of, you know, trying to bring all the communities together that are involved in the space that we work on here, which is optical networks, and optical networks to support so many use cases, right?

We like to promote that. I have been an advocate of promoting. I appreciate the support from ITU and TSB for that promotion. Especially at OFC coming up next week with the expanded booth we have, where we have a couple of demos as well from Ad Tran and Signify, in addition to MOPA to highlight the interoperability standards and recommendations we have here at ITU‑T.

We're looking to leverage this OFC engagement, not only in the booth, but we have a workshop event on the show floor where I'll be leading with each of the Working Parties to give their update.

I'm in another workshop to highlight Study Group 15 with other SDOs. And there are various panels and tutorials that various Delegates are attending as well. We appreciate the support from TSB and hope this will increase the visibility of ITU and Study Group 15 in the industry.

Thank you very much, Bilel.

I introduced the head table at the Opening Plenary. I won't introduce the Vice‑Chairs again. But it is a little bit more crowded up here since we have the Working Party Chairs up here as well. So just to highlight the Working Party Chairs who are sitting up here with me, from Working Party 1, the Working Party 1 Chair is Ian Horsley, who is down here.

Working Party 2 Chair is Paul Doolan, who is right here. Next to him is Thomas Huber, the Working Party 3 Chair as well.

So of course, next to me is our advisor, counselor, Hiroshi.

Now there is no interpretation at this Closing Plenary. However, there is captioning. Or there should be captioning. So maybe Hiroshi, what is the status on captioning? Is it working yet?

>> SECRETARIAT: Unfortunately not yet. My colleagues are now checking what is happening. And also finding out what we can do. Thank you. Sorry for this inconvenience.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So the intent was to have captioning. We'll check in and Hiroshi will let me know when it becomes available. And we'll let everyone know that.

So thank you for your indulgence as we continue without captioning, as we had expected.

The Agenda for today is in TD 2 of Plen. And this is an update to the continuation of the Agenda that we approved at the Opening Plenary that was in TD 1. This is the remainder of the Agenda. And so I have added to this Agenda here, you see starting with Agenda Item 13, I have added the references for the TDs for the so‑called big five from each of the Working Parties that we'll go through in Agenda Item 13. These are all noted with the TDs. So all of the sub items in 13, we'll take all of these as we go through the reports of each of the Working Parties.

Now, in addition, if you scroll down, Hiroshi, the next Agenda Items in 14, 15, and 16, and item number 16, there has been a revision for the promotion and coordination report. That is in TD 49R1. And then the next update is the Study Group 15 report in item 20 here, it is now R1 of TD 33R1.

So this is the Agenda that we'll have for today. Are there any comments on the Agenda, ladies and gentlemen?

Okay. Not seeing any, can we agree to this Agenda?

(Gavel)

Thank you. It is so agreed. So we'll start with the reports of the Working Parties. And we'll go through these. And we'll go through them just to change things up, for the first study period, we'll go through them in reverse order.

So we'll start with Working Party 3 first. (Chuckling)

And then Working Party 2 will still be in the middle, this time. And then Working Party 1. Maybe next time we'll do it in random order.

(Laughter)

But in any case ... maybe we'll draw straws next time. That might be a good idea, yes, yes, yes. We're going to draw tickets or something when we go to OFC. We will give out some Swiss army knives ‑‑ ITU branded Swiss army knives. And we're going to have, you know, to collect cards. Drop your business card in. We'll have a draw for who gets a Swiss army knife. To try to bring more people to the booth kind of thing.

Maybe we'll do that, we'll have a draw for who goes first, which Working Party Chair goes first. That's a good idea.

Any case. Let's start with Working Party 3. This is in ‑‑ we'll start with the main report, which is TD 44 of Plen. So if we can open that up, thank you very much. And Tom, please.

>> WP3: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, Working Party 3 had a very busy two weeks at the meeting here. You know, in addition to don't have the exact number of documents for consent in my head. But beyond that, you know, we have nearly 30 new work items added in this meeting, 12 outgoing liaisons and we'll have a busy slate of interim activities with three face‑to‑face meetings and six virtual meetings.

Going through each of the highlights of each of the questions here, Question 10, you know, has several newer revised recommendations for consent in this meeting. Among those is the consent of what we'll call G.8020.3. Which is the incorporation by reference of Ethernet into an ITU recommendation. That will not only be beneficial for extending the reach of Ethernet to the larger community that uses ITU recommendations but will also simplify some of our work here by allowing other Documents to point to that and avoid having to write a lot of A.5 justifications.

And they also are continuing the work on Ethernet OAM and Ethernet NTLMSSP functional models. Question 11 will have seven Documents for consent related to the OTN and MTN work they're doing. They've also decided that recommendation G.798 is going to be divided up into a set of recommendations now to make it easier for users and the editor to work with it. There was significant progress on the topic of beyond 1 terabit OTN, including, you know, some specific work items that will be started related to that topic.

Also a new work item related to specifying what they call the module to framer interface. That was something that was historically an intrasystem interface.

With the emergence in the industry with pluggable optical modules, that interface is becoming one that needs to be open and standardized. So that one vendor's plugs can go into another vendor's system.

Question 12 has one recommendation for consent on MTN architecture and continue the work on media architecture and MCC architecture. They have two new technical reports that they'll be preparing. One related enhanced network operations and one that was a big topic of discussion here during this meeting and international optical networks, you know, toward the year 2030.

Any rate, there was a lot of discussion around that, and at least a skeleton of an outline was produced in this meeting.

There is also some liaison activity with the R Sector related to the free space optics that came in, related to some contributions that came into Question 12 here.

As usual they updated the OTNT standardization work plan. Question 13 has continued their work on packet timing definitions and metrics in the G.826X series, transport of frequency in the 817X series. Transport of time sync in the 827X series, sync layer functional models and data centre synchronization. They have a large number of recommendations for consent and for every one of those they start new work items again to continue that work. The work for Question 13 never comes to an end. There is always more to be done there.

Finally, Question 14 has, you know, eight Documents for consent. Among those are two emergency amendments, if you will, related to the work to be able to put the Yang modules they have developed on to the ITF Git repository, to facilitate getting all of the relevant modules posted up there at the same time. We're adding the necessary disclaimer to Documents, even those that were not originally intended for consent in this meeting.

Other than that, Question 14 has continued their work on common management models, MC operations and management, sync management, OTN management, media management, transport Ethernet and MPLS‑TP management. That is the highlights of the report. I won't take any more of your time going through the details. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Tom, for your summary of the work of Working Party 3 and the excellent progress that the questions had during this Study Group meeting.

Are there any questions or comments on the report from Working Party 3 in TD 44?

Okay. No comments, can we agree to this report?

Okay. Thank you. So let's continue then with the next document from Working Party 3. Which is the text for determination consent agreement and approval, which would be in TD 45 of Plen.

So if you can pull that up here. So thank you very much. Tom, can you introduce this briefly and then we'll go through each for approval.

Well, once he introduces it, then I will do the IPR call after he does that. Tom, please.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. As usual, Working Party 3 has no texts for approval or determination at this meeting.

We have a large number of new or revised texts for consent here. Again, I don't have the exact number in my head. And we have one supplement for agreement in the OTNT standardization work plan revision for review in the meeting.

Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you for that update. So we'll go through this. But before I go through this, I will make the patent announcement ‑‑ before I do that, I would like to ask Hiroshi to take the floor and let us know what the status of the captioning. But it is not behind us yet. But anyway, please go ahead, Hiroshi.

>> SECRETARIAT: Thank you, Chair. The program is fixed and now captioning is working. You can see the real‑time captioning from the Study Group 15 web page. Which I show you now. Now, you can follow from Study Group 15, the 15 web page. This is not my screen. In the meeting in focus block, you have captioning here. Almost at the bottom of this block. This link file, leads you to the captioning file. The second one, captioning, if you click here, you can see the real‑time streaming player. You can see the captioning. So you can see the text, what I am talking right now.

If you put some text in your address, which is and equals start zero, it shows from the beginning of the caption. So sorry for the inconvenience, but now, captioning is working. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much for giving us that update on the captioning, Hiroshi. Thank you for that. We have a patent policy with ISO and IC. Patent statement and licensing Declaration that are relevant to the recommendations for decision in this meeting that have been received prior to the Study Group meeting are listed in the ITU‑T patent database on the ITU website. But for this Closing Plenary, as the Chair, I will make the following query on IPR. Does 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? Anyone wish to make a statement there? Okay. Not seeing any, in addition, I will confirm with TSB that no patent statement or licensing Declaration has been received to prevent the approval of any of the recommendations proposed for decision here.

>> SECRETARIAT: Yes, I confirm TSB has not received any Declaration that would prevent any of the candidates for consent or approval. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much proceed, the first one is G8013, amendment 1, which is OAM functions and mechanisms for the Ethernet based networks. This is in TD 19 revision 1 of Plen.

Are there any comments on this? Can we agree this for consent?

(Gavel)

Thank you. Next is G8021 amendment 2. This is the characteristics of Ethernet transport network equipment functional blocks, amendment 2, the text is in TD 87 revision 1 of Plenary. Any comments on this? Can we agree this for consent? Thank you?

The next is G81 amendment 2, characteristics of MPLS‑TP blocks, equipment 2, text in TD 18 revision 1 of Plen. Any comments here? Can we agree this for consent? Thank you. The next is ... G8020.3 new recommendation, the text is in TD 61 and this is also in TD 5 of Plenary. This is in reference of the IEEE802.3 standards. The base standard and amendments to make it an ITU recommendation. Any comments on this one?

Can we agree this is for consent? Thank you, agreed for consent.

Next is G709, amendment 4, interfaces for OTN. Amendment 4, the text is in TD 5 revision 2. Any comments here? Can we agree this is for consent?

So agreed. Next is G709.5 corrigendum 1 on FlexO short interfaces, text is in TD 69 of Plen. Any comments here? Can we agree to this? Next is G709.20 amendment 1, overview of fine grain OTN, the text is TD 9 of Plen. Any comments? Can we agree? So agreed. Next is G798 amendment 3, characteristics of OTN hierarchy, equipment functional blocks, amendment 3, the text is in TD 4, revision 1. Any comments here? Can we agree to this for consent? Thank you. Thank you all.

Next is G8023, amendment 3, characteristics of equipment functional block, supporting the Ethernet physical layer in FlexE interfaces. Amendment 3, text is in TD 78 revision 1. Any comments here? Can we agree this is for consent?

Next is G8312, amendment 4. Interfaces for metro transport networks, amendment 4. The text is in TD 10 revision 1.

Can we agree to this for consent?

Next is G8321 amendment 2. Characteristics of MTN equipment functional blocks. Text is in TD 16R1.

Can we agree to text for consent?

The text in TD 3, any comments? We agree for consent. Next is G8310 ‑‑ we just did that one. Next is G781, amendment 2, synchronization layer functions for frequency synchronization based on the physical layer, text is in TD 65R1. Any comments here? Can we agree this is for consent? Thank you. Next is G7781.1 synchronization layer functions for packet based networks, text is in TD 73R1 of Plen. Agree for consent? Next G8271.1. Amendment 3 this is synchronization for full support, text is in TD 68R1. Agree for consent? Next is G8272. Text is in TD 72R1 Plen and references in TD 93 Plen.

