

**RAW CAPTIONING TRANSCRIPT FILE**  
**JOINT ITU/WHO WORKSHOP ON**  
**SAFE LISTENING ON VIDEO GAMING AND ESPORTS: UPDATES**  
**RENNES, 16 APRIL 2024, 0930-1230 HOURS CEST**

Services provided by:  
Caption First, Inc.  
P.O. Box 3066  
Monument, CO 80132  
800-825-5234  
www.captionfirst.com

\*\*\*

This text is being provided in a realtime format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

\*\*\*

>> CHAIR: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Let's start the ITU/WHO workshop on esports and video gaming. My name is Masahito Kawamori, I'm the Chair moderating this session. Before we start logistics, I'd like to invite those people that want to intervene to make comments. Please use your microphone or please ask for microphones. Yeah.

>> SIMAO CAMPOS: Don't use your microphone. We have remote room and the audio, the room is connected. If you use microphone, the laptop will generate echo so don't. We have a microphone in the front and raise your hand and we will hand to you. We always make interventions with microphone before because of the remote participants.

>> CHAIR: Please don't connect to the audio, right. Don't connect to audio but use the microphone here. Thank you. That's about it. Let's start the workshop. I would like to invite Ms. Shelly Chadha to start the session and explain the background and so on. Please, go ahead.

>> SHELLY Chadha: Welcome to the webinar on safe video game play and esports. This covers a compilation of a series of workshops we have been having. The most recent of which was on 13 of January to discuss the Draft Standard, to get perspectives of all the states that have been participating and to update it and move it towards a final version, which will be ready for approval. So since January, since the end of January, since back to the last meeting, we have been from WHO's side, in collaboration and close collaboration with ITU and working on a revised standard. We're taking into consideration the perspectives that were shared with us during the January workshop, as well as the feedback we received from participants from industry, from out-of-state, from

experts in the field of video game play and sound and so on. Over the past couple of months we're receiving input and so on.

>> SIMAO CAMPOS: Shelly you may want to turn off camera because the voice is coming a bit chopped. May be bandwidth.

>> SHELLY Chadha: We have been having these discussions. Simao, can you hear me clearly now?

>> SIMAO CAMPOS: I was having difficulty with the microphone. Yes. It's much better.

>> SHELLY Chadha: No worries. Based on the perspectives we heard in the previous meeting and also with the feedback that has been shared with us by various partners and various stakeholders in the field, we have been working on a revised draft of the standard which was submitted to ITU and will be the point of discussion today.

So the purpose of this workshop is really to go through this revised draft and to discuss all of the changes and all of the features which are currently included in this draft and to come as far as possible closer and closer to a final version of the standard.

I would like to briefly share the entire standard and to give just a brief update on what are the changes that we have made, so like overview of the changes that we have made before we start going into the text of the document itself. Masahito, however, since some of us are online and some of us are in the room and we can't all see each other, perhaps it would be useful to have a quick round of introductions if you think that is suitable?

>> CHAIR: Yes. That will be great. Yes. So, let's start. Yeah.

>> SHELLY Chadha: I can start with myself. I'm Dr. Shelly Chadha and I am the technical lead for hearing care, including the safe listening initiative at the World Health Organization. I'm very pleased to be part of this workshop, even though I'm enjoying remotely today. My colleague, Peter, who will introduce himself. You can has it to Mark if you would like.

>> MARK LAUREYNS: Hi, good morning. My name is Mark Laurenyns, representing G3ict and co-chair of the safe listening workshop at the World Hearing Forum. Happy to be here.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Malita, please.

>> MELITA MOORE: Good morning, everyone. Dr. Melita Marie-Laure, Chair of the commission for the global esports federation and as well as Vice-President. Very happy to be involved as we continue to work on the standards. We have some of the largest esports events starting to happen across the world, so as we continue to make recommendations for all of our gamers to be healthy and safe, this is the great work much needed in the industry. Thank you for having me this morning.

>> CHAIR: So the next one is --

>> PETER: Hello. A colleague of Shelly Chadha from WHO. Working on the standard, making it safe, happy to be here, from Sidney Australia, long way to get here but excited to be here.

>> CHAIR: Yeah. Okay.

>> Michael from the TTA, Korean SDO. Glad to see you all.

>> Okay. Good morning, good afternoon and good evening for all of the participants in the room and participants online, so my name is Noah Lo, Chair of (?), it's my great pleasure to join you for this workshop. Thank you.

>> Good morning to you all. My name is Joseph from Shri Lanka.

>> My name is Seong Kim from Korea. Glad to be here in this workshop. Thank you.

>> My name is (?) Sun from Korea. Thank you.

>> Hi. My name is (?) from Korea and I participate here for the topic. Actually I'm not expert in this topic, but global esports because last year or this year, Korean esports World Cup in champion, so Korea member so just for interest, I think.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good morning. Katuna from Kenya, ICT regulator. Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good morning. My name is Kamila Ohel of the Minister of Communication.

>> Good morning, from Korea. Thank you.

