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>> CHAIR: Ladies and gentlemen, if we could take our seats and begin our final session of the day. We are now on item 11.5, concerning the work of Study Group 9, and without any further adieu, I would like to give the floor to Mr. Webster, the chair of the Study Group 9, please.

>> Mr. Webster:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good afternoon, everyone. I will give you a brief overview and highlights key issues of Study Group 9 for the period of time since the last WTSA. And the document I'm going to be working from is TK288 first. 288 has a text report that is a very short or very small ‑‑ contains very small changes to the last version since Study Group 9 has not met since our last TSAG meeting. Our last Study Group 9 meeting was in September of 2014. Our next one will be actually next week in Beijing. So we will have probably more documents for TSAG at the next meeting.

But let us go through the second part of TD288, which is the slide presentation. Before you on the screen, is page 3, which shows the terms of reference of Study Group 9. And all of this is on the web page, but just to point out the key features, Study Group 9 is a vertical study group. It has ‑‑ it's the lead Study Group for integrated broadband and cable and television networks that consists primarily of two parts, one the transmission of video or television signals to the home, and to head ins which distribute to the home. The second part is the use of table networks for Internet service and a host of ‑‑ a host of the applications that we all know about such as voice, video on demand, interactive services, et cetera.

So next slide, please. An example of the current work since the last WTSA are new physical layer specification for high speed transmission oh, coax called HiNoC and interactive video services, telephone and data services and Internet access, like cable modems and we are making inRhees on ultra HD, and smart cable television and 3DTV. And all of these over the cable networks, in association with the broadcasting Study Group in ITU‑R and ITU‑R 6. We also work a lot with quality assessment of video and multimedia over cable. In this we coordinate with Study Group 12 a lot. Study Group 12 is the lead Study Group for QOS and QOE.

Also we work on conditional access for cable, which includes digital rights management, which is why you can't get HBO unless you subscribe to it, and that, we coordinate a little bit with Study Group 17. And lastly, digital program insertion which is the way advertisements are inserted into a television program.

The next slide, please.

Overlapping the two study periods, Study Group 9 had a focus group on smart cable television. It lasted 18 months, held nine meetings and I won't go into any details but the deliverable is found in the link in the middle of the page there, and this gives you an idea of the focus group on smart cable television.

Next slide, please.

Now we ‑‑ as many of you know, in WTSA 12, resolution 18 was revised to allow intersector Rapporteur groups, Study Group 9 has established or been party ‑‑ established or been party to three of those, and actually, there are only three that I know of currently. First is the IRG on AVQA and intersector Rapporteur group is a technical body of Rapporteurs that ‑‑ that meet ‑‑ that can meet across sectors on an equal footing to do technical work and they can, if they wish work on common text recommendations, although those haven't happened so far.

So we have IRG‑AVQA, and audio visual quality'sment and IRG‑AVA which is audio visual media accessible and IRG‑IBB, which covers integrated broadband ‑‑ broadcast‑broad band systems.

All of these include Study Group 9 and ITU‑R6. The first one is includes ITU‑T SG12 and the last two include ITU‑T SG16.

Next slide, please.

Next, I want to talk a little bit about resolution 80. There is a liaison that we have sent, that will be addressed on Friday, asking for action on what is the next step for this pilot. So in order for you to think about that until then, I would like to tell you about the resolution 80 pilot. Resolution 80 is a resolution to basically directing the ITU‑T to look at ways to better acknowledge the contributors of ITU‑T deliverables. At your last TSAG meeting in January, TSAG tasked Study Group 9 with a pilot program to develop guidelines and trial of implementation of this ‑‑ of these guidelines.

So the first ‑‑ there were four items, first item was to encourage the use of bibliography references in recommendations. That item has ‑‑ is underway and several recommendations, both approved and ‑‑ and in progress are using bibliography references.

Next item 2 is a little more difficult. It is to try to find a way to list ITU‑T recommendations within IEEE xploe, web of science or Google Scholar. ITU‑T is looking at, since the first two cost a little Monday, we are looking at Google Scholar first since it is free and Google does most of the work for us. So we hope that will be successful.