Agreed for consent. Next is G8272.1 amendment 1. Timing characteristics of the enhances primary reference time clock, amendment 1, the text is in TD 70R1.

Any comments? Can we agree this is for consent? Thank you. Next is G8272 amendment 1, timing characteristics of coherent network primary reference time clocks. Text is in TD 71R1. Can we agree this is for consent? Thank you. Next is G827273 amendment 1. Framework of phase and time clocks, text is in TD 13R1. Can we agree this for consent?

Next is G8273 amendment 2, common aspects for PTP profiles phase time synchronization. Amendment 2, TD 64R1. Agree for consent. Next is G8371, this is a new recommendation, previously GMT 'N Sync, synchronization aspects of metro transport network. Text in TD 14R1, reference in TD 86. Any comments here? Can we agree this is for consent?

So agreed. Next one is G711 generic protocol neutral information model for transport resources. Text is in TD 6R1 of Plen. And this is with an asterisk, I presume that is the 30‑day request for editorial cleanup and review.

>> Yes, it is. There are a number of items that have that. I think just below the table, that is clarified.

>> CHAIR: Right, that is what I thought it was. So okay. That is what the asterisk was. These are requesting 30 days. Okay. Any other comments on this one? I see several hands in the back on this one. So Stefano, please.

>> STEFANO: One of the previous recommendations, G.8275. This is common aspects of the PTP profiles is the new title. Here we have to report the old title. Let's see.

Because 8275 will change the title, this should have been October. The amendment 2 should refer to the previous title. So it is for editorial. I'm sorry for this.

Because in different Documents, we can go in parallel the new titles and old one. The correct title should be ‑‑ maybe I can ‑‑ let me check.

>> CHAIR: This is an editorial point, and maybe you can send text to Hiroshi in a text or chat. We will issue it with the correct title. Okay. This is just in the table, the text in the document that we consented is.

>> STEFANO: The document is correct.

>> CHAIR: It is just the report table here?

>> STEFANO: Just the table.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the clarification. If you will send the email to Hiroshi with the text to modify.

>> SECRETARIAT: I would like to make a small clarification about this. The amendment is still part of the original recommendation.

So we cannot change the title. But when we revise the recommendation, we are free to change the title as we wish this is some difference between amendment and revised recommendation. There is already I assume that there is consensus about the new title. But we need to wait until the old one.

>> The issue is the text in the table ‑‑ it is a revision coming.

>> CHAIR: In October.

>> To make sure.

>> CHAIR: As I understand it, the situation is that the title in the table here is the new title.

>> That's right, yes.

>> CHAIR: And needs to be reverted to the old table. Everything else is fine. So Stefano is going to send the text of the old title and you update this table.

>> Right, right, sounds like we're all on the same page.

>> CHAIR: Yes. Very good. That is an editorial background. Let's get back on where we were, which was G7711. I heard no comments on this. Can we agree this one, for consent? Next is G7721, the management requirement and information model for synchronization. The text is in TD 11R1 of Plen. Again, with the 30 days. Can we agree this for consent? Thank you. Next is G7721.1, which is the data model for synchronization management, text is in TD 12R1. Again, with the 30‑day request. Can we agree to this for consent?

Thank you. Next one is G8052.1, OAM information and management models for the Ethernet transport network element. Text is TD 7R1, 30 days requested. Can we agree to this for consent? Thank you. Next is G8151 amendment 1, management aspects of MPLS‑TP network element, amendment 1, TD 17R1. Can we agree for consent?

Next is G.8152, the resilience information models, and TD 22. Can we agree for consent. Next is G8052.2 amendment 1. Resilience information and data motions are amendment 1, text in TD 94 of Plen with the 30 days requested.

Can we agree to this for consent?

Thank you. Next is G8152.1 amendment 3, the OAM investment information models for the amendment 3. Text is in TD 95 of Plen. And 30 days is requested here as well.

Can we agree to this for consent? Okay. Thank you. The next text that we have for agreement is G supplement 72. This is modelling a consideration and optical media networks. The text is in TD 8R1. Any comments on this? Can we agree to this supplement?

Thank you. It is agreed. And finally, for review, there is the OTNT standardization work plan, issue 35 in TD 52. Can we agree this review of the work plan? Okay. Thank you.

So that is the Documents from Working Party 3. So let's ‑‑ as I said, there will be a revision of 1 of this that Hiroshi will prepare.

Next move on to TD 46. That is the Work Programme for Working Party 3. So I'll ask the Working Party 3 Chair to introduce this please.

>> WP3: There are 30 new work items, two related to the emergency amendments I alluded to earlier that Question 14 is doing. As always we have a lot going on in Working Party 3. I will let you take it with that.

>> CHAIR: So we have the Work Programme here. So this is the set of items by Question, which the additions and what we have at the end are the A1 and A13, correct.

>> WP3: Yes. I note in a number of the tables there are highlighted text in the editor columns indicating changes to the editor or email address, which in some cases or affiliation, which in some cases was not correct. In the database. We highlighted those and it can be sometimes difficult to tell if that particular column has changed.

>> CHAIR: Okay. We'll just highlight the items here. For the update of the Work Programme. And then we'll go through ‑‑ I guess we'll accept each of the A1 and A13s individually and accept the entire Work Programme at the end. By accepting the Work Programme, we agree to the editors that are in the Work Programme as well. And as well as the proposed timing and such. So this is shown in change mark. You can see the addition of two items here. And scroll down, Hiroshi, you will see Question 11 with changes.

I presume the highlighted in yellow means the new?

>> WP3: That is a new editor or one on the screen is an example of where the affiliation has changed. We're trying to correct all of those issues here in this document.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. So if you will scroll down, continue to scroll down, Hiroshi, past Question 11, which the highlighting in yellow for the affiliation changes. Then the new work items. Then in Question 12, we have two new GSTR work items in Question 12. Then if you continue. There are new work items in the Question 13, it is a typo or editorial in the item here. In the Plenary, there, I made a mistake as well.

>> WP3: It has been a mistake for several meetings now. We're trying to get it fixed.

>> CHAIR: Yes. Okay. Removal of some work items addition of some more, more cleanup of names.

>> WP3: On several items, the ongoing texts are updated based on the work in this meeting.

>> CHAIR: Very good. That is the summary of the work plan, let's go through the justifications in the Annexes here. And so we'll approve these one by one and accept the report at the end. First is A1 justification for a proposed revision to G8020.3 on Ethernet. This is a revision of the document that was just consented because it was noted that there is an additional corrigenda and perhaps subsequently amended items to include in here. That is there with the supporting members listed below. Any comments on this A1? Okay. Can we agree to this? Thank you. The next one in Annex B is justification for G8011. This is a revision, I believe. Yes. To align with the latest published work for ‑‑ and this is by reference. We have the four members noted there as well. Can we agree to this A1? Thank you.

Next is Annex C, G79 eight. This is a revision of G798. This is moving content around. This is in the same idea of reorganizing the work?

>> WP3: That's correct. And the next three are all related to what I mentioned earlier of splitting the recommendation up into, it will be four trial recommendations.

>> CHAIR: Right. Very good. G698. If you scroll down Hiroshi, we see the supporting members noted here. Any comments on this? Can we agree to this A1 justification? Thank you. So the next one Hiroshi.

It is for G698.ODU, which is the split as we mentioned by Tom. And supporters listed on the bottom. Can we agree to this A1 justification? Thank you.

Next one is the G698 FlexO recommendation of the split off with the supporters noted on the bottom. Can we agree to this recommendation? Thank you.

Next one is G798.media, the split is listed and supporters listed below. Can we agree to this A1 justification? Thank you.

The next one is G709.5, this is for an amendment of G709.5 to add additional features for 800 and 1.6 interfaces to align with the work in 802.3 noted supporters. Can we agree? Next ‑‑ that was the last one? There is ‑‑ many more. Okay.
Okay. Many more.

>> WP3: We're only a third of the way through.

>> CHAIR: Might get to them by the end of coffee break or start of coffee break. G709.6. This is a revision. This is an amendment to G709.6, also adding FlexO for 1.2 and 1.6 terabit. The supporting members shown below. Any comments? Can we agree to the A1?

The next is G80106. This is a revision to G806 with the scope and summary and supporters listed below.

Any comments? Can we accept the A1? Next is G709.1, the OT elements. The summary and scope and if you can scroll down Hiroshi. Noted supporting members. Can we agree to this A1 justification? Thank you.

Next is G709.MFI, which is the OTN module framework interfaces. This is a new recommendation.

Noted supporters here. Any comments? Can we agree to this? Thank you. The next one ... Annex L. This is A13 justification for the GSTR on enhanced network operation for transport networks with the purpose and scope noted here, base text of course, in TD 84. And noted supporting members any comments? Can we accept this A13 justification?

Next is A13 justification for the proposed new GSTR on international optical networks towards 2030 and beyond. Base text is in TD 100 of gen. There is a purpose and scope indicated here. With a number of supporting members noted below.

Any comments on this A13 justification? Okay. Thank you, it's agreed.

Next is the A1 justification for G781. Synchronization layer functions for frequency synchronization based on the physical layer, with the base text noted there. And scope and summary. So this is proposed new recommendation, you scroll down with the noted supporting members.

Can we agree to this justification? Thank you.

Next Hiroshi, please. It is the A1 justification for proposed amendment to G781.1 with the base text noted here. The scope and summary, and if you scroll down to see the supporters, there we go. Any comments on this? Can we accept this? Thank you.

Next is the A1 justification for amendment 2, to G8260. Base text is the published amendment. And this is the scope and summary noted here with the indicated supporting members. Can we agree to this justification? Thank you. Next is the justification for a revision to G8272.1, base text in TD 68R1, noting the scope and summary. The supporting members listed below. Can we agree to this A1 justification?

Thank you. Next one is it G8272, draft amendment, the text in TD 72R1, draft text, base text and the supporting members noted below. Can we agree to this justification? Thank you. Next is justification for draft amendment 8272.1 and the base text in TD 72R1. Can we agree in this A1 justification? Next is Annex T, based in TD 64R1. The supporters noted below. Can we agree to this A1 justification?

Thank you. The next one is in Annex U. G8371, draft amendment, base text in TD 41R1 and the scope summary shown there with the supporting members listed here. Can we accept this A1 justification? Thank you.

The next one in Annex V is the draft amendment to G811.1. And the base text is published addition. And there is a scope noted here on adding some points with a number of supporting members. Can we accept this A1 justification? Thank you. Next is the G7713 draft amendment. Using the base text as the enforced recommendations of the forced text with a number of supporters noted here. Can we agree to this? Thank you.

Next is the A1 justification for an amendment to G7721. Base text in TD 11R1, noting the scope summary and the supporting members. Can we agree to this? Thank you.

Next is A1 justification. Most of this is highlighted as an update to, so maybe you can clarify this.