>> Good morning, Ejumapa, College of Medicine. Meeting online.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hello. Yamamoto from Korea. Happy to be here and meet again. Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good morning. Zack from France.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good morning. Michael from United States representing Meta Platforms.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hi. My name is Sen from France of I group and very interested in this meeting and possibility to be involved in the Cloud computing gaming. Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good morning. My name is Vanessa from Indonesia Ministry of ICT. I'm new in this topic, so I would like to know and interested in the knowing of the workshop. Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hello. Good morning, everyone. My name is Dani. I am from ministry (?) and information of the Republic of Indonesia. Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good morning of the my name is Persil from Malaysia.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good morning, everyone. This is work of Study Group 16 Chairman and Question 26 Associate Rapporteur, thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. And Tatiana, can you introduce yourself?

>> TATJANA SACHSE. Good morning. I'm the lead of the global video game coalition. Maybe if I may hand it over to my colleague Sergi.

>> SERGI MESONERO: Hello. Sergi of video game Europe representing the video game industry. Happy to be back at the workshop. Hopefully we can contribute positively.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Raphael.

>> RAPHAEL: Hello. GN audio AS. Gaming and headsets and part of the GN Audio Group and I am based in France but I was not able to be in person. I'm here by -- because I was involved of this kind of initiative and workshop, so I'm here because it might be interesting for us for the business.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Karl?

>> KARL : Carl from soap sewn ee based in UK.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hello. Recently retired esports, worked on modifications for improved hearing safety in the video game.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Trying to in my opinioned the name. There are some people from Myanmar Sports Federation, two people, can you introduce, please.

>> TUN OLIN: Hello. My name is (feedback).

>> CHAIR: I think you're muted. Maybe can you use a headset please.

>> TUN: I'm sorry. My name is TunOLin, representing Myanmar, invited by Ministry of Communications so I'm attending this workshop on behalf of the Federations. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I see Video Games Europe, that's Sergi? Okay.

>> SERGI MESONERO: Yes.

>> CHAIR: Oh, okay. Okay. And I'm waiting still -- waiting for Brian Schmitt? Is he here?

>> BRIAN SCHMIDT clip video game consultant, audio consultant from Seattle Washington in the United States. Great to see some of you again and great to see some of you for the first time.

>> CHAIR: Simaos. My name is Simaos and I work for the Secretariat of the ITU. Before we proceed, just requested if all remote can turn off cameras so the bandwidth can be preserved. Thank you. Then I guess we're back with Shelly at this point. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Shelly? Please.

>> SHELLY Chadha: Thank you, Masahito and thank you, Simao. Can I understand that you hear me clearly at this point?

>> CHAIR: Yes.

>> SHELLY Chadha: Since we have a number of people joining that have not been part of the discussions in the earlier workshop, I would just like to give them a bit of background if that is okay before we proceed with the updates to the draft and so on.

Which is to say that we know that there are estimates that suggest that there are nearly 1.7-billion people who game over consoles

and devices on a regular basis. Another 1.3 who are occasion -- 1.3-billion that are occasional gamers, perhaps. What our research shows us is that there is limited but clear evidence which leads to extended video game play and sound exposure as a result of that or during that to increase risk of hearing loss and other auditory symptoms.

So it is to address this risk, it mitigate this risk that this initiative is launched. It is part of WHO's work to make listening safe because we estimate that globally over 1-billion people are at risk of hearing loss simply because of the way they consume sound over their hearphones, over their headphones, in venue, in various entertainment venues and so on. And part of this exposure, of course, is also the sounds that they are getting while they are participating in various video game play activities.

So it is to address and mitigate this risk that WHO has initiated this jointly, along with the ITU, along with the International Telecommunication Union, the development of a global standard for safe listening in gaming and esports.

This standard builds up on work that is already being done by ITU and WHO on developing a standard for safe-listening devices, such as -- and when we talk about devices, we mean phone, smart phones, MP3 players, et cetera, which have music-playing capabilities so that users of these devices can have proper information and proper messaging in order to enable them to listen safely and mitigate their risk of hearing loss.

So, with this background, this is a standard which was already developed and launched by the ITU and WHO in 2019, followed by an update to that standard in 2022. We started working on a standard based on the similar framework, on the similar framework of providing people information about their listening practices and encouraging them to listen safely while enjoying their video games and that WHO has worked on the standard.

We have been very fortunate to have the participation of various groups and entities since we started this effort, including many of you who are around the table today, so thank you to you for coming back for this discussion. Thank you also to those who have joined, very encouraged to see the participation, also gaming federations and ministries of health so that we can move this work forward in a systematic and beneficial way.

So let me start now by sharing my screen. Can you see that is this can you see my screen? Can you confirm?

>> CHAIR: Yes. We can see it. Thank you.

>> SHELLY Chadha: So what we have been doing over the last few, I think more than a year now, is to draft a standard, to understand what is the, on one hand, the need in this field and what are perspectives of users in this field, that is of players and esports participants, and also to then prepare like a list of features, what should be in a video game play device and video game play title that should or mitigate the risk of hearing loss, that can help to mitigate the risk of hearing loss.