But item 3 has already been implemented in Study Group 9, and that is on the Study Group's web page, acknowledge all participants, IE chairs, Rapporteurs, editors, contributors and attendees.

And let's see if ‑‑ if you want to see how it's done, you can look ‑‑ you can click on that link there. I don't know if you can do that right now. Maybe you can. So there is a page ‑‑ or there is a section on this acknowledgments page, which is found on the Study Group 9 home page. There's a section for each meeting. It lists the management team, Rapporteurs, meeting participants, and probably most important perhaps there is a list of the editors, main contributors and approved recommendations and deliverables. It will list liaison officers and a link to the executive summary.

So you can ‑‑ I will show you a mock up of that editors and main contributors page in a minute. If you will go back to the main presentation, then item 4 is a ‑‑ the item 4 was to put on the publications page of ITU‑T recommendations a link that shows the authors or contributors who did submit at least one contribution that was accepted to progress the recommendation.

And on the next page, please, you see how this has been implemented, only for one recommendation and that's subject to TSAG's approval that red box shows a link to a download where you can ‑‑ you can click the next one ‑‑ or next page.

So if you click there, you will go to the next page, which will show you this document in PDF that lists the main contributors and editors of this particular recommendation. I hope we come back to this, PD276 rev1 liaison which asks TSAG ‑‑ we can do it right now if you want.

It asks TSAG to make an action to decide what we should do with this, do we continue the trial and as it matures, do you take the section ‑‑ the portions that are complete and other Study Groups to implement them on a ‑‑ on a voluntary basis or something else?

So that ‑‑ we can pause now and deal with that if you would like or we can wait until Friday. Friday. Okay. We'll do that Friday.

If you can go to the next slide, please, we have the issues that I have listed here for Study Group 9, it is a small Study Group, but active and productive. It's a vertical Study Group. It is broadband cable, soup to nuts and that may be a phrase that's not familiar to most people that don't live in the United States, but that means from beginning to end. So we do cable from the beginning to the end. Soup to nuts refers to a meal or you get soup at the beginning and nuts at the end. So ‑‑ it's supposed to be kind of funny.

(Laughter).

Maybe not.

Okay. So we are ‑‑ so Study Group 9 is also a pioneer in implementing the IRG concept. We have successful coordination with suds in T and R sector, and Dr. Minkin has acknowledged us. We are pioneer in are WTSA 12‑resolution 80 and TSAG will decide whether to emtend that trial to other Study Groups and we have successful liaison with other outside groups, for example, VQEG and ETSI.

Next slide, please.

So in conclusion, I want to say Study Group is successful, productive, dynamic, vertical and is focused element entirely on the broadband cable television industry and we think speaking as the management ‑‑ for the management team, Study Group 9 should be retained as a separate Study Group and I have a TD277, which is coming up next or in a minute, and I'll go into that in more ‑‑ as much detail as you would like.

So we meet next week and the Study Group as a whole will produce some document for TSAG with the endorsement of the Study Group.

Next slide. In case you didn't know what I looked like, there I am. And that's all I have for this presentation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Yes, thank you Mr. Webster. That's an accurate representation.

(Laughter).

So, ladies and gentlemen, perhaps Mr. Webster you could proceed to the presentation of document TD216 for TSAG's action. This session, I would like to focus simply on the work of the Study Group on restructuring issues. We can deal with that separately, but I would like to get through the rest of our agenda for rest of the day. I don't want to get into the discussion of merging or not merging at this stage. So if you could present TD216, please.

>> MR. WEBSTER: TD216 is a draft revision, approved by the Study Group, revision of question 9/9. We have a new Rapporteur, and he started ‑‑ started out by revising the question, which is very admirable of him. We are asking for TSAG to endorse the revisions of this text. So do you want to look at the text, you can there. There it is.

It doesn't ‑‑ it doesn't particularly extend the scope of the question much, but it ‑‑ it specifies a few more items that will make it easier for him to do his work. So I ask TSAG to endorse these changes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Webster. So first of all, are there any comments with respect to the presentation in TD288?

Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Thank you, chairman. I have a question for clarification with regard to TD288 and with that, slide 7, on items 3 and 4. Is this voluntary, or is this obligation? Of course, for example, I ‑‑ I personally would not appear as a person if I contribute that I do this as representative of Germany and not my personal self.

It must be voluntary. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Mr. Webster, please.

>> MR. WEBSTER: Okay. The ‑‑ I have sent an email out to ‑‑ well, and a document out to all are Rapporteurs in Study Group 9 asking them to include a table with the actual authors of a particular contribution. I know that many ‑‑ many contributions come in as ‑‑ as the Member States' representative on the contact list, but it is asked that you identify who actually wrote it, and this is primarily for technical contributions. It doesn't make a lot of sense for policy‑related contributions, but, again, it's ‑‑ it's purely voluntary. There's no requirement for a contributor or a Rapporteur to record this stuff. It's for the benefit of the contributors. So we expect if they ‑‑ if they want to reap the benefits, then they will go to the trouble to list the contributors.

On number 4, those authors or contributors are collected and put on a special page for the recommendation like to be linked as you see here on this slide, and, again, that's purely voluntary and at the moment, it's only ‑‑ only voluntary in Study Group 9. If it goes beyond, it would be voluntary in other Study Groups. So I hope that answers the question, Mr. Chairman, I will try more if there's more clarification needed. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes, thank you very much. I remind everyone that we will be addressing this point of the trial on Friday under TD276. So we do have an opportunity to ‑‑ to deal with this specific item at that time. But I will give the floor to those who have requested it, but I would like to move on to the issue associated with TD216, as soon as possible, because I would like ‑‑ I would like to finish the Study Group presentations this afternoon. So I would ask for your indulgence in that respect. First orange, please.

>> Orange: Thank you, Chair. I will try to be brief. Regarding the TD216, that was covered in the presentation of the chair of the Study Group 9, I will put forward my question now. Regarding the acknowledgment of the participants, I would ask whether regarding the management team of Study Group ‑‑ the Rapporteur, and the associate Rapporteurs that perhaps each meeting ‑‑ perhaps on the page of Study Group 9, this refers to meeting by meeting. Could I have clarification? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Mr. Webster, please.

>> MR. WEBSTER.: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, we have had some turnovers and so it seemed best to us to have a separate list of the Rapporteurs, the liaison Rapporteurs, the editors, et cetera, for each meeting. Now the editors and the contributors are only listed for those recommendations that have been approved or sent to AAP for that meeting. So it's not all editors, you know, at any given moment. But sometimes the Rapporteurs change and so we reflect the current Rapporteur, but we still acknowledge Rapporteurs that were there two years ago, I say. I hope that answers the question. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I have Israel next, please.

>> ISRAEL: Thank you, Chair. I will be very brief. 12 years ago, the assembly adopted that every distribution, we shall have a contact person in the contribution, and it would make it also for the ITU‑T. So may I propose first in the ITU‑T also we shall ask that any contribution will be written by a contact person and regarding what to write in the recommendations may be contack person and the sector member or Member States or associate that contributed to this contribution. To this recommendation. Thank you, Chair.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, Germany, please.

>> GERMANY: Thank you. Coming back to the arms of Mr. Webster, it doesn't satisfy me, because I haven't asked about the voluntary Rapporteur or the Study Group. My question belongs to the voluntary of the attendees or others. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Perhaps I could encourage Mr. Webster and Mr. Gabower to discuss this outside the meeting and reach a common understanding of this particular issue. Mr. Webster.

>> MR. WEBSTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will meet with Mr. Gabower, and tell him all the details, and also the document has a lot.

I suppose we are waiting for TSAG to approve the revision to the question. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yes thank you. That was my next item. So ladies and gentlemen, is there any objection to the revision of question 9/9 on the requirements for advanced service capabilities over broadband cable home networks?

I see no one asking for the floor. So it is approved.

The other issue is later in the agenda where we are dealing with a whole host of documents on that subject, so if you don't mind, we will defer that until later.

So ladies and gentlemen, I would like to move to item 11.6, from Study Group 11. I would like to offer the floor to one of the vice chairs, Mr. Kinyoshi to present TD289, please.