>> WP3: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This work item exists already. The Rapporteurs were trying to highlight that with the text in red, that these are the updates to the existing work item. So it is not an entirely new work item.

>> CHAIR: And the addition looks like amendment 3 of G798?

>> WP3: A change to the completion date and some other minority updates.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Noted supporting members. Thank you very much.

Next is A1 justification for amendment to G876 with the base text as the enforced recommendation and the noted supporters. Can we accept this? Thank you.

Next we're moving into double letters of the alphabet. Annex AA, using the enforced text for the G8052 and a number of supporters for the amendment of the UML models. Can we agree to this A1 justification? Thank you.

Next is the A1 justification for G8052.2 with the base text the enforced recommendation we only have two supporting members for this work item.

>> WP3: This is an emergency amendment that is adding the legal disclaimer. Treating it as we would an emergency corrigenda.

>> CHAIR: This is updating the legal text for example, the update of the models.

>> WP3: This one and a similar TD will have only two supporting members.

>> CHAIR: That is specifically to update the legal text?

>> WP3: Yes.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Can we agree to this justification? Thank you. Next one. It is A1 justification for 8152 for the base text is the enforced document and this is the UML updates. Can we agree? Thank you. And then the next one is the other one that was just alluded to. The emergency amendment for the legal text, this is for G8152.1. Can we agree to this? Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, please.

>> (Off mic)

>> CHAIR: There is a typo in this ... I'm sorry. The typo where? In the timing for the base text. The ‑‑ I mean, the timing is approval at this meeting. That is not ‑‑ is that ‑‑ oh, did we already approve this?

>> WP3: Yes, just bookkeeping to put in the Work Programme.

>> CHAIR: We should have done this before we approved it for consent.

>> WP3: Fair point.

>> CHAIR: The timing was this meeting. We already consented it. Yes. Perhaps we should ‑‑ maybe we should have been made aware of that.

>> WP3: My apologies for not mentioning earlier.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for noticing and bringing this to our attention. Yes, this is agreed. So we can consent it in the past. Okay. Was that the last one, Hiroshi? Okay. Thank you very much. Are there any comments on the entire report? Can we accept the Work Programme update? Which means we accept the editors as noted before. Okay. So agreed. Let's proceed now then with the next TD on liaison statement from Working Party 3. That would be in TD 47. So I ask Tom that summarize this, perhaps, and then perhaps then introduce the liaisons one at a time. And we'll approve them as we go.

>> WP3: Thank you, Mr. Chair. At the beginning of the document is the usual summary table here that has the incoming liaisons on the left and outgoing responses on the right. A few of these rows are capturing responses that were sent from the interregnum meetings to liaisons that were received, you know, prior to when the meetings were held. For example, the first row shown here would be one of those.

And then right at the end of this table, there are the spontaneous liaisons generated in this meeting. All of the ones in this meeting are in the Annexes to the document, which as you said, we'll take one by one.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. If you can scroll down, Hiroshi. And ... we'll go through the liaisons one by one. For review. Would you like to introduce them? You can introduce them and I'll ask if there are comments.

>> WP3: This first is the forming the organisation that is getting the approval for P.8020.3 and the options for the maintenance procedure for that. If you scroll down slightly, there should be a numbered list here that explains the different ways that they could cause us to revise this based on them publishing new amendments or corrigenda. This was also worked out in detail with the legal affairs unit.

And then at the end of this the incoming liaison had mention to the workshops and mentions the anticipation of the workshop we will hold in 2026 and we're attaching the consented text.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. So is this ‑‑

(Overlapping conversations) LMSE. That was the incoming liaison was from the standards Committee. Is that right? It was responding to a liaison?

>> WP3: I will defer on that detail.

>> JESSY: It was referring to the LMSE.

>> CHAIR: Any comments on this liaison, ladies and gentlemen? Can we agree to this? Thank you.

Next in Annex B then. Tom, please. All right. Yeah. This is for information to ITU Study Group 5 informing them of consent of this recommendation and the reason for that is that Study Group 5 also interacts frequently with 802.3, because of the power over Ethernet work that 802.3 does being relevant to the recommendation or some of the recommendations at least that Study Group 5 does. So we're telling them what we have done here.

>> CHAIR: And attaching ‑‑

>> WP3: Again, attaching the draft.

>> CHAIR: Any comments on this? Can we agree to this liaison? Thank you. Annex C, Tom, please.

>> WP3: All right. Annex C. Yes, this is informing MEF of the intention to consent to the work item in our next meeting, giving them a heads up that that is revised.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any comments on this liaison? Can we agree to this liaison? Thank you. Next.

>> WP3: Annex D is intentionally blank. When we were assembling our Documents we realized a liaison that didn't need to be there. It was covered elsewhere. It was simpler to not have to go three and renumber everything. Annex E. All right. Yes. Annex E is 802.3 is in response to a liaison sent to us. In here we're thanking them of sharing the draft of the project and confirming that we reached the same conclusion they did and a request about the mapping reference point of the Ethernet OTN.

>> CHAIR: Comments? Can we agree to this liaison? Next is Annex F.

>> WP3: Annex F from Question 11 to the OIF giving information about the work on beyond 1 terabit. They requested we modify the description of a payload type code point, Question 11 agreed that is the right thing to do. Informing them of new work items we started here. And some of the additional work we're doing and beyond 1 terabit OTN would be interesting since they use the same frame formats.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Any comments on this liaison? Can we agree to this liaison? Thank you. Next is Annex G.

>> WP3: G is the usual OTNT standardization work plan liaison to a number of organisations asking them to continue to update us.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Any comments on this liaison? Can we agree to this liaison? Thank you.

Next is Annex H.

>> WP3: Annex H is to multiple ITU‑R Study Groups, so there were input contributions to this meeting about satellite to satellite free space optics communications. So here we're asking ITU‑R for some guidance as to whether they would view that as being part of their mandate and you know, as to per the instructions from TSAG to coordinate with ITU‑R. This is intended to do that.

>> CHAIR: This is to ITU‑R Study Group 4 with a copy to Study Group 1 and 3?

>> WP3: Right. That is based on the information Hiroshi provided us from a colleague.

As a note here, there is another liaison related to FSO in Working Party 2 that we're asking to be attach to this to make sure that the recipients here have the full ‑‑

>> CHAIR: Right. Hiroshi, that is the highlight.

>> WP3: That is the highlighted XXX and instructions to TSB.

>> CHAIR: And please attach the liaison.

>> WP3: We're not aware of the correct nomenclature for that would be.

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

Okay. That's agreed. Next is Annex I.

>> WP3: Yes, Annex I is from Question 13 to the IEEE1588 Group. And the data set members as the title says here.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Any comments on this? Can we agree to this liaison? Thank you. Next? Annex J.

>> WP3: That is announcing the next set of timing and data table centre coordination meetings to the other participants.

>> CHAIR: Any comments? Can we agree to this? Thank you. Next is next K.

>> WP3: Annex K is sharing information on the consented recommendations of this meeting to other interested entities.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We have a comment from Mr. Mansfield.

>> Mansfield: If you don't want to hear these things I won't say them. I say it again. That is why I raised my hand. It is not March July. It is March. I would search the whole document for that. It has been a couple of times.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you for noting that issue. I'll ask Hiroshi to fix that.

(Overlapping conversations)

>> WP3: My apologies we missed it.

>> CHAIR: March is July. We'll fix when we ‑‑ won't do a rev 1. Hiroshi will do the editorials when he sends them. He has to do editorials in inserting things in any case. Thank you.

Can we agree to this liaison in Annex K? Thank you. Next is Annex L.

>> CHAIR: Yes. Similarly this is from Question 14 to a number of other organisations informing them about the things that were consented in this meeting.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Can we agree to this liaison statement? Thank you. Next in Annex M.

>> CHAIR: This is the normal liaison from Question 14 announcing one of the coordination set of meetings that are held with a number of other organisations.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Any comments? Thank you to Question 14 for continuing to organize the calls.

This is agreed. Next? That was it. So thank you very much for that set. So next we'll move on to the next set of ... the next document. The next document to review. The set of things to approve in interim activities, which is in TD 48. Of Plen. So if you can open TD 48, and perhaps, Tom, you can introduce this as well, please.

>> WP3: Thank you. Right, there are three face‑to‑face meetings planned. You know, two of them are being co‑located with Question 12 and 14 and Question 13 and 11, this meeting in a different time and location. And four virtual meetings. There is the coordination and data centre we just had the liaison about. Q13 is having an additional meeting on another topic. The usual four tracks of Question 13 in the virtual meetings and correspondence and we have the Annexes for each of those, you know, with the tables.

>> CHAIR: Okay. These are the tables ‑‑ these are the virtual meetings and in‑person meetings were first. Let's look at the tables. These are the face‑to‑face. To clarify, are all of the face‑to‑face meetings with remote participation?

>> CHAIR: No. They're all noted as.

>> WP3: No. They're all noted.

>> CHAIR: This particular one in June is face‑to‑face with remote participation on the topics. Annex B in Paris. With Question 13.

>> WP3: Question 13 preferred to not have remote participation. Annex E is the other face‑to‑face meeting and that is with.

>> CHAIR: They're both in Paris?

>> WP3: Yes.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So Question 13 is in Paris without remote participation. And upon Question 12 and 14 are with remote participation?

>> WP3: Correct.

>> CHAIR: Facilities are available, but Question 13 prefers to not have remote?

>> WP3: Correct.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for clarifying that. Note the work items here, what will be progressed. So there is a number of work items meeting objectives for Question 12 or 14. But scope to Question 13. Is there only one work item?

>> WP3: For a virtual meeting.

>> CHAIR: We're down in the virtual meetings?

>> WP3: Yeah, right there is the terms of reference for the face‑to‑face. The EPTC topic required extra time. So they included a virtual meeting for that.

>> CHAIR: Okay. That is Annex B. What was C? This was the virtual meeting? So there are other Annexes that are just virtual.

>> WP3: Annexes F through H are ‑‑ put them in Question order.

>> CHAIR: Oh, I see. Okay.

>> WP3: Maybe next time we'll separate them by type first.

>> CHAIR: We just needed help in understanding your organisation. That is fine.

Okay. Any comments ladies and gentlemen, on the virtual meetings? Noting ‑‑ so the Question 13 in person meeting will be without remote participation, but the other ones will be with. Just to add another comment, also for the Paris interim meeting, as a mentioned before, we'll be having a workshop at that meeting, and the management team is discussing the title and the scope for that. And we'll agree to that later today and let the organizers know, and TSB will help us create the web page and such for that as well. As usual.

Just to let you know that as well for the interim that is in person in Paris.

Okay. Very good. I see no further comment. So can we agree this set of interims both in person and virtual for Working Party 3 questions? Okay. That's agreed. Thank you very much.

And that concludes the set for Working Party 3, then. And so we're into coffee break now. So let's take our coffee break now and we'll resume with Working Party 2 at the end of the coffee break. So at quarter past 11, we'll resume with Working Party 2 and then we'll have Working Party 1 after that, and I expect that we'll be able to finish before lunch. Well, we may need to go until 1:00 or so. But we'll see how the rest of it goes.