What many of you may have seen on online is a updated draft standard. What I want to give right now is just a quick overview of what those updates have been. After, this I as I mentioned earlier, we would like to go through each part of the standard. I would really beg your patience if you would just listen to this, and then there will be plenty of time for discussion, for questions, for your comments as we go through each of these aspects during the detailed review of the draft document.

So, what we have done between January and now is to have made minor changes to the document and some major changes.

So quickly, the minor changes that we have made and like I said we will go through each of them, to refine the scope of the document. We have added some definitions, which were missing. We have removed some definitions which were considered redundant. We have further refine exclusions so it is very clear what is included in the scope of the standard and what is not. We have aligned the standard base also on contributions that were made by some of the other members, specifically Sony in the last meeting. We have also aligned the Clause 7 of the document, aligned the operational mode and uncertainty of those dose estimates with the previous standard. For those of you not familiar with H.870, this refers to the WHO/ITU Global Standard for Safe Listening Devices, such as smart phones, headphones, and so on as I mentioned.

So we have aligned these two so that they are really based and building off of each other.

Then we have moved all of the textual warnings and information which need to be provided with the devices, with the games to a separate clause, and of course subsequently the numbering has been changed. These were just the minor updates.

We have also made major updates to the standard. As I mentioned in my introduction, we have been working since, well, the last meeting which was the end of January, to discuss with various experts and also get perspectives of users and also perspectives of industry partners on how the standard speaks to them, how they see the practical issues, challenges, and so on.

We have tried to address this in a way that we can -- that we can have a standard that is both practical -- it must be something which can be implemented, but at the same time it deserves the need of hearing protection, which we wanted, which WHO needs, and it is aligned with the principles of safe listening.

So based on these two factors, we have prepared the major updates, listening as I mentioned, to all interested stakeholders who have been providing us with this feedback and their inputs.

So the major updates we have made are really to the safe listening features for video gameplay device, and that is Clause 8, the first one. Here we have specifically now aligned it, as I mentioned, to the text of H.870. We have made many small or big changes that were asked for from us. We have removed the disclaimer requirements because that was considered most appropriate, so those have been removed. And these are the changes

which have been made to, for example, some changes to languages instead of talking about warnings and being more alarmist, I would say, we have softened the language as was requested.

So we have been making these changes and we will go through the text in a short while. One of the key concerns that we have in here is about the messaging. I'll come back to this, but simply to say at the device level, at the level of the hardware, essentially what we have requested as compared to earlier is a much, much I would say simplified messaging. This is a mandatory requirement that there must be at least some way that the user gets a message, gets information about how they're using the sound. It could be through an alert which is sent to them at some point before, during, or after the gameplay. Here you see the text at an appropriate time. But what this message must do is tell the user that you have consumed approximately 60, 40, 20, 30 percent of your listening standard allowance. It must give them some clear information. It could be in the way of a prediction if that is what the manufacturer prefers. It could also be simply in the form of off battery running, and at the corner of the computer you have the battery sign that now I have reached 60% or now 10%, so maybe something like that. We leave that really to the discretion, of course, of the manufacturers who are very much more capable of coming up with ways to share this information.

What we also mandate, which is also part of H.870 is that there must be a message and a cue for action when the person has reached 100% of their sound dose. So, based on the 80 decibels, 40 hours a week, or 75 decibels, 40 hours a week tradeoff, they must be able to get a message and cue for action, asking them to either continue listening if they choose to accept the risk and continue listening at that level, if they wish to turn down the volume, or not. And in case they do not act on it, the volume, same as H.870, it automatically gets reduced. This is in addition to the fact that they should have access to the general dosimetry information on the gameplay or on the interface of the gaming interface, just as it is in H.870.

So this is about the messaging, but like I said I will come back to this in a bit. This has been really a point of discussion and contention. And as a point of discussion, and I would say quite a contested one, has been the headphone safety mode which is about that there should be a default headphone safety mode so that every time a headphone is plugged into a device, it should automatically know the volume by a certain level. We have added that level based off of what is the practice in the industry of what some of the manufacturers are already doing.

So this has, I know, been a point of contention and concern, but we consider this as an important aspect that we would wish to maintain, but we can discuss more about this when we come to the review of the text. And, again, here what we have added in terms of LUFS is based off what is the current practice by some of the manufacturers.

So that -- those were the -- those were the features with respect to the gaming hardware. We also have some major changes to the safe listening features for video game play software and I will start with what was probably the most contested part in a way at the time which was about the messaging. Here again, as you would see, the messaging requirements have been much reduced. The mandate requirements only are that there should be a message on the initial loading when the individual loads that game, they should get a message just like they get for other things, that listening at high volumes and prolonged periods to this game or any sound can damage their hearing, potentially, so they should listen at a safe level.