>> Thank you. I'm the vice chair of the Study Group 11. I would like to introduce this presentation on behalf of Study Group 11 management team. First page, please. Okay, this is statistics information of the last Study Group 11 meeting which was held in April, last month. This is very good information to show our performance. There are a number of contributions that 110, 17% increase on the registered participants. It's a 17% increase. And 28% increase on the countries and consent recommendations, 71% increase. On the proposed new work item is 263% increases. And the following pages have the highlights.

First is the combat counterfeiting, and that is question 8. The resolution 188 was discussed in BUSAN 2014 and Study Group 11, question 8 approved the new technical report counterfeit ICT equipment in the November meeting.

In the last meeting, question 8 create new work item ‑‑ four new work item, three TR and one draft recommendation on this topic. And we had a demonstration during the question 8 meeting in the last question 8 meeting on the data, structure that is a possible solution and this demonstration was provided by the TSV.

Next one, please. The next topic is the software defined networking. The question 4 and 6, it starts with Study Group 13. In the last meeting we approve the new supplement document 67. This is first for Study Group 11 on this topic. This is based on the Y3300 recommendation which are provided in the relating the service 13. And this is the cross collaboration of Study Group 13.

Next, please.

Next is the conformity assessment issue, under questions, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 11. So the first we established the ITU‑T CASC. We approve the one guideline document and we create the ITU‑T CACS, and we also study, the ITU‑T recommendations on the key technology suitable for conformance and assessment testing. And we have two pilot projects under consideration. And we create new work items such as conformity assessment, and Internet speed quality measurement and test plan for number portability and benchmarking of IMS platform.

And this is a new work item, the ITU‑T recognition procedure for the testing laboratories. In the last meeting, Study Group 11, question ‑‑ question 11/11 offers a new Gude hype. The testing laboratories recognition procedure, and we create the ITU‑T conformity assessment steering committee under the Study Group 11. And one of my vice chair, Mr. Isaac Boateng was appointed as the chair of this committee. And first committee meeting will be held in December, and all the ITU‑T Study Group are invited to this committee.

And this picture shows very high level procedure of the test laboratory established in the guidelines and it will establish more information in the committees.

Next slide, please.

The next is the SIP‑IMS conformance testing, under question 2, 11 of Study Group 11. This aims to correct the old standard on SIP‑IMS in ITU‑T, and amend it with missing standards. And establish the conformity assessment of SIP‑IMS profile, and create a list of TEs based on the SIP‑IMS. This is under ETSI technical community, INT. We have a joint Rapporteur meeting in September of this year.

, next on topics back one. The next is the Internet speed under question 15. This new has the two types of measurements, Internet access speed, and the Internet resource access speed. And we create a new draft recommendation, ITU‑T q.int speed test under this question. And this is information about joint coordination activity, CIT. JCA‑CIT establish the coordination issues with the ITU and the SDOs. We decided to extend the list of the ITU‑T items to be tested on conformity and they also discussed amendments that are being listed on the compatibility, and we share the information about the event on the conformation and the interoperability.

And this is other information about the joint APT event. This is between the APT and the ITU‑T. In the third event, we will have the third event on the APT/ITU‑T C & I event in Bangkok in this year, in September, this is the joint work of the ITU‑T and the regional HDOs.

And this is the final slide, the conclusion, Study Group 11, the signaling requirements under the test specifications and the conformance and interoperability and we study the protocols on the NGN and I'm oT and crowd computing and SDN under IPv6, and the leading coordinating role in the harmonization of various protocol standards among the relevant are SDNs.

The following is additional slides for your information. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for that presentation. If you could proceed to the presentation of TD194, please. And then I will give the floor to anyone who wishes clarifications or questions.

Yes, could you present TD194, please.

>> On this, this looks at the 2 question. Scroll up, please. Yes, the first question is question 2, requirements for the protoe tolls. There's one addition, proposed addition on this ‑‑ of the difference. In the first paragraph, maybe. Regarding the e‑health. With 9 underlining. We start the discussion on the e‑health, based on the data from the focus group MTM. This was a division to study that topic. So the director ask that you endorse to the division on this question two.