Okay. Any questions? Okay. Thank you. Enjoy your coffee. And then we'll talk to you again ‑‑ we'll resume at 11:15. Thank you.
(Break)

>> CHAIR: Ladies and gentlemen, let's resume the meeting for Study Group 15. We are still on the Agenda item 13. We have completed Working Party 3, let's go with Working Party 2. Start with the main report of WP2, that is in TD 39 of Plen. If you can open up TD 39, please, Hiroshi. I will ask Mr. Doolan to present the report.

>> WP2: You see the report of WP2. We have brought 10 texts for consent, three for agreement, 11 A1s, three A13s, and eight liaisons. I will go through the main results, the work, and questions. Go down to 3222, the work on 1102 resulted in an A1, the optical fiber for aerial application. A1 for revision and 2 A1s for recommendations for fibers along power lines with high and low voltage. 3223, L104 and 105, 105 we intended to consent. We will do that in October. There were questions on clarifying the scope of the work. 104, however, we are consenting small indoor cables. Moving to L107, that is optical fibers in sewers. The work is ongoing, it will be consented in October. H108, we'll work on. L110, we'll consent in October. Ongoing work in L111, and we'll have a supplement to talk about that recommendation.

Section 3229, a new supplement for agreement here today. That is standardization framework for SCM. This is an area where we are leading the industry. It is followed by 32210. This is a new item. An A1 for weekly coupled multicore fiber for long haul submarine applications. That is an industry first.

We have the two outgoing liaisons in Q5 and 3 interim e‑meetings planned. Moving to Q6, Q6 spent the whole of the first week dealing with the long list of Documents for consent. G959.1. G6.95, 6984, and go to 3.3.25, please Hiroshi. 6.98.4 brings a peculiar attribute. A reference to an MOPA document. It is in the bibliography here, but in a future revision we would like to put it in the normative text. We would like TSB to start A5 approval of that organisation, please.

Moving on, 661, the amplifier. The recommendation, that is for consent. 671, revisions, the same. Consent. 672, the multidegree document has some revisions, the good work done on that recently.

G sub 39, the bible if you like of optical systems design and Engineers is here for agreement. In 3310. In Annex D, it records the work on that.

GDFOS is ongoing. We have three weeks 14 a technical report on feet forward fiber sensing. A13 for that. Mr. Wang will edit that.

We also report in 33217, the thing Mr. Huber mentioned, the TR we're doing across the Study Group. The Q6 notes significant operator intervention from Algeria telecom, Portugal, Burkina Faso on that topic. The outgoing liaisons from Question 6 we'll see in a minute in TD 42.

So moving on to 7. L341, the recommendation is in TD 82R1 for consent. L360 is also for consent. We're expecting to consent L.PCC. Cabling after correspondence activities consent in October. It is going with. This will undergo correspondence for this. And L41 in 3426. A1 for revision of L.361 ID tag requirements. Outgoing liaisons to ITUH‑C and ITU‑D. And Q7 work hard for fliers and we'll show them next week. They got in just under the wire.

Question 8, 35221, recommendation 971, features of submarine cables. Purchased in December. We discovered some small legal ‑‑ essentially legal matters. Names of legal entities in a table in the back need correcting. A1 corrigendum. 976. Test methods for submarine cables is work on that continuing. We expect to consent that in October. We have a revision of 978 in TD 83 of Plen the characteristics we're work on 979 by correspondence and expect to consent that in October. That is the monitoring recommendation.

We have a correspondence activity to conduct between now and next Plenary to understand the structure of a proposed series of recommendations the new 973X series.

We have one change in the structure of the management of Working Party 2, and that is the appointment of BU Jiang as the coordinator. I'm grateful to him and others that helped with that activity. That is the introduction to our report. Or the summary of it. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Paul, for the summary of the work of Working Party 2 during the Plenary this week. And the review of all the great work that has been done including a preview of some of the Documents we're going to be consenting shortly. Any comments, ladies and gentlemen, on this report? Okay, not seeing any, can we agree to accept this report from Working Party 2? Move to TD 40, the text for determination consent agreement and approval from Working Party 2. So maybe Paul, if you can just maybe introduce it. And then I'll go through it line by line to approve.

>> WP2: Yes, we have 10 Documents here for consent. Section 1.1. And three text for agreement in 1.2. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, let's go through the text for consent, the first one is L104, small count optical cables the text is in TD 80R1 of Plen. Any comments? Can we agree for consent? Thank you. The next is G698.4, multichannel bidirectional BWM applications with port agnostic single channel interfaces in TD 67R1 of Plen. Any comments on this? Can we agree to this for consent? Thank you. Next is G959.1 amendment 2, optical transport physical network interface. The text is in TD 74R1 of Plen. Any comments on this? Can we agree to this for consent? Thank you. Next is G672, characteristics of multidegree reconfigurable optical multiplexers. Text in TD 75R1. Any comments? Can we agree to consent? Thank you. Next is G671 transmission characteristics of optical components and subsystems. The text is in TD 76R1 of Plen.

Can we agree to this for consent? Agreed. Thank you. Next is G661, definitions and test methods for the relevant generic parameters for amplifier devices and subsystems, the text is in TD 77R1. Can we agree to this for consent? Thank you.

Next is G695, optical interfaces for CWDM applications. The text is in 91R1 of Plen.

Can we agree to this for consent? Thank you. Next is L341, maintenance of telecommunication poles and overhead facilities. Text is in TD 82R1 Plen. Agree for consent? Next is L360, operation support system requirements for infrastructure management using ID technology. Text in TD 89R1. Agree for consent? Thank you. So agreed. The final one is G978, characteristics of optical fiber submarine cables. Text in TD 83R1 of Plen. Can we agree to this for consent? Thank you.

So agreed.

Next is the set of text for agreement. Just scroll down a little bit Hiroshi, so we can see it on the top of the screen. Thank you. So for agreement, the first one is G supplement 47. This is a revision of that. The general aspects of optical fibers and cables. The text is in TD 54R1 of Plen. Any comments on this? Can we agree to this text? So agreed. The next is G sup on G65X. This is a new one. The numbers will be assigned in sequential order by TSB once they're agreed. So when ‑‑ after this meeting, TSB will process that and we'll find out what the number is. Any case, the standardization framework for optical fires for space multiplexing. The text is TD 20R1. Any comments on this one? Can we agree to this text? So agreed. And the final one is G sup 39 revision, optical systems design and Engineering considerations. Text is in TD 90R2. Can we agree to this text? Thank you very much. So agreed. And those are the Documents for approval from Working Party 2.

So next from Working Party 2 would be the Work Programme, that is in TD 41 of Plen.

>> Revision one.

>> CHAIR: Revision 1 of TD 41. That will be noted in our updated Agenda. In any case. So this is revision 1 of TD 41. So Paul, please, can you introduce the Work Programme?

>> WP2: Thank you, yes, I'm happy to. This is the list of Annexes. Please scroll down Hiroshi, so I can make sure there is an L. That is the change. The Chair will go through these one by one. We had ‑‑ I will explain the revision. We just consented amendment 2 twine 5.1. This is the actual A1 for it, which was approved in Hong Kong. Very similar to what Working Party 3 did where we have included this new here as a kind of bookkeeping exercise.

Please scroll down and show us the amended Work Programme. From the Question. This is Question 5 as usual things in yellow indicate changes. The blue text came out of the Work Programme of record. Most of these are ‑‑ some of these are things that you will see A1 or A3 for, others are minor changes. The one on the screen you can see there, L.111, we changed the priority from low to high. Scroll on, please.

As Tom mentioned, most of the reference texts have changed because of activity in this meeting.

Scroll on down.

Back up a little bit, please. Well, no. Yeah, go back up to 6. So you see 959.1. It looks like a new entry in the Work Programme in yellow. It is set for 2503, because the work was done between the meeting in Hong Kong and this meeting. TRFSC is new work. The 665 is ... I don't know exactly why that changed.

7, please. Reverted to the title of the L.360 work. Reference Documents changed. L.361 revision.

Change in timing for L391. At the bottom, you see new maintenance of conduits, excuse me, for telecommunication, Mr. Kitto will edit that. Q8 priority is changed to high in three items. And we have the corrigendum, I mentioned to change the legal name of some entities in a table at the back of the document.

That's the amended Work Programme for Working Party 2. Updated.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Any comments or questions on the updated Work Programme? Eugene, please.

>> Eugene: Thank you, Chair and Paul. In Question 6, Work Programme G sub 39. I have found that the new dot, looking at the email, in the previous one. Please update the email address to that. Thank you. If needed, I will send you the address. We have it. Thank you.

>> WP2: Thank you, Eugene. The new edit is correct. The email is wrong.

>> CHAIR: The email address is not reflected here in the TD. It is in the database. Right. Thank you very much for that comment. And so that change will be made offline but will not require an update to the TD.

I see no further questions. We'll take agreement of this updated work plan Programme at the end after we go through all of the A1 and A13s that are noted here. So Hiroshi, if you will scroll down to the Annexes now. And we'll walk through the various A1 justifications. The first one is for the revision of L102/L26. With the base text and a number of contributions. Let me just go back. Just go back up here. So maybe you can explain Paul, the base text is in multiple Documents. Once ... is there proposals in the contributions to the base text? Is that the intent?

>> If I can refer to Mr. Nakajima.

>> It is describing the aerial table. We consider this we consider the scope of the recommendation. This is because there is two cables, the first used with electrical power lines. Otherwise does not use electrical power lines.

After discussion we decided we have to establish three recommendations to support every type of aerial cables.

For this discussion we used these three contributions in order to decide our scope and description. That is why we put three contributions as a base text for this recommendation.

>> CHAIR: Mr. Parsons.

>> WP2: Thank you. I can further clarify in answer to the specific Question. The reason we include the two contributions as base text is explained in the summary. Table 1C198 and figure 1 and 2 in C.284 are considered as initial content.

>> CHAIR: Just to further clarify, it was noted that there was three recommendations. Is there further ‑‑ like a follow‑on A1 are for the other ones?

>> WP2: Yes, for the new ones.

>> CHAIR: Thank you for the clarification. Any further comments on this? Can we agree this A1 justification? Thank you. The next one then is the new recommendation L.0CWP.1, again. This is with the same base text, the same set as the last one. We will split it into three, I guess is the intent. It will be ‑‑ two new ones, plus the existing one. And with the scope and you scroll down here. With the scope and summary and indicated here in the supporting members.

Any comments on this? Can we agree to this justification? Thank you. And then the next one is justification for L.0CWP.2. Noting the base texts in this case from the contributions noted. And the explanation of how it relates to the other ones in the scope and summary. With the supporters noted.

Any comments on this one? Can we agree to this justification? Thank you.

Next then is A1 justification for revision of L107, with base text in L107, plus two contributions with the scope and summary noted here. With the supporters noted below. Any comments on this?

Okay. This is agreed. The next one is A1 justification of L108. With the base text noted as the base document plus two contributions. And the scope summary and supporting members. Can we agree to this justification? Thank you.