And this message, or a message, not the same message, but a message be also provided to the player at a convenient moment during the gameplay. After a period of gameplay, it could be after if they have played for two hours, it could be at the exit screen, it could be when there is a pause in the game, when the, let's say the person becomes inactive in the game, or they somehow take a pause, et cetera, then that message could be displayed. It's not to disturb the gaming experience and the immersion into the game.

And what we have also very much done is amended the safe listening features required for further different gaming titles, for the software. Let me first talk about the messaging.

So last time we were asked how many messages, really, do you expect an individual to receive, and we wanted to show it here. So what we would like an individual to receive is one message from the gaming device which is based on their dosimetry. It could be a message in an alert, it could also be a constant somehow display which is in a corner, not disturbing anybody, they could look at it if they wish to or not, but that information should be available.

The second from the gaming perspective, is also when they exceed 100% of their dose. This is really not going to happen, this message is not going to come if a individual doesn't really exceed their sound allowance or sound dose. Essentially, it is one message coming based on the dosemetry, unless they exceed their sound dose or allowance.

And the second messaging, the second part that comes from the gaming title, is really one when you're starting the game, it's a general warning, general message saying, you know, don't listen to very high volumes and it can damage your hearing.

The second is after a period of gameplay, at any time, so as not to disrupt or disturb the users' experience. That is all right now in terms of the messaging requirements, and as you can see, this is really the minimum amount of messaging that we need to give in order to inform people, in order make them aware and make them act, in order to protect their hearing.

So these are the messaging, but what is also being done in this is to amend the approach to the safe listening features. Some of you may recall that last time we had proposed a safe or safer or smart



or smarter listening mode. But what is now suggested, recommended, or mandated is that these features should be implemented in a game as it is appropriate. We leave it, really, to the discretion of the game sound developers who best understand the need of their games, the nature of the sounds, and therefore also the best solutions for it.

What we provide, really, is an indicative list. We provide an indicative list, such as output scaling to - 23dB, dynamic range setup, dynamic range compression, tinnitus souped removal, passive gameplay audio. We provide this as a list and leave it really to the discretion of the sound engineer to take the steps to mitigate the risk of the individual based on the nature of the audio of the sound of their game. And this is safer/smart listening mode has been removed.

What we also maintain is headphone safety mode, but headphone safety mode for a time period only when this site is to be played on a video gameplay device that doesn't necessarily have the same feature, and hence that is what we proposed.

The other, in a way a major but maybe not so major changes that we have moved all the textual warnings, health warnings which are to be given on the website, on the accompanying materials and so on and so forth, to a separate clause of its own as well as requested last time.

So, this is just a quick overview of what has been done, what changes have been made to this standard since the January meeting. And now I would like to give it back to Masahito for discussion forks reviewing the text of the standard but as to say that in what we still need to discuss and what we will focus upon, not necessarily in this workshop because the Clause 8, 9, 10 in the proceeding sections should be the focus of this short workshop but in future or further discussion, we would also like to focus on Clause 11 and 12 which are about headphone output sensitivity and features for safe listening to esports events.

So I'll stop there and open or hand the floor back, rather to, Masahito and Simao.

>> CHAIR: Thank you, shelly. Thank you very much for the informative presentation. I would like to invite people from the participants to have comments, please. Can you say your name again and affiliation. Thank you.

>> Can you hear me? My name is Sen -- a group started in French company. My first question for you in relationship of this and startup in Cloud gaming. It's a very important to my question. Just in positions of -- prediction health offices, intensive gaming, what's your position? It's very important but it's for me very started in creating a Cloud gaming in France. The technology is very possibility and to -- the second question is what's the position for preventions in health and Cloud gaming and very intensive of this part? Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Shelly, please.

>> SHELLY Chadha: Masahito, I'm not sure that the question is very clear to me, but in terms of if I understand it well, and please correct me, please, who made the comment if I don't answer your question correctly. Because in terms of position of WHO with respect to gaming, we don't really have as far as safe listening is concerned, we don't really have a position in terms of what intensive gaming is or how long an individual should game or whatever. We are talking here about how we can mitigate the risk of safe listening -- how we can mitigate the risk of hearing loss while enjoying gameplay. And for that, our position is very clear. In order to do so, there should be certain features which are available to the user through the hardware, through the software so that they can know how they're listening and they can take action to prevent hearing damage. Think of it as you're driving a car and you want to see how fast you're driving. You need a speedometer. All we want is to include a speedometer in a device so the user can know how long and how loud, are they over the limit or within the limit? Think of it as a seatbelt. We want a limiting option so this they go above the limit by default, it can be reduced to the safe levels. However, respectful of individual and perm choices we also want this feature to be such that if the individual decides to ignore that feature, that is really their choice. We cannot create something that 100% protective, but the principle is that we give them the information and allow them the choice to listen safely by giving them the information, by giving them positive messages to promote safe listening. That is WHO's position as far as hearing protection in video gaming goes.

Again, not sure if that answers your question very clearly, but that's how I understood your question.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. There is another hand. I see Serg?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Certainly in information users when you pass the gaming of in this Cloud gaming but on this day still startup in France, not in including results in estimate, just preventions and scheming, a very, very important for ITU in relationships in government to start new recommendations into it.

