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**Comment**: We support this text on the condition that it be modified as suggested herein.

**Attachment**: None. Comments are given in the Observation field, no attachment needed.

**Observation**: We respectfully submit four comments on this text:

1. At the time of Consent for V4 of ITU-T H.265 in February 2016, it was known that ITU-R was working on a Draft New Recommendation ITU-R BT.[HDR-TV]. Most of the content of BT.[HDR-TV] had already been standardized elsewhere, but one aspect had not - i.e., the *ICTCP* colour representation. Although text for this aspect had been prepared, it had not been included in the Consent text for V4 of ITU-T H.265 because ITU-R BT.[HDR-TV] had not yet been approved. The approval of ITU-R BT.[HDR-TV] has since occurred, and it is now Rec. ITU-R BT.2100. Including *ICTCP* at this time rather than waiting until the next revision of ITU-T H.265 would have the advantage of timely inclusion of this extra aspect and would avoid the need to revise the Recommendation again very soon, so we therefore suggest to add this aspect into V4 before its final approval.
2. A small detail regarding the precise scaling factor associated with video\_full\_range\_flag for transfer\_characteristics equal to 16 and 18 has remained under study in ITU-R in the development of Rec. ITU-R BT.2100. The final text of V4 of ITU-T H.265 should take into account the latest information available on how this aspect should be defined.
3. We have noticed that the Recommendation uses the phrase "inverse transform" in an editorially inconsistent and potentially confusing manner. This phrase only occurs once in the text outside of the definitions section (in recently added material) and three times in the definitions. We suggest to review the use of this phrase in the text and its possible removal.
4. We also suggest that if any other such editorial problems are noticed in the text, they could be considered for inclusion.
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