The next one is A1 justification of a new recommendation G.SMMCF, characteristics of the single mode weekly coupled multicore optical fiber and cable. With the base text in C21. And a series of Documents. Maybe you can ‑‑ this is a new recommendation. Is the ‑‑ maybe you can clarify why there is a series of Documents as base text. As I presume C21 would be the base text. Why the existing set of recommendations in the base text? Maybe you can clarify.

>> Thank you, Chair, it has the discussion for the new recommendation for the fiber. In this scope, Question 5, we would like to consider the backward compatibility of the recommendations. I put G.65X3 as a recommendation for the base text. Thank you. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. It is not necessary to have the G5X series. If we want compatibility with it, that is sufficient to mention that in the scope. We don't need to mention that. It is not appropriate as base text. But C21 would be appropriate. Okay. So noting that. And if you scroll down to noting the supporting members. Like that. Okay. So with that explanation, can we agree to this text? Justification? Thank you. Next is the A1 justification for G6650.2. Noting base text in C211 and scope indicated here. Scroll down with the supporters listed there. Any comments on this one? Can we agree to this A1 justification? Thank you.

Next is A13 justification for revision to supplement 39. Base text is the supplement itself. And then there is the scope and summary indicated here. If you scroll down, you see the list of supporters.

Any comments here? Can we agree to this? Thank you. Next is the proposed new supplement on National experiences with respect to XL1XX series on optical fiber and installation test methods. So this is new supplement. I guess the base ‑‑ there ‑‑ I just a comment that it does not have to be a base text when we have the A1 and A13. So having the existing series, which is probably what this is based on, is the based text is probably not appropriate. So there is just no base text, I guess. But this is the list of supporters, listed here. Any other comments? Can we agree to this? Thank you.

And was that ‑‑ no, there is still more. The next one is the justification for provided draft revised G665 with the base text of the recommendation and the scope and summary noted here, with supporters here. Can we agree to this? Thank you. Next is the A13 justification for a new TR. On feed forward sensing in optical communication networks.

You can see the base text noted here in the contribution. And if you scroll down. We'll see the list of supporters here indicated. Can we agree to this? Thank you. Next one is the J1 justification for ‑‑ A1 justification for prose new recommendation, maintenance for conduits for telecommunications, base text and contribution and scope and summary here, and supporters listed on the bottom. Any comments on this? That's agreed.

Next is A1 justification for revision to L61. With the in force and a couple of contributions, base text. And scope, purpose ‑‑ scope and summary as well as the supporters indicated. Can we agree to this? Thank you. The next is an A1 justification for corrigendum to G971. With base text in a working document. We can't do that. It says working Document 8 of 3. We need a TD or we remove it.

>> WP2: Given the previous comments about base text, can we remove it?

>> CHAIR: We can remove it. This is ‑‑ the base text is the 971. That is fine. Yes. We can remove it. We'll do an R2 with things not necessary. We can't have a working document in here. And the ones where it is not necessary to have the series.

>> WP2: The early ones.

>> CHAIR: The early ones I had mentioned. You scroll down to the summary. I mean, the list of supporting members. Thank you. Can we agree to this? Thank you. And last one, this is G959.1, including this in the set. This was as was mentioned earlier for the draft amendment to G959.1, that we consented. We will agree ‑‑ because we already agreed anyway.

Thank you very much. So can we agree the Work Programme as indicated in this TD, noting that we will have an R2 with some of the minor editorials I noted as we went through the A1 and A13s.

Okay. Thank you. That is so agreed. Let's move on now to the next document from Working Party 2 which is the liaison statements in TD 42. So if we can look at TD 42, and then Paul, if you can introduce this, and then we'll go through each liaison statement to approve it.

>> WP2: Thank you, Chair. This is a standard document. The table at the top shows three outgoing liaisons from 5 and 6 and two from 7, making eight in total. They're listed below. You can go through one by one.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. We'll go through one by one and I'll ask you for a brief introduction of what the liaison is as we go. And we'll ask if there is comments. So if you could introduce the first one in Annex I.

>> WP2: Annex I is information for two working parts of IEC. It is an explanation of activities here. We're telling them we started this new supplement. Or that we agreed it. We attached that document. We are telling them about the two new work items that we started. The multicore fiber and the revision of 650. We share ‑‑

>> Can you turn up the mic, please.

>> WP2: Sorry. Do you want me to start at the beginning again, Jessy? I can just continue. Okay. At the bottom we have the normal boilerplate and we can continue appreciate working jointly with them.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Are there any comments on this liaison? Okay. Can we agree to send it? Thank you. The next liaison in Annex 2.

>> WP2: Reply liaison from 5 to IEC, it is information no action. The reply to LS7, thanking them for it. It is coating diameter on fibers. We have established the correspondence. I thought it was odd. But I think the point is there are people in IEC that come here, and there are people here that go there. So we're alerting our people in IEC that there is a correspondence activity going on they might want to contribute to.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. Any comments? Can we agree to this liaison? Thank you. Annex 3, then.

>> WP2: IEEE, for action to reply before next meeting. Reply to their statement. And this is related to the 1.6 terabit work going on in IEEE. We are explaining to them that we started this weekly coupled multicore fiber standard and asking for feedback if they are interested in a short reach application for this technology. I think the notion here is that they have a better idea of where this might be used for example, in data centres, those type of applications. We are seeking input from them on that.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. Any comments on this liaison to 802.3 and IEEE. Can we agree? Thank you. Annex 4.

>> WP2: Annex 4 is from 6 with information to 802.3TJ, clearing up a slight misunderstanding that occurred with a series of earlier liaisons. This is essentially acknowledging we made a mistake in assuming that IEEE were developing scripts for ETTC. We cleared that up. We continue to collaborate with them on this activity. So we inform them of what we have done to progress that work. And we look forward to continuing to work with them.

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

Can we agree to this liaison? Okay. Thank you. The next one, then, in Annex 5.

>> WP2: This is from 6 to ITU‑R Working Party 5A and C. We started this work on free space optics and essentially asking them the three bullets in the middle there, can you give us a list of Documents that might be relevant to this work? Can you give us feedback about the conclusion in one of the contributions which we attach. And we are also asking about whether they think it is appropriate to leave out the value of the probability or leave it unspecified.

Again, this is a liaison asking for assistance from the experts in ITU‑R.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. So just a Question on this one. Related to the other one ‑‑ it is related to the other one, but Hiroshi had connected with Sergio, who is one of the counselors in ITU‑R. And had provided a list of recommendations on free space optics in ITU‑R.

Was that provided to you in Working Party 2 and to Question 6 Rapporteur?

>> WP2: I don't know. Can you ask him, please?

>> CHAIR: Fabio, were you made aware of this list of Documents? There is a list ‑‑ I am noting a list of Documents that the ITU‑R Rapporteur ‑‑ ITU‑R staff in the BR had made available. So in addition to ‑‑ this is from Study Group 5. There is a list from Study Group 7 and 4, I think it was. Maybe Hiroshi, you can clarify.

>> SECRETARIAT: Thank you. Chair, I believe the response from my BR colleague is copied to Fabio, I think, and Stefano. So I think it is the related Rapporteurs. And my understanding is my colleague sent us a table. Three lines were filled and the other lines were blank. And I believe that he meant all the Groups were interested in receiving that liaison.

Some of them have already related Documents, but some others are not. So blank rows are also meant to be relevant. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Working Party 1 and 3 with the documents. So Mr. Cavieli. Please.

>> CAVIELI: Thank you. I was reminded about this email. We didn't have time to list and we will analyze it by the next time in Paris. And we will reply to the liaison. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So you have the list. This liaison is to Working Party 5A and 5C. I guess the Question is, would you like to add any of the other ITU‑R Study Groups or Working Parties to the list as was suggested or not?

>> I will first ... yeah. For the moment, I will keep things as they are, waiting until we analyze better the input. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Mr. Shu, please.

>> Shu: Related to this. We adjusted the liaison that is found in the Working Party 3 set to send it to Working Party ‑‑ Study Group 1 and 3 in ITU‑R. So we made the adjustment in the other liaison.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Right. So 1 and 3 is where the list of Documents are from. So maybe it might be worthwhile to add for information here Study Group 1 and 3 for this one. Maybe if I suggest we do that. We'll leave it for action from 5A and C and information to Study Group 1 and 3. Okay. With that change, any other comments? Can we agree this liaison has changed to add information for Study Group 1 and 3 and ITU‑R. Okay. So agreed.

If we can move to the next one then. In Annex 6, I guess. Paul, please.

>> WP2: This is a response liaison that is just for information. They sent us liaison from open road. Feedback on the G652. That is enough?

>> CHAIR: That is fine. Any comments on this liaison? And the various attaching TDs here. Okay. Less do you have a comment?

>> LES: In the title shouldn't in the liaison it be LSO/R. Outgoing liaison, yeah?

>> CHAIR: Yes, it is an outgoing liaison, it should be LS/O for outgoing. We'll make that editorial update, thank you. Can we agree to the liaison? Thank you.

So the next one is in 7.

>> WP2: This may look strange. It is IECSC86. It is for action. Look at the list of Documents, we're sending a liaison where we say we agree not to include the following standards. I thought that was strange. But the point is on the page below, we would like to have comments regarding whether we made the correct assessment here.

I think the sense is, if you look at the dates, the Documents are 1996 somewhat out of date and irrelevant. We are asking IEC to confirm that.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Any comments? Can we agree to this liaison? Thank you. So the next one is Annex 8.

>> WP2: This is joint liaison to 6 and 8 prepared by PCG, I think. We're telling ... let me see. We're telling them about the new submarine dedicated sensing and monitoring work that we agreed and has been published. We're explaining two pieces of work that might be in the GD and the supplement from Working Party 2.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Any comments? Can we agree to this? Thank you. Next one. That was the last one. Thank you very much.

So can we agree ‑‑ this was the set of liaisons. Yeah.

So we'll do a revision 1 of this with a few changes that were noted for that. Paul, will you do that? Paul, if you will do the revision of this one with the few editorials that we noted along the way.

Very good, if we can move along to the last document from Working Party 2 which is the interim activities. So that is in TD 43 of Plen. So Paul, if you can introduce the interim activity plan?

>> WP2: We have only one face‑to‑face meeting plans for Working Party 2, that is Question 6 in Paris along with 11, 13, 12, I think. The list of topics that we intend to address is there. And as I mentioned at the start, Question 5 has 3, two‑day e‑meetings planned. You see them in the virtual meetings section there. Respondent's activities for 5 on a series of Documents that are listed there on the right‑hand side. Actually for 5, 6, 7, 8, I apologize.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. Clarification Question on the in‑person meeting for Question 6. Is this in‑person only or is it in‑person with remote participation? It doesn't indicate here.

>> WP2: Fabio, please.

>> Fabio: I think it is indicated it will be both in‑person and remote.

>> CHAIR: So it is with remote participation. If we can update this, please. So that it indicates with remote participation.