For me on this day, a possibility just including in software and approximately one hour, two hours unlimited, and for example use in some intensive gaming for 12 hours and okay to stop in your protection of health, it's very important. Thank you for me and uphold clear visions. On this now for me, the group to build Cloud gaming and new possibility including specific software to have new Cloud gaming and to start in prevention of this thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Sergi?

>> SERGI MESONERO: Thank you, Shelly -- can you hear me?

>> CHAIR: Yes.

>> SERGI MESONERO: Okay. Thank you, Shelly, for introducing the changes. As you are aware of a concern or interest, of course, is that the standard is there and the companies can comply with the requirements.

>> SIMAO CAMPOS: Sergi, can you turn off the video because the bandwidth is not so extensive here and the voice comes chopped.

>> SERGI MESONERO: No problem at all. Thank you. I was saying that it is helpful a big effort is made to find common ground. Thank you for the effort. We will be contributing to the discussion with considerations when we analyze the specific features. Digital inclusion of esports is confusing scope of the standard, but I am much more optimistic right now of having final document that will be applicable. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Yeah. Okay. Thank you very much. Patrick, please go ahead.

>> PATRICK ZUDEL: One of my concerns is volume reduction when a user ignores a warning message. I have a few questions around that. Like the first question would be, what is meant by a volume reduction? Is it system-wide volume reduction? Is it volume reduction that is in the in-game settings? Basically, what is meant by the volume reduction?

The second question would be that I think it is important to make it easy to revert that ultimately volume reduction. I think we want to not risk frustrating the player just so they don't overcompensate the volume reduction through the TV, for example, just through increasing the volume in the TV or in their speak, et cetera, et cetera. I think it should be very easy to revert that automatic volume reduction. I think we should be aware of that as well.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Shelly?

>> SHELLY Chadha: Indeded, you are absolutely right. That is intent. It should be default feature but the user should have clear instructions in the instructions. This is at the device level. It is not at the software level, so it will be, yes, a global volume reduction, and it is based on their sound dose, so when they receive 100% of their weekly dose, they get kind of an alert saying that you have exceeded it. You can accept the risk and continue listening. You can also lower the volume or you can not respond, which means your device since you did not switch off the option, lowers it for you. It is intended everywhere to give the user the option of how they wish to listen, but at the same time it is also intended to protect the gamer, should they just inadvertently, and they are so immersed in gaming and so on, reduce track of the volume of which they are listening and consuming sound. I hope that clarifies, Patrick.

>> PATRIK ZUDEL: I have a further question about that. You say that it relates to the dose in a week. For example, imagine I'm playing and I've maximized my dose. My volume, and for example, I didn't notice as you say, I didn't notice the warning so I just click away, for example. My presumption is that, okay, the volume gets decreased, which is good. I think as a user, regarding I didn't notice the warning, I might get a bit confused that I don't realize why my volume is reduced.

So I think, for example, the next time within the week, the next time I turn on the game, I should be warned that my volume has been automatically reduced, just so I realize and I don't get confused that why is something different.

Also, so that's kind of my first question. And that does the user get notified that the volume has been automatically reduced? And the second question is, as it is related to a week worth of dose, does it switch off the next week? Because in a way, the dose resets? Does it persist until the user turns it off?

>> SHELLY Chadha: Firstly, I would like to not go systematically through the document, and secondly to say, Patrik that this is a future which is already included in the H.870, and we did, indeed, have many of these discussions which you have rightly pointed out at that time. It is meant to be a rolling average. So it is not on a calendar week. It is a rolling week.

Secondly, whether the user gets a rolling kind of message when they re-log in if they're still over their let's say sound dose and so on is really an implementation feature. How the user is informed -- we also clearly state that the user, the person must be informed about what are the safe listening features and how they can use them, and also of course how they cannot use them if they don't wish to, how they can turn off the default features.

So that, and we do not go into the granularity of the guidance as to say how any one manufacturer should do it because ultimately they have and can come up with many ways in which to convey this information. What we state here is the intent, which is to reduce the volume, which if they have been listening for a long time. Like I said, of course we understand that this feature is often turned off, which is -- we know that this happens. We also know, based on the theory of behavior change, that there are some people who are already in a stage of readiness to change. They could benefit. This they don't find it beneficial, they can also switch it off. At every point, the user is intended to have a choice. What we want is for them to have a choice. It's really about making sure that a choice is available, visibly and currently, the choices are not systematically available. Some companies and manufacturers, of course, have put certain choices in their games, but it is neither uniform, nor systematic, and nor is it universal. The intent of the standard is to make something which is -- which can be adapted to the context of different game platforms, of different game titles, but at the same time keeping the intent and principle very clear.

I'm happy to discuss this further as we go through the document.

>> PATRIK ZUDEL: To elaborate the point shortly. The main point is there is a pretty high likelihood within gamers specifically that they could ignore a warning. Any outcome that could come of ignoring a warning, should be taken with care. That was just my main point. I think within gamers, there is a higher likelihood than in other devices that people are going to ignore something, just due to immersion, et cetera, et cetera.