Next one is question 8, and this is a revision of the question 8. Question 8 studies the combatting counterfeit issue. This is other list by the PP188, other in PP14. So this is a revision to show the career responsibility of question 8 to study the combatting counterfeiting.

This is a request to end those in the TSAG meeting from Study Group 11. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

Ladies and gentlemen, the floor is open to any questions pursuant to TD289, the general information on Study Group 11. Are there any questions or requests for clarification. Canada, please.

>> CANADA: Thank you, chairman, and congratulations to Study Group 11 for such a progress in the results they have none straited. The question I have is I notice that you have increased over 200% in the number of your work items, 253, and the question I have, on ‑‑ what is the breakdown of those items? It counterfitting or other aspects that you cover?

>> CHAIR: Study Group 11, please.

>> STUDY GROUP 11: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the proposed new work item in the last meeting is mainly conformance on the interoperability issue. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So ladies and gentlemen, we have ‑‑ I see no further requests for the floor. With respect to TD194, with regard to 2/11, on signaling requirements and protocols for service applications an emerging telecom environments, this question is proposed for revision. Any objection, ladies and gentlemen?

I see no one requesting the floor. It's endorsed.

Secondly, question 8/11, on guidelines for implementation for addressing counterfeit ICT. This too is to be endorsed by TSAG, any objection, ladies and gentlemen? I see none. So it's endorsed.

Thank you very much.

So these two questions are now approved by TSAG and we thank Study Group 11 for their presentation. And we encourage them to continue their work.

So ladies and gentlemen, if we could move to item 11.7, Study Group 12, I would like to call upon the chairman of Study Group 12 to present document TD275, please.

>> Study Group 12: Thank you, Chair. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Study Group 12 with the map dates for performance, quality of service and quality of experience is the lead Study Group which is also for rival destruction and communications. So I think this is common to us. So we can move to the next slide and see what work we have been doing with this mandate.

So we have these various questions as related to the topics. I won't go through all of that. Our recent work, if you move to the next slide, we are trying to study these physiological measures for speech quality assessment and methods on evaluating speech intelligibility.

We have a number of ongoing work with the next two slides going on.

Move on quickly. The next is the recently completed work items. And Mr. Chairman, you will allow me, I want to share some experiences with these recommendations.

The first two, must tend to be used for testing and now the ITU has managed to publish a wide list of forms which are useful for vehicle communication. The third one ‑‑ the fourth one, yes, the third one is an experience from a focus group which was mainly involved by automobile manufacturers. Even though we spent two years as a focus group, that work could not be completed because the expertise was out of the ITU and so it had to take us another two years in the ITU to be able to conclude this work. But then we were himmed by having a lapse time of two years as a focus group. So that gave us essential delay.

If you look at the fourth recommendation, this is a request from UNEC, and as a matter of fact, we did two Study Group meetings, we have been able to have a standard or consent to a standard on eco for vehicles which the last started yesterday.

If you move on not next side, our possible overlaps with other Study Groups. Just as the chairman of Study Group 9 said, Study Group has collaborated so much on Study Group 9 on questions 2 and 9, and we have as many as six questions in Study Group 12 involved in these two questions.

As you are considering Rapporteur meeting for work program, we will want you to look at these two questions again. As Study Group 12 has a desire that they will want to have these two questions in Study Group 12.

Away from that desire, to the next slide, with questions 10 and 15 as is happening with Study Group 11, for every meeting of Study Group 12, we have to be sending statements of consent to Study Group 11. Something that we feel that should not be the case. Rather we should be working to progress work.

The use of the word "testing and measurements" tends to bring a certain confusion between Study Group 11 and Study Group 12, and we ask the Rapporteur group on work program, you may consider ‑‑ we will want a certain clarity. So I will move on to the next slide for the other items that we try to drive participation in Study Group 12.

We have this quality of service development group, which meets every year. And we are open to nonmembers of the ITU community, and we are able to brainstorm on the quality of service issues and all. We have also given this group the mandate to be our liaison and organize on the quality of service and the quality of experience and also to take operational aspects and regional experiences in those meetings.