So we just have a TD just to clarify that. So R1 of TD 43 to clarify this Q6 is with remote participation. I think this is important because Q13 will not have remote participation. We need to be clear that remote participation is offered if that is the intent of Question 6.

Okay. Also noting that this is part of the Group of Rapporteur Groups that will be meetings in Paris and there will be a workshop there as well.

Okay. Any other questions on this?

>> Yes, thank you. On the correspondence activity, I don't believe there is a correspondence for the G dot defaults.

>> CHAIR: Can you clarify that?

>> CAVALIERE: There was a request raised for the correspondence activity. We discussed this opportunity again when we discussed the Q6 report. I confirm there will be this correspondence.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you for that clarification. Any further comments on this? Okay. Can we agree to the interim activities for Working Party 2? And there will be an R1 of this to make it clear that the in‑person face‑to‑face is with remote participation for Q6.

Okay. Thank you. So agreed. Let's move along then to in backwards order to Working Party 1 now. We'll start with the Working Party 1 report in TD 34 of Plen. And I'll ask Ian to introduce the Working Party 1 report. Please.

 >> WP1: Thank you. We have had a busy two weeks, particularly in Q2 and 3. In terms of output we have 15 Documents for decision, consent, and agreement. That is all inputs of the meeting, one recommendation for AP, nine draft recommendations for consent, one technical paper, three supplements and generated as an outcome of this meeting, one Appendix to be updated for agreement. We had no text for determination or review.

We also prepared three outgoing liaisons and reviewed two liaisons generated by the PCG. In terms of new work, we have got one A1 and three A13s. In terms of the future, we have three face‑to‑face Rapporteur Group meetings and nine tele‑Conferences that are planned and confirmed.

Q2 met from Thursday to Wednesday and progressed all the Documents they expected to. Held a joint meeting between Q6 and Q12 on the ION2030 technical paper and Q3 and 4 to complete and review the broadband and access networks technical paper.

Several face‑to‑face Conference meetings planned. The liaisons prepared. And update the Work Programme and typically new work on low latency on TDM, which is a supplement as well as several revisions and amendments to projects. Q3 met from Monday to Thursday. The second week. The guess list of 38 contributions, four incoming liaison statement. And progressed work on the various recommendations into the responsibility from QH, fiber and various supplements on home and UBS, et cetera.

At the end of the meeting, one will recommendation was forwarded for approval after the comments, four forwarded for consent and one Appendix for recommendation was forwarded to agreement. Q4 met for half a day. Receiving one contribution and liaison, which was reviewed for information. So no outgoing liaison or work has been started on that. They also reviewed the draft technical paper, considered mature by Q4. Reviewed the Work Programme, it was confirmed and invite contributions in the meeting to progress the work and find the existing recommendations. I won't take time to go through any more detail. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Ian, for your summary of the work of Working Party 1. And its progress through the Plenary here. We have new work. We have mature work. And so I'm pleased to see that progressing.

Are there any comments, ladies and gentlemen, on the report from Working Party 1?

We just reviewed the front part of it. We didn't go through the whole thing which has more detail in it. Okay, can we agree on this report from Working Party 1? Okay. Thank you very much. That's agreed.

Let's proceed now with the text for determination, consent, agreement, and approval in TD 35. So if you can introduce this Ian and we'll go through each one for approval.

>> WP1: Yes, I think I mentioned we have recommendation for approval, consent and five Documents for agreement. It is probably worth pointing out that two of them we have A5 for, which are noted in the list for new references to existing approved organisations. And also then that the very last one on the end was an Appendix update generated during this meeting to an existing recommendation which has the new use cases. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Let's go through this list then for it one by one. We'll start at the top. There is nothing for TAP approval. Do we have AAP approval? Document sent back to the Study Group after AAP. G9960 amendment 2, unified high speed wire line based home networking transceivers, TD 15R1 of Plen. This is for approval. Any comments on this? Can we approve this recommendation? It's approved.

Next there is no recommendations for determination. So we'll move to the Documents for consent. First is G987.3. This is XGPON, transmission con vergence layer. TD 60R2. Any discussion here? Can we agree this for consent? Thank you. Next is G988 amendment 2, this is ONU management and control interface. The text is in TD 56R1 with the A5 justification for normative references in TD 96 of Plen.

Any discussion here? Can we agree to this for consent? Thank you. Next is G989.3 amendment 2, which is NGPON2, the text is in TD 61 revision 2. Can we agree to this for consent? Thank you. Next is G9804.1 amendment 3 for HSPON requirements, amendment 3, the text is in TD 55R1. Can we agree to this for consent? Thank you. Next is G9807.1, amendment 1, 10 gigabit capable symmetric XGSPONP TD 63R2 is the document it we agree for consent? Next is G9949, the XG.WMC9, W land management control interface. The text is in TD 84R1. Are there any comments on this one? No, okay. Can we agree it is for consent? This is previous GUXSR. It is for extended reality services. Text is in TD 88R1.

That is agreed. Next is G9961, COR1. Unified high speed wire line based home network transceivers. Text is in TD 79.

Can we agree to this? Thank you. Next is G9943, the previous G fin‑NN for high speed fiber in‑premise transceivers, the TD 85R1. And A5 for normative justification is in TD 98R1 of Plen. Can we agree to that? Thank you.

Next in Documents for agreement, previous were for consent. The first one is several supplements. So these supplements will be numbered once they're agreed and TSB will assign them numbers. The first is the supplement on operational aspects of optical access. TD 62R2 is the text. Any comments on this? Can we agree to this text? Thank you. The next one is fine grain overview, the text is in TD 58R2. Can we agree to this? Thank you. The next is supplement on fiber to the grid, use case is network requirements. Text is TD 57R1. Can we agree to this?

Thank you. Next is technical paper on broadband access and in‑premise network or BAIN as referred to earlier. Text is in TD 59R1. Can we agree to this technical paper? Thank you.

The final one is an Appendix to recommendation G9930, the point‑to‑point fiber. This is TD 97, this is an Appendix to information and we can agree the Appendix separately. No comment. That is agreed.

There are no texts for review and no texts for deletion. That concludes the text for Working Party 1.

So if we go back to the Agenda, we can look at the Work Programme for Working Party 1. In TD 36. Of Plen. So Ian, if you can introduce this.

>> WP1: So we have the Work Programme for Q2, 3, 4. The changes during this meeting are revision marks. The Q2, number of two projects and baseline texts. Thank you very much to the editors. Change the spaces including editors. Q4, the Work Programme is currently empty. We encourage contributions. To continue to improve the quality of our recommendations as it is rolled outgoing forward.

We have one a1 and 3A13s, where we have new scope and new work. The A1 is on data over power line vehicle networks for Q3 and we have a new piece of work in Q2 on low layer split for TDM or WDMPON. And also a refresh of the conservation in G45 and finally we have new work on co‑existence between G.fin and G.X fin systems.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. There is change marks in the tables of the Work Programme. As I mentioned before, if there is new work items with the editors that are noted here, when we agree to this, we're agreeing to the appointment of these noted editors here. This is indicated in change marks here. Let's go down and review the new A1 and A13, then, that are proposed. The first one is a proposed draft new recommendation for data over power vehicle network system management DLL specifications. This is G.GOP is the proposed. With the base text. This is the so‑called G.HN. 9960 and 9961. I believe this is based on G.HN. That is why it is indicated as at base text. Perhaps this is like a profile or extension of G.HN for this use case.

So if we scroll down here ... we have details here. Scroll down further. We will see the list of supporting members. Maybe a clarification on the base text. Is the intent that we will be copying in text from G.HN recommendations in the new one? Or we will just reference the new ones?

>> WP1: To Marcos.

>> Marcos: It will be the delta recommendation, likely.

>> CHAIR: So it is not necessary to have them listed as base text.

(Overlapping conversations)

>> CHAIR: That is not necessary to be in the base text. So we can take the base text as being blank. Okay. Maybe we can do an editorial revision to reflect that. Can we agree the A1? Thank you. Next is proposed A13 on new supplement for lower layer split from mobile front haul over TDM and TWM PON, as indicated in the base text. Scroll down Hiroshi, please. We'll see the indications here. And the list of supporters indicated down here. Okay. Any comments on this one? Can we agree to this? Thank you.

So agreed. Next is A13 justification for proposed new supplement 45. This is a revision of the supplement, right?

>> WP1: Yes.

>> CHAIR: Since you are doing the update, it is not a new supplement, it is revision to supplement 45. The base text is the existing supplement 45. The purpose and scope is noted here with the summary and supporters noted there.

Any comments on this? Can we agree? This A13. Thank you.

The last one is justification for this one as a new one, the new supplement on coexistence between G.fin and X fin systems with the description noted here. If you scroll down. We'll see the summary and list of supporting members. Okay.

Any comments on this one? Can we agree to this A13 justification? Thank you.

Okay. And then we'll have an update to this TD 36 with the editorial changes that we noted with the R1. So then can we agree then this updated Work Programme from Working Party 1. Thank you. So agreed.

So we'll move on now, to the next document. From Working Party 1, this is the liaison statements in TD 37. So if you can introduce these and then we'll approve them one by one after you introduce us please.

>> WP1: Three liaison statement proposed from Working Party 1 listed in the table at the front. One from Question 2 around changes to Documents at this time. The second on updates to the ANT, HNT in request for more input and finally to inform 80211 on the consent of the WMCI.

>> CHAIR: Great. Very good. Let's go through one by one. Thank you. We'll go to the first one then you can introduce the text of these Ian and I'll ask for comments as we go.

>> WP1: This is the broadband Forum to let them know the changes to this meeting that we appreciated the line rate of 12.5 GIGA bets for this series. And also provided a test plan for the lab stage clarification of the reverting functions into the new supplement on the ON ops. This is for information. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Can we agree this liaison? Okay. Thank you. The next one, please, Ian.

>> WP1: This is information to a range of Groups in the ITU‑T, R&D and other SDOs. This is about the ANT and HNT overview and work plans. We thank Q9 and 21 for their up in on the incoming liaisons. Discussed the update to the web base and updates. Which we publish after the meeting.

And finally discuss the plans and overviews more generally and request some input changes from many of the SDOs. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much, any comments on this liaison?

Okay. That's agreed to send. Okay. The next liaison, then please Ian.

>> WP1: Funny, this one is to 11 and it is about the consent of WMCI informing them about the Wi‑Fi protocol interface as presented. And we find that information. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. Scroll down Hiroshi. Are we attaching? This is the one we consented right? Did you want to attach the document?

>> WP1: It would be published. That is it. We can touch it.

>> CHAIR: Sending with consent now. So you have it not attached, right now. It is not attached.

That is the preference to not attach it. That is fine. But we indicated the number for it, right? It says 9949.

>> WP1: Yes.

>> CHAIR: The discussion on this. Can we agree to this liaison? That was it, I think.

>> WP1: Yes.

>> CHAIR: Let's move to the last one, which is the set of interim activities for Working Party 1, which is in TD 38 Plen. So if you can go through this, please, Ian.