>> SHELLY Chadha: Your point is very well noted, Patrik. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments or questions? Karl, please go ahead.

>> KARL BROOKES: Thank you. Karl from Sony. Yeah. Just a couple of things. I just agree on the last point. I think that was a implementation issue. The other issue is the other point, and I want to thank WHO for all of the work they've done in the last few months in these implementations to make this a much, much better document. We still have some issues that we can talk through over the next couple of days, but just to thank WHO for their work on this. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any other comments, Shelly? How would you like to -- go ahead.

>> SHELLY Chadha: My side also to say thank you, and thank you also for all of the input from your side. It is much appreciated. And Masahito, in terms of next steps, I would suggest that we could share the document and start going through the text as has been our practice in the past.

>> CHAIR: Okay. So, can we share it?

>> SHELLY Chadha: Would you like me to share it.

>> CHAIR: If you want to share it, you can share it. Thank you. For those of you online, there is a link provided on the chat box. Yep, we can see it. Yep. Can you scroll down to --

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Just a moment. Okay. Let me go back. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. You see my screen, but I would like to ask you and Simao if you would like me to keep all the track changes. This is a submission that we have made. It has many, many, many track changes. Would you like me to keep them or to not be able to see them so we can see a clean document? Please let me know what you prefer.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: I'm sorry, Simao, I didn't hear you clearly.

>> SIMAO CAMPOS: I'm sorry. Still fighting with the microphone here. I guess in some moments the change is useful. Sometimes it's better to see the clean verse. I guess --

>> SHELLY CHADHA: You can tell me when to change.

>> SIMAO CAMPOS: Yeah. Okay.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Is that okay?

>> SIMAO CAMPOS: Yeah. Yeah. Go ahead.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: So, this is the contribution which was made by WHO towards this meeting and building up of the work that has been done in the past. This is the table of contents. I'm not going to go through the table of content. We start first with a summary of the recommendation. Here again not much change, except that we have changed from in the past from players to gameplayers and from

gaming to gameplay, so those kind of editorial changes as were suggested.

But what I would like for you to focus on for now is the scope. Let us start with the scope. If it is okay, I'm just going to briefly show no mark up here just for us to be able to review the scope in a clean way, and then we can see the marked up version if you wish.

So here in scope. This provides comprehensive safe listening guidelines for the devices used for purposes of video game play, video console, hand-held mobile devices, and personal computers. It includes video game titles, so it specifies that it is for devices used for gameplay but as includes the software which are the video game titles.

Just skipping over the editor's note, the scope further extends to video game play audio profiles, including video gameplay focused headphones and headsets which are regularly used either in home entertainment or esports content.

So note here is that video game play devices include hardware and software, which is used also for esports competitions. So, to be very clear this includes within the scope that hardware and software which is used in esports competitions which may be the same or a bit different to gameplay software and hardware used at home or in routine personal gameplay.

The guidelines are designed to ensure auditory health and prevent hearing damage from gamers across a wide spectrum of video game play scenarios and equipment. I'll stop there in case there are any comments on that.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Sergi?

>> SERGI MESONERO: Yes. I would like -- this is Sergi. I would like to point out that the note is extremely confusing as there is a lot of hardware and software for esports competitions that has nothing to do with video game device and software. I think that is confusing. The fact is that the current state, the standard does not include any specific features for esports competition, which means that trying to fit esports in this scope, mottles the meaning, mottles the -- it makes the scope very difficult to understand, so I insist that as it is written now, material for broadcast things, hardware that is used for specifically for esports competitions seems to be included, but that's not the case. I mean I insist. I mean the games and the hardware are the same. We don't need to specify that they are the same for esports competitions. Introducing this sentence, yes, makes the scope mottled. The segment needs to be included here. I think it's a mistake.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: I would like to hear from other people who are in the meeting and what their perspective is, and also from Sergi. I understand what you think, Sergi. I think the point is this note should not be included, but the point is that the note should be clarified so that the intent is clear. It may need rewording or addition or deletion.

>> SERGI MESONERO: It's already there. We're saying the video game play head it is phones and headsets used in entertainment or esports context, and we already say this. I mean we can spend video game devices to titles to software, so I think that is probably the previous sentence can be extended, a bit more elaborate, but this note as it is now is very confusing.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Point taken.

>> SIMAO CAMPOS: Sergi, you spoke a little too fast and it came out a little choppy. If you could speak a little bit slow, it would be helpful for us here in the room. Thank you.

>> SERGI MESONERO: My apologies. I think the previous sentence is already a good ground because it says headphones, et cetera, used in common entertainment or esports context. Maybe this sentence could be included to contain the games and the hardware is the same. But the way of this note, the way it reads now is very confusing, because as I mentioned before there is a lot of hardware and software used in esports competitions specifically that do not fall under the scope of these text. As per example, displays.

>> CHAIR: Go ahead.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Thank you. Any other comments from others if they have a position on this?