We have currently one regional group for Africa, which meets once a year and also meets during the main meetings, and then during the regional group meetings, that's Regionional organizational forum which is able to drive the aregional standardization agenda and as we conclude these activities have managed to help us improve our participation and contribution in our group meetings.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much for that presentation, ladies and gentlemen, the floor is open for any questions or clarifications with regard to the work of Study Group 12.

Orange, please.

>> ORANGE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to revert to the potential problem of overlap with Study Group 11, which the Study Group 12 mentioned, Q.QMS.

We don't believe it's necessary to create any comprehensive test as suggested by Study Group 11. We fully support the position of Study Group 12. It requests that this project would simply be either placed ‑‑ other removed simply from Study Group 12. I think TSAG can play its part perfectly. As advisor, making sure that Study Group ‑‑ each Study Group functions in accordance with resolution 2 within its own recommendation, in order not to delay the proceedings, I would suggest that perhaps the chairman of Study Group 12 could have informal talks offline. I would be happy to participate as a representative and ‑‑ a representative of Study Group 11 as well would be most welcome to see what can TSAG recommend so that the Q.QMS be placed only in Study Group 12. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

So you have heard the proposal to encourage the Study Group 12 and 11 to try to identify and resolve the issue with regard to the Q.QMS testing. Or range would like to participate in the discussion and hopefully as a result of the consultations it would be possible to clarify exactly what the scope and the role of these study Groups are with respect to this particular issue. So I would encourage you to to contact representatives from Study Group 11 and try to resolve it particular issue.

Thank you for the suggestion from orange and I give the floor back to Study Group 12.

>> STUDY GROUP 12: Thank you, Chair. Certain work was done with the Study Group 12 meeting with the advisor for Study Group 11, but we are open to hold further discussions on this. Unfortunately, I have never met the chairman of Study Group 11 before, and that makes it very difficult for me to really take this at the highest level of the group. I'm very much open to resolving this issue. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. We would ask the TSB and the counselor responsible for Study Group 11 as well as the vice chair of Study Group 11 to contact you and discuss this matter further and, of course, Mr. Dubisen has offered to provide his advice with regard to this particular issue.

So if there's no further ‑‑ so I would like to ask the vice chair of Study Group 11 to comment, please.

>> STUDY GROUP 11: Thank you very much, from orange. I convey your concern to the Study Group 11 management team. This work is ongoing and next meeting ‑‑ the next meeting, we will be joined in September in Vienna and the question 10, the Rapporteur invite the Study Group 12 expert to this meeting and hopefully discuss jointly to avoid a conflict on this topic.

Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Yes, thank you for that. In the meantime, I would encourage the parties to discuss the matter further during this TSAG meeting, if there's any particular way forward that can be applied later in that meeting.

So thank you for that and now we can move to Study Group 13. We have a number of documents to be presented. I would like to give the floor to the chairman of Study Group 13, Mr. Lehman, to present, first of all, TD290, please.

>> STUDY GROUP 13: TD290 gives an overview of our work. The key topics are cloud computing, Internet of Things, big data, SDN and future networks, which are handled by our different questions. Without explicitly stated, I would like to know that in Internet of Things we have received a significant increase from African countries which present the Internet of Things requirements from African countries, and it shows me are a very good result of this African ‑‑ the regional African Group of Study Group 7 which has prepared here these presentations.

Major topics appear now, I think, first of all, to mention, I think, it's IMT‑2020, that is the future activity in ‑‑ of Study Group 13. In 5G area, or IMT‑2020, indeed, deliverables will focus on the network part that is non‑radio regulated, and in order to define the appropriate package, we are working on, that is more to the extent possible aligned with work in other SDOs. We have established a time frame of six months until December of this year, so ‑‑ with the objective to produce the materials or analysis in order to identify the relevant scope of ITU‑T recommendations in this area.

Furthermore, just one back, we have another ‑‑ we are raising area is trusted infrastructure in ICT. Based on a workshop we had this year, correspondence group, it was established as a first result in order to clarify the term of trust.

Next slide, please.