>> WP1: We have three face‑to‑face meetings in Q2 and Q3 all of them will have the remote option, the best efforts as usual. All of the meetings have been confirmed. Then we have got nine virtual meetings across Q2 and Q3 with the joint one. Q2, 3, and 4. I guess it is worth noting, they're all confirmed. Some of the face‑to‑face are beyond the next Plenary. I want to thank the host to volunteer and get us organized early in getting the Visas.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. That is noting so we have three here. So one for Q2. One in June of this year, but then another one in December of this year. The December 1 being beyond the next Plenary point. Right? Yes. Okay. And these are all with remote participation. With remote participation possible at those. Okay.

So ... yeah. Maybe if you wouldn't mind doing a quick R1 of this, just to add that, perhaps in brackets with the face‑to‑face meeting with remote participation offered for the face‑to‑face meetings. So we're clear. Because we have other Working Parties that will not have remote participation for some of the interim meetings. So just to be clear. Okay. With that, are there other comments? Of course the remote meetings listed here are just between now and the next Plenary. Nothing beyond?

>> WP1: Yes.

>> CHAIR: Any comments on this? Can we agree this with editorial point that I noted so we'll put it in an R1 for this. Okay. Interim meetings for Working Party 1 are agreed. Thank you very much, Ian for all the work and for your excellent report first time as the Working Party 1.

>> WP1: I want to thank Frank for assistance as well.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Frank. Next, back to the main Agenda. That covered all of item 13, all of the sub‑bullets there. We also covered item 14 and 15 as we went through all of the big five there for the Working Party. So next we'll continue with item 16 which is report from the promotion and Coordination Group. So this is in TD 49. We have revision 1 of that. So if I'll ask Taesik to give a summary of his report and we'll look at the liaisons at the end and approve those one by one. Taesik, please.

>> Taesik Cheung: The main object much the meeting was to bridge the gap and responses to incoming liaisons submitted to all questions. Regarding promotion in section 3.1 this section is to various promotional activities from the last Plenary meeting. We published one ITU news participated in three external events, posted in five technical fliers and one identity workshop regarding 2030 and beyond. In section 3.2, it contains new proposed items for promotion from this Plenary meeting for ITU news 40 years plus anniversary of G.652, recommendation on characteristics of the fiber and cable. And our participation in OFC next week and fiber in premise networking topics. All of the three items are proposed in the publication. And for external event we participate in OFC2025 next week. We a booth to promote ITU and the recommendations. And we have a presentation session about standards update on higher speed PON in the technologies and interoperable interfaces.

If you are planning to participate in web C, visit the ITU booth and presentation sessions with your colleagues.

We have many external event activities this year as listed in the report. We may not participate in all of the events, and need to prioritize, considering our interests and available resources.

And we will publish seven new technical fliers from Question 7, 3, and 14 and all other questions were requested to consider at least one flyer on their key topics.

And for item D, we took video interviews with the Working Party 2 Chair and Working Party 3 Chair and Vice‑Chair. We also took video interview with the former Working Party 1 Chair as an ITU‑T veteran.

The communications, one Article from Question 6 will be considered. And for the workshops, the first two were proposed during the next Plenary meeting. The fiber and premise network FTR joint workshop and the workshop on emerging optical fiber transmission centres.

The last one, ITU workshop will be held during the Question's interim meeting in June. At the time this report was prepared, the title of the workshop was tentative. New name has been proposed by the Study Group Chair. That is ITU workshop for the AI, broadband and more.

In section 3.3, objectives for promotion for the study period. This is one ITU news per quarter. Participation in average 1 Conference or event per quarter. And participation in events in all geographical Regions.

And in section 4, regarding bridging the standardization gap as part of coordination, we receive three contributions and one liaison from ITU‑T. These are considered in the corresponding questions and the feedback will be informed to ITU‑T Study Group through liaisons.

And the last item of PSG, the Vice‑Chair of Study Group 15 introduced the African and Arab Delegation meetings and their activity during the meeting. And no document was received in this meeting. Section 9.1 contains the discussions on the incoming liaisons from TSB and TSAG and there are 10 liaison responses.

In section 9.2. Scroll down, please. We received nine liaisons related to terms and conditions and prepare three responses.

Section 9.3, we received 11 liaisons from various JCA Focus Group and Correspondence Groups and prepared three liaison responses.

And in section 9.4 we received 25 liaisons from other Study Groups and prepared 3 liaison responses. And in the last section, 9.5, we receive 6 liaisons from other SDUs and prepared one response to the fiber optic sanction association.

Table 1 shows the list of output liaisons from this meeting. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for your report on the excellent work that the promotion and coordination Group has done leading up to the Plenary meeting and at the Plenary to review the TDs and the core contributions that go to all questions. Q All, as well as promotion activities. Including OFC and other promotional activities, the news and communication and things. Thank you very much for that.

Any comments on the report from PCG? Okay. We can accept the report.

Thank you. Let's go through the Annexes one by one with these liaisons. So Taesik if you can introduce the Annexes one at a time. I will ask for comments and approve them.

>> Taesik Cheung: In summary, total 58 incoming liaisons submitted to all questions in this meeting. Among those, 19 liaisons were correction and prepared 15 liaisons in the Annexes. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Can you introduce the first one, number one, and let's ‑‑ and then I'll go through them one by one.

>> Taesik Cheung: First one is liaison to ITU‑D Study Groups on contributions from Developing Countries. It provides discussions on the contributions from Developing Countries as a PTD activity.

>> CHAIR: If you can scroll down Hiroshi, please, once you pour your coffee refill. Any comments. Can we approve this liaison statement? Scroll down, Hiroshi, and Taesik.

>> Taesik Cheung: The use of telecommunication. It is Question 7 and 8 related to the topic and informs ITU‑T for the consideration of the contribution 356 on establish the warning centres.

>> CHAIR: Any questions? Can we 'approve sending it? Next on Annex 3.

>> Taesik Cheung: It provides our comment on Resolution 8.8. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. This is attaching our guidelines on AAP practices to this? Can we agree to send this liaison?

>> Mr. Chair. In the attachment, we should change TD 23R1 Plen. Not 21 Plen. A typo.

>> CHAIR: It is 23. Yes. That will be R1. I mean the Annex is unchanged. The point is it is 23R1.

>> Taesik Cheung: Sorry for the typo.

>> CHAIR: Do we need an updated TD to include this, Hiroshi? You can take care of it? That is a direction to TSB kind of thing. You will remember that point. Okay.

With that correction of what the right attachment is, can we agree to the liaison? Okay. Next.

>> Taesik Cheung: It is in cooperation and coordination with ITU‑R Study Groups. This is a simple response saying thank you for the liaison and we will follow.

>> CHAIR: Can we agree to the liaison? Next five.

>> Taesik Cheung: That is response to the JCA. It informs that Mr. Lou was appointed at this meeting.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Agree to this liaison.

>> Taesik Cheung: Next is the appointment of the vocabulary. And Mr. Gene will continue in this role.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Any comments? Can we agree to this liaison? Thank you. Next on number 7.

>> Taesik Cheung: In response to TSAG on the focus of deliverables. Simple response saying thank you for the liaison. We look forward to cooperation.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Agree to the liaison. Thank you. Next number 8.

>> Taesik Cheung: Response to the focus of the FAAINN, a response saying thank you for the liaison.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. Can we agree to this liaison? Next number 9.

>> Taesik Cheung: That is response to the Study Group 17 on the coordination for identity management. It provides the latest status of the supplement 81. Aspects for PON security to update the Roadmap for ID management. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. Can we agree to this liaison? Thank you. Number 10.

>> Taesik Cheung: Number 10 is in response to Study Group 12 on the technical report for impact assessment for backhauling on Q is the indicators on mobile networks. It provides feedback from Question 26.

>> CHAIR: Okay. This is to Study Group 12. Are there any comments on this liaison? Okay. This liaison is agreed. Thank you.

Next is 11.

>> Taesik Cheung: 11 is in response to liaison from FOSA. It is the work items including optical fiber technologies.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Any comment on this to FOSA? Can we agree to send this? The next Annex.

>> Taesik Cheung: Next is response to Study Group 13 on the new work item, framework of low latency and energy efficient communications in the networking. This liaison providing the comments on the multiple questions on the work item. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. Any comments on this? We agree to send this. Thank you. The next liaison.

>> Taesik Cheung: Next 13 is response to SECV from ITU‑T Study Group 5. It provides questions to consider on using the existing definition from the database or determine the definition more closely to their use. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Can we agree this liaison? Thank you. Next is Annex 14.

>> Taesik Cheung: Annex 14 is for the activity on Study Group 2. It provides the term, interworking identified.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any comments on this? Can we agree to this liaison? And Annex 15.

>> Taesik Cheung: This is the next Annex in response to IMT2020 to update the information. In the Annex Appendix we provided our updates on the table.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Which is quite detailed update in the Appendix. Thank you. Any comments on this? Can we agree to this liaison? Thank you. Thank you very much. That was the last one. Right?

>> Taesik Cheung: Yes.

>> CHAIR: Thank you Taesik and to the promotion and Coordination Group that we expanded this study period. Thank you for working through all of the items and producing the report and the work. Moving the worked for. Thank you.

Next on our Agenda is item 17, which is leadership appointments. This is in TD 21. I have R2 here. But if there is an R3 available? I think I had made another minority update, check for an R3 on this one, please, Hiroshi for the leadership appointment.

>> (Off mic)

>> CHAIR: This is TD 21R3. So there is just a couple minor. One minor change. The first thing is that I inadvertently left off a part of the Associate Rapporteur for Question 2's name. Her full name is now listed. So thank you for agreeing to serve for this term. That is just editorial. In Question 3, noting that we will be promoting Marcos to be the Rapporteur of Question 3 as the existing Rapporteur Les Brown fades slowly towards retirement.

I understand Les will be able to join us for the next Plenary at least in October. And I want to thank him for his decades of service to Study Group 15. I think it was the mid-90s when Les started with Question 4 and work on DSL in Study Group 15.

I want to thank Les for his years as Rapporteur in Question 4 and on Question 3. Thank you much, Les for your service.

Thank you, Marcos for agreeing to step into Les's shoes to take us through the next few decades. Ha‑ha.

Can we agree this update to the list of Rapporteurs? Thank you. So the next Agenda item, no OUI assignment this time. We'll move to the next one. The guidance for the work of Study Group 15. This is in TD 23R1. As I mentioned at the beginning of the Plenary, there was an extra guideline that we were working on. We were working with the legal staff to make sure that we got it right. And so if you just scroll down a little bit, Hiroshi, we'll see it in here. It is the Yang repository guideline. So this is in Annex 26. If you can go to the end of Annex 26, Hiroshi.

What this is, it is our intent, I guess there are two aspects to this.

The first one is that the copyright release for the Yang modules did not allow the text of the Yang network management to be copied out. As a result of that, we needed to update the legal copyright release so the Yang module text can be used in systems and for its intended use. That is the first aspect. And the second aspect was that we wanted to make sure it was available in the Yang repository that is used by other SDOs, including ITF, IEEE, broadband Forums and others, so the equipment that uses the network management can go to the one place to see all of the Yang modules and models that apply to that particular piece of network equipment. In order to do that, we needed to agree on what the licensing release would be to put that material on this GitHub platform based repository.