>> CHAIR: Yeah. Any comments offer Sergi's comment?

>> PATRIK ZUDEL: I quite are agree with Sergi. It might be confusing and maybe a bit redundant because esports and video games overall have like amazing overlap. So I want to reiterate what he said. I just agree.

>> CHAIR: Richard, please.

>> Richard GLOVER: I would remove the note. It is confusing. Put something in about esports competition-related equipment will be subject to further review or something. But as it stands, it's just confusing.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Karl?

>> KARL BROOKES: Yes, so I was just going to agree to remove the note. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. There seems to be general agreement on removing this note, the green one. Shelly, what do you think?

>> SHELLY CHADHA: For us it is not a problem to remove the note, as long as without the note, the scope and intent is clear. So, Sergi, you also said that something could be added to the sentence to clarify it, whether it is the one above it, and could you make that concrete suggestion, perhaps, as a text or in whatever way you feel comfortable considering also that audio I think from your end is not per se so that we can do that.

>> SERGI MESONERO: Yes. I can send a suggestion. If you want I can prepare something right now.

>> CHAIR: Yeah. Can you write in the chat box. You can propose some sentences. Any other comments? Yeah.

Karl?

>> KARL BROOKES: Yes. Thank you. Just focusing and literally focusing on the word "focused" in the last sentence. Including video game play focused headphones. How would you determine that? Are you saying that headphones are sold in that way with that advertising? How would that be addressed? Shelly?

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Yeah. So ultimately, it is about devices that are specific or intended for gaming. Not specific, but are intended. And what it includes is the audio preference as well. So, can H.870, which is very similar, already covers headphones and headsets which are using plain capabilities, so here would it be appropriate then to transpose that standard on this as well? Or is it better to keep it for those which are already intended for purpose of gaming? That was the intent here when we say video gameplay focused. It is really products which are meant for gaming, advertised as gaming, conceptualized as gaming, benefited, and also sold as such. Does that clarify?

>> KARL BROOKES: Yes. I understand the intent. I think in practice that could be a bit tricky to achieve, really.

I think for now, if we sort of put square brackets around "focused," and then maybe people could have a think about it. Because you could have two people, one with a gaming headset on and then another without a headset on. I think there are different requirements. I think we need to think about that.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Of course, the dosimetry requirement is at the video game play requirement so that is depending which headphones or ears being used as long as there are headphones or earphones being used. If it is confusing we can somehow revert this and give it a more detailed think. Yeah. That is what I would say. It is not because intent is not to confuse it but to clarify it. So, like I said, we can put square bracket, for sure, Masahito and also put a note and consider this particular sentence.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Richard?

>> Richard GLOVER: Square bracket around focused, could we extend to video game play focused. Again, I think it could be rather confusing. What we're trying to do is not forget headphones and headsets.

>> SIMAO CAMPOS: Simao here. Maybe what you could do instead of square bracket is just refer to the phrase and say including headphones and headsets used in video game play. Would that sort out Karl's issue? Instead of saying it's focused but they are used in headphones in video game play.

>> KARL BROOKES: I think that's improved, but I still think that doesn't completely address my issue. In theory, you could have any headset and play a game with it. It wouldn't have to be a specific video game playing headset. I think we just need to think about this a bit more and come back to it.



AUDIENCE MEMBER: I think the point is not any headphones and headsets, or we should nail it down to those used in video game play. If I understand correctly, it's to which extent the specifications in the standard would apply to any headphones and headsets or those that are used in video game play. I guess that's your point, I suppose, no? Trying to understand.

>> KARL BROOKES: I just think we need to think about this a bit more. That's my point, yes.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Any other comments on this issue? Is it okay if we just make a square bracket around is video game focused? Video game play focused. Any other comments on this scope discussion?

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Masahito, may I request you also to note in a comment or suggestion made by Simao, it seems to me at least to be a good option, and then we can reflect on it further. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: So you want to add an editor's note as a suggestion.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: A note or a comment on that sentence, anything would be fine. Yeah. Thanks.

>> CHAIR: Yeah. Karl?

>> KARL BROOKES: My question was about the title of the document. Is that something you want to address now or when we've gone through the document?

>> CHAIR: We can do it now. I mean it's rather simple it seems. Go ahead.

>> KARL BROOKES: I'm not completely sure of the title of the document at the moment. Is it the title of the paper?

>> SIMAO CAMPOS: A little down, Shelly. Down, down, down. There.

>> KARL BROOKES: Yes. At the last meeting, I thought we agreed to remove "and esports," but maybe that position has changed on that? My proposal would be to remove "esports."

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Masahito, can I? I somehow have trouble raising my happened by sharing, so apologies for that.

>> CHAIR: Yes, you may.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: So here I get your point. There were two points on this. It was my understanding that we can just change the title, what was accepted already in SG16. But besides that, the appropriateness of changing the title is what I would like to address here. I mean why is there a hesitation to mention esports here given that this standard, as we have mentioned and just discussed about the scope it, includes those hardware and software which is intended for gameplay, whether you're a casual player or esports participant playing at home in an esports event. So, why should it not include that is first the question.