Looking on the progress since the last TSAG meeting, I just would like to point out item 2, that we achieved two common text in the cloud computing area with iceo, IEC/JTC1, the one is the cloud computing architectures, and we have also started this year at the end, a bit ‑‑ very strong activities in our Study Group.

Next slide. Coming more here to the organizational matters, since our former chairman is sitting here in front as the new TSB director, we had to elect a new chairman. And as I already established we established a focus group on IMT‑2020, and we have all the ‑‑ also created a joint Rapporteur group related to cloud computing management with Study Group 2.

After completion of this communication with the different collaborative teams where we are now ‑‑ we are now closed. Further more, we have closed the JCA‑cloud. And as we have since a while, specifically spoken over to Study Group meetings. No mention of former question 8 and no more Rapporteur anymore, we decided to answer question 8, it was dealing with security, with the Study Group 13. So we decided to move as cloud computing, security‑related version, which from question 8 to question 19, and SDN security related issues to question 14, and after having done this, to close question 8, as there is no longer activity.

Coming here to further as we have question 8, as we propose to deletion. Just back. It was too fast. Then we have related to this deletion of question 8, we had to modify the question text of question 17, and ‑‑ sorry, of question 14 and question 19. We have sent revised Tex of question 5 and to give more focus on the big data activities, we have asked for endorsement of the modification of question 17 to include here big data aspects.

I guess we can take next slide.

Just an overview of the workshops we have done and this next slide. For the big data and IMT2020 it seems an important future activity for Study Group 13.

Next, regarding overlap, currently, we have no overlap, but here I also have to thank the good cooperation with Study Group 17 chairman as we always have to be careful and through his support we work on the revised question text that we include here a source of potential overlap for the future.

And I just would like to point out the recent mutual work with ISO and JTC1 on cloud computing.

Next slide, please.

I think the prospective, if I look here at areas like cloud computing, SDN and IMT‑2020, collaboration with the ITOs to work in the development of networks and it should be part of future studies.

It seems to me major importance.

Next slide. Okay. That's it. Thank you very much.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Would you present are TD195, 261 and 263, and 308. You already alluded to the the actions taken with them. If you would like to briefly introduce.

>> Study Group 13: Let's start with TD195.

This is liaison from question 5 applying IMS and IMT in developing country, mobile telecom networks. And this question has identified that when that ‑‑ it would like to broaden its scope or alter new technologies for mobile networks that are beyond IMS and for this purpose, they request to add in the question text and other new technologies and then you find them in several places, and some editorial extension.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. So ladies and gentlemen, the proposal is to endorse the revision to question 5/13, which would now read applying IMS, IMT with ‑‑ and adding the words "and other new technologies" in developing country mobile telecom networks. Any objection to this revision?

I see none. So it's endorsed.

So please continue, Mr. Lehmann with the presentation of TD261, please.

>> STUDY GROUP 13: Okay. So TD261 is a modified text for question 14, and question 19. That is a consequence of deleting ‑‑ of deleting or terminating of question 8, and why question 19 and 14, I think in both cases, we have here with Study Group 13 ‑‑ Study Group 17 agreed collaboration between both Study Groups with 19 related to cloud computing and with 14 related to SDN. And in order to keep this activity in line, we have to we agreed to modify ‑‑ to keep it in line in a smart way.

We agreed to modify the text, as you will look first at question 14 text, it's quite less. It is ‑‑ it just said in the ‑‑ in the second big paragraph, which improves security and in ‑‑ and the question part under the third party, it is secure ‑‑ it's the ‑‑ the verb "secure" is added.

So that is the changes for that text, if you come to question 19, I think in principle, the changes are quite editorial, just adding insecurity in the text, and adding security in several locations in this document.

What I have to note here is there is ‑‑ like I stated, by the cooperation with the Study Group 17 chair, we identified that in the ‑‑ in the tasks sector, that there is ‑‑ there's a certain ‑‑ the third bullet is ‑‑ in the original form, it was development recommendations required for cloud computing security. I think may be misunderstood because it's very general, and that does not reflect the color or the collaboration agreement between 13 and 17, and so in the document TD308, you find here the appropriate clarification by ‑‑ is it possible to open it? TD308. Just go down and there you see the extension as defined in the cloud computing between Study Group 13 and Study Group 17. Even giving you the reference where this is stated.