So what we have here is the guidelines of how we will in Study Group 15 handle the Yang and how we will develop it as part of recommendations and how we will attach it to the recommendation. Because the manipulate document of record for the Yang module is the recommendation.

And then some details on what would be in the Git repository and the read me file and what will be in the Yang modules itself as the legal text with the release.

So if you scroll down, you will see all of that information described here. So we spent some time before the meeting. And we met with the legal affairs unit to finalize this document here for this meeting. Are there any comments on this guideline for Yang modules ‑‑ repository that we will be adding? Okay. Can we agree this revised set of guidelines for Study Group 15? Thank you. It is so agreed.

So Hiroshi, you will add that one to the repository as well, in the IFA/guidelines, we'll add the revised Yang repository one.

Okay. Very good.

The next Agenda item is the draft Study Group 15 report. And so we'll go through this here. I won't spend too much time on this. Perhaps I'll take us to 1:00 on this one or just before and we'll adjourn by 1:00.

So this is in TD 33. I think I had an R1 of this. There is a couple of editorials that were in here. So let's just walk through this. This is the draft report of the meeting that will be presented as an R report. So this will be R1 for this study period followed by the reports of the Working Parties that we had already approved as they will be R2, R3 and R4. There is no determined text. I have a Question mark here. No determined text. We won't have an additional report there.

So just going down briefly, the first is noting that we had the meeting and that the Chair and Vice‑Chairs were here, thanking the director for his remarks. And I don't have in here, thanking the Deputy Director. I will probably add that because that was from today. And then that I presented the Agenda. If you scroll down, we agreed the Agenda and then we had the reports of the previous study period. We had the WTSA summary that I introduced and then the previous Documents. The candidate Documents for approval.

The highlighting the new promotion and Coordination Group that new includes a coordinator for Working Party, highlighting that.

And thanking ETRI the host for the networking reception at this meeting.

Scroll down to meeting organisation. We have the objectives for the meeting and the appointment of the Chairs and Vice‑Chairs. The Rapporteurs, and if you scroll down, I think I need to update this, too. I need to fix the Question 2 Associate Rapporteur thing.

I will do an R2 of this one. Just to fix that. And I'll also add in the Bilel point I mentioned at the beginning for this.

Then the appointment of the two tables of Rapporteurs. We had the change, as I mentioned.

Then there is the guidance for the work here. And this guidance was without the 26th. I need to add that one here as well. That is the one we just approved. That needs to be added here. I'll include that in the rev 2 as well. The meeting Documents, noting a bunch of Documents. The ones highlighted in yellow, I will ask TSB to help me fill in that. They can do the final count on how many liaison statement we received and sent and such, right? We updated the Work Programme. That is noted here in section 4. And the recommendations approved since the last meeting. The IPR status and so on, in section 4 here.

Okay ... oh, ... right. We forgotten an additional item the EWM report, we missed that on the Agenda.

So I will finish this. Then we'll take the EWM report before the conclusion.

Did I have here what TD that was in? TD 99. We'll take TD 99 after I go through this. Then promotion and coordination as I say and then there is the Lead Study Group activities. If you will scroll through those, please. Keep going Hiroshi.

Noting the workshop that we had since the last meeting. Future work. The A5 qualification of MOPA requested by Working Party 2, included here. The future work, interim meetings. That will be listed.

I want to spend a couple of minutes on the future meeting. To let you know this is our plan for the future meeting. As I want to make it clear that so for the October meeting, which is the next meeting, October 13‑24, we will be overlapping with both Study Group 21 in the first week and Study Group 13 in the second week. Study Group 21 is having a joint meeting with the MPEG Group of ISO. Large, 6 to 700 people. Meeting room space will be tight during the first week. I asked the leadership team to put forward our draft timetable already. So they'll be working with you or have been working with the Rapporteurs already to identify that. We'll put in the request for how many rooms we would like. But we may not get all of them. We'll have to work for that through October. The reason for that is these are the dates we wanted that don't overlap with other meetings. We work with TSB to get our dates and not overlap with other Groups like IETF that we overlapped with for this Plenary.

The next one, third study periods is Montreal, 29 June to 10 July. Hosted by Canada, again. This time with IEEE802 as the sponsor. This will be the 10th joint workshop on July 11. Between the two meetings. Again, noting here, two things. First, the Opening Plenary will be on the Sunday. In between. Opening Plenary will be on Sunday. And that the ‑‑ so that will allow more Working Group ‑‑ more Rapporteur Group time. For the first or second in the second week, be in the same hotel. First week we're hosted in McGill University, rooms there.

Because of that and the room capacity will be less during the first week because of that.

To let you know that point. We'll work with the management team to make sure that we will fill and what the requirements are. But we may need less meetings during the first week because of that.

The fourth, fifth, sixth meetings in March and October of 27 and July of 2028, rounding up the study period.

Any comments on my report before ‑‑ okay. Can we agree that report? Provisionally agree it, based on as a said, I will make a few updates and TSB will update it as well with the yellow points. Okay. Thank you.

Now, the last point as we mentioned in here, the EWM report, in TD 99. So I ‑‑ the EWM, we have a coordinator from each of the Working Parties and I believe Tony from Working Party one drew the short straw to present on behalf of the Group. There is revision 1. Hiroshi, first.

>> SECRETARIAT: On the TD 99 revision 1, provided by 20. It hasn't been posted yet. We will post it as soon as we finish the meeting. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: But you have R1 on the screen and can show it as presented. Tony, please provide this.

>> Tony: Thank you. I receive comments from our Vice‑Chair last minute, so I update the report as revision 1 to include the comments from TSB.

So this report is generated by the coordinator from different WP. And we collect feedback before the meeting and during the meeting and we have gathering together the Thursday and generate a report. This report included to parts. One is talking about the EWM issues from last study periods.

We have two main issues from the last study periods. The first one is regarding the email with a list of common incoming to see if the email is sending to multiple Question list, the user who subscribe to multiple Question email list can only receive one email. This point is still under debate, but we need to consider the confusion of the Question of different emails.

The second one is contribution submission for each Plenary. I think there is some contribution contain as the joint co‑author there.

There is a problem when the people make the contribution with this kind of contribution, they need to input the company one by one. And also the system cannot actually adapt to the order of the authors in the content list in the contribution. The system only support the alphabet order. The other issue is whether the system is support a kind of batch input function to include all the multiple company information together in the same type, not one by one.

This should be taken into consideration in the future. This is talked about the issues identified during this Plenary. Can you scroll down, Hiroshi?

Yes. Actually this feedback is from Scott. I think Scott is doing very detailed research on how to use the so‑called SEO. Search engine optimization. It is like using a website like Yahoo, Bing, Google, how this engine can show good results related to the ITU‑T 15.

The benefit of using this, highlighted there, including increase the visibility and attract the users, give you a cost‑effective marketing results and improve user experience and create credibility and trust. So we have Annex A attached to the report, to showing the results how we search ITU‑T 15 as terminology in different search engine. How the search engine bring us results. Sometimes it is good. Sometimes they cannot attach to the very good website there. There is a suggestion to the TSB if you look at the bottom of the screen. First of all, consider some investment in populous one like Google to improve the result when the users of the ITU‑T 15.

The second is that we would like to suggest to update the text and photos in our at a glance page. It means when they collect the ITU‑T 15 web page, they can also see some photos and also some very good text there to attract the user's attention. The third one is to get the Engineer to drive traffic to ITU‑T servers.

For the second issue is regarding the IFA. There is one comment coming in to say that some of those are linked from the IFA require registration. But when you lock in using the current ITU‑T account, actually access cannot be done. I think the whole time should look at the link for the prepared study period to check whether the link are available for the current ITU‑T account. And the third one is regarding the web page. There is some common ways when you go to the web page to collect the IFA link for the new period, 2025‑2028, this link is related the previous IFA link, 2022. It needs to be updated accordingly. The third one is regarding to my meeting. This is one raised by Q3. We like to generate the meeting report list, all the attendees and the affiliation. The current system only support to generate the names of the attendees but not the affiliation information.

The second one is when you create the generation of the attendees' list, it only show the attendees when you click the link.

It is suggest if the system request provide historical report of the attendees to make sure the Rapporteur don't need to always generate this report different times in the meeting.

. The fifth one is related to the document repository. As you can see we have comments from newcomers, especially each Plenary a new company joined ITU. When the newcomer come to the Plenary, we tell them how to use the Plenary facility because we have guidelines session in the Plenary. When you go to the meeting, different questions may use different tools. Like Question 3, use RGF and another one uses IFA for the contribution.

They have confusion with the newcomer. I receive a comment that says I think IEEE will include all the contributions from the Plenary so the interim meeting from IEEE.
So whether we can consider to have a unified tour to include all the contributions from the Plenary and RGM in the same system.

The sixth point is raised by Rapporteur when doing the meeting report and those in the Programme in the TSB file. Currently, this is maybe the first time we really go heavily into this TSB Cloud. We see problems there. If you are sharing a folder, it takes a long time from the first, second and third one. When you update the document in the TSB and click save. The system does not actually save the document.

Some update will be fixed. If you try to paste a large block of text or table, the network instead says connection loss or checking connection status will appear. This will allow the Rapporteur to update Documents in the TSB Cloud.

So things that TSB Cloud is supposed to use to assemble the document for the efficiency that should be improved in the new future to report the next upcoming meetings.

We thank all the members to provide feedback to raise issues for the ITU team for to further improve this methodology to increase efficiency of our work.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Tony, for your comprehensive report. And working with the coordinators and management team to pull this together. I know you reached out to the team at TSB to perhaps have a meeting to discuss this with them. The discussion was we propose to discuss with them as opposed to highlighting in TSAG. We won't send to TSAG at this point, but we will follow that into the management team as well leading to the next meeting.

Any comments on the report before we conclude. Thank you, Tony. That brings us to the end of our Agenda. Apologize for going beyond the 1:00 I had hoped we would conclude by.

I suggest to conclude the meeting with thank‑yous to the management team. The Vice‑Chairs, Working Party Chairs. New promotion and Coordination Group. Extended management team including new Rapporteurs, Associate Rapporteurs, Liaison Rapporteurs and all the experts here, especially those that stayed until the end. I have a surprise at the end. To the counselors, Hiroshi, thank you, Emmanuel and our new support here. He is here earlier, I look forward to your support while here. And TSB for their support for all of the stuff that we do. To the captioners, especially to the captioners for staying the extra bit here while we try to conclude before lunch.

So thank you for Ian that is joining assisting Emmanuel this time. Thank you for the assistance with that. I look forward to seeing all of you in person again here in Geneva in October for our next second Plenary of the study period. And I look forward to OFC next week. And for those of you who may be at OFC. I look forward to you being there and helping us to promote ITU and Study Group 15. For those that won't be there, like us on social media and promote the fact that we're going to be there with you and all of your friends. And colleagues.

In any case, thank you very much for your participation. And this Plenary is adjourned.

(Gavel)

(Concluded)
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