So I think with this, I have presented both texts where we ask for the endorsement of the modification.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. So ladies and gentlemen, again, the modified text of question 14 open software defined networking and service aware networking of future networks. Is this any objection to the modification as described?

Seeing none, so that's endorsed.

Secondly, the integration of question 8, into question 19, as Mr. lehmann has stated this is mainly editorial. The name has been modified to 19, to end‑to‑end cloud computing and management and security. Any objection, ladies and gentlemen?

Seeing no one asking for the floor, it's endorsed.

So the final document is TD263, concerning question 17. So Mr. Lehmann, please.

>> STUDY GROUP 13: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Okay. Finally, this is a modification of text of question 17, just for the background question 17 has started significantly work on big data related to the cloud computing aspect. Currently, we have three big work items running and we expect already now in the July meeting our first recommendation for content on requirements and recoverabilities for cloud computing and big data.

And for ‑‑ to make it more visible, we ask ‑‑ the questions we ask for question 17, to include here big data in the name of the question as well as giving here some explanation on big data within the text.

>> CHAIR: Yes, thank you, Mr. Lehmann. So the action for TSAG is to endorse question 17/13 by adding reference to big data activities. It would now read requirements ecosystem and general capabilities for cloud computing and big data. Anybody objection, ladies and gentlemen?

Seeing none, so that's endorsed.

So thank you, Mr. Lehmann for that report.

Yes, Mr. Lehmann, please.

>> STUDY GROUP 13: I would just like to know that we don't have to present it, but the presentation which was shown, it was a PowerPoint slide, if you go in the number, you find an addendum, which is a Word text, which gives you more detail, especially the lead Study Group activities. I have covered it here, but if somebody is interested, please look in it.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. So ladies and gentlemen, we are almost completed our agenda for today. I would like to ask Dr. Trobridge the result of the discussion that took place with representatives of Study Group 5 with regard to the L series recommendations. Dr. Trobridge, please.

>> DR. TROBRIDGE: Thank you. We had a consultation and discovered happily that the liaison's statement had a proposed title for the L series which was simply an extension by adding additional topics to the existing title. The slides were a little misleading in that it appeared that we were replacing the title with something completely different, rather than adding some new topics to the title.

So I think with the understanding that we are simply adding these other topics to the scope of the L series, Study Group 15 has no issue with that modification. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Dr. Trobridge. So we can consider that issue resolved.

I see that Mr. Tsugewa has just ended the room. The timing couldn't be better because I was about to ask him the result of consultations with regards to question 6/3. Mr. Tsugewa, please.

>> MR. TSUGEWA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I have been inactive in this room for a certain while.

I think we have reached a consensus. I think Laura sent that. So would you ask Laura whether she sent the agreed text or not?

>> CHAIR: We haven't received it yet. So we'll defer that item. I think it can be dealt with fairly quickly, so we'll refer that item until later, perhaps tomorrow morning.

So, I think ladies and gentlemen, we have completed our tasks for today. The reception will begin at 1745 but I remind you at 1900, we have a meeting of the Rapporteur group on working methods which will meet in this room. So I think without any further adieu, although I see a further request for the floor from UAE, please.

>> UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It's actually on the same topic that Dr. Trobridge clarified the issue. So I see under item number 26 on your agenda, it's resolved. Perhaps you need to amend this. So it's TD268 from the chairman of Study Group 5 proposed text for the revision of recommendation ITU‑T A had the 12. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So the agenda will be modified accordingly. Thank you.

So, ladies and gentlemen, I think we have completed our tasks now. So enjoy the reception and we will see you tomorrow. I would like to, again, thank the interpreters for the extra time at noon, but I'm pleased that we have completed our work in time this afternoon. I hope it continues for the other two days where we have the interpreters.

So, again, enjoy your evening and we will see you tomorrow morning at 9:30. Thank you.

(End of session 1731 Geneva time)
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