Second, if you wish to change it, what would you want to change it to? Yeah. I finished from my side.

>> CHAIR: Karl, please.

>> KARL BROOKES: As I said last time, I think in the title, it's a distraction from the main objective of the document. The main objective is to focus on safe listening for video gaming, and I would leave it at that. It's a very, very small percentage of people doing esports and I think the focus should remain on video gaming. Yeah. That is my proposal for the title.

>> CHAIR: What's the specific proposal? To remove esports?

>> KARL BROOKES: Yes.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Peter?

>> PETER: On discussion of the title. We've been advised that gaming suspect perhaps the best word to use. So just as a question, should it be safe listening for video game play or safe listening for video gaming is still acceptable?

>> CHAIR: Karl?

>> KARL BROOKES: Maybe square bracket around that? I don't have a view on either of those two terms.

>> PETER: That wasn't directed specifically at Karl, just a question.

>> CHAIR: Yes, Melita?

>> MELITA MOORE: I understand saying potential redundant see of esports, when we think about North America and certainly Canada, esports encompasses the clej at scene, schas particular scene, 670 universities in the United States has varsity esports teams, so I think keeping that language in there, I don't see how it's harmful for it to say video gaming and esports. I know when most people think of esports, we think of that 1% professional level of esports. But that terminology, I think when you see esports there, certainly for our high school and college students that have varsity esports teams, that also lets them know that oh, this is for me as well, you know, versus video gaming may just be for that casual gamer but doesn't apply to me as a esports athlete. I think it's important to leave in there, as well as when we look at the overall picture of how esports is being used globy, fl a industry perspective, esports is very specific and different than casual video gaming, but if we're looking at global and esports being used in a ubiquitous form, especially with the international olympic committee having now the esports olympic games, I think having that title of esports in there does make sense for the overall picture and not so much from this very industry-specific definition of what esports is. Although we do know it is a separate definition. I think having this in the title, just makes more people say oh, actually this is for me and not just for some young kid video gaming. I think it's important to leave esports in the title. I think we made that clarification in the paper that this is not specific for esports for the professional level, but I think having it in the title keeps it broad enough that everyone who is gaming, competitive or not, will know the standards and recommendations are for them.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Sergi?

>> SERGI MESONERO: Of course, we concur with Karl. Although, I would not like to focus on the number of people, but I also would like to correct Melita, the definition of esports is competition and casual competition. It's not just for professional, agreed by U.S., Canada, New Zealand, South Korea. But the fact is that the governing standard doesn't include any future that is specific for competition, which is what esports are. So it makes the title very confusing, so if people are going to see the title, they would expect there will be features specifically tailored for competition, and it's not the case.

>> CHAIR: Any other comments?

>> MELITA MOORE: I didn't say esports is just for professional, I said organized competitive video gaming. But I think if we're looking at more of a global picture in the way that esports is used, this would be -- it's my recommendation to leave it in.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Patrik and then Shelly?

>> PATRIK: Future perspective is also needed. There is possibility to look specifically at esports. I mean if there is a month that the standard would be made specifically for esports, now I would like define esports as kind of -- it lives between gaming and live events, and basically it's competition within gaming, yes, and also overlap between live events. Basically what I'm trying to say, if there is a possibility that until the future there would be a standard that would regard either the competitive aspects of gaming or live event aspect of esports, maybe it would be better for the title to be adjust so it doesn't just contain esports here but it would be left for the future standard if that makes sense.

>> CHAIR: Shelly and then Karl.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Firstly to say that I concur with Melita. From our perspective, to be honest, certainly, I don't necessarily subscribe to Karl's view that this represents a very small fraction. Even if that statement is presumed to be correct, it still does not mean that that small percentage should not be included. That is number one point.

Number two, it is not about -- it does not say here, and this is to Sergi's point, it does not talk about esports competition. It talks about video, and hopefully we change to video game play and esports. I do not see, to be honest, the value of excluding esports potentially sending a message to those people who identify as esports participants or esports players, that this is not something which is for them.

As to Patrik's point about will we have something for esports separately? That is certainly not the intent right now. Because what we have in esports, what is there is the component of the equipment, let's put it that way, the equipment, software, or hardware, but then also the personal equipment they are using, headset they are using, et cetera, but then there is also the greater aspect of the environment, which has other sound sources as well. That is not something they're going to address in devices. For that, we already have a standard and we intend to

mention that. Okay. It's okay, Sergi, if all of them identify as video game players. It is for our perspective, it is better to error on the side of inclusion at the risk that, okay, everybody is still included, then to error on the side of exclusion. That would be mine and WHO's perspective on this.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Yeah., Karl and then Sergi?

>> KARL BROOKES: Yes. I just want to support Patrik's view, actually. I think that makes sense to split this out so that could you have another document, another recommendation for esports that focuses on this. Whereas, this document is clearly focused on video gaming and video game play, and there is a very small element in esports. A document specific to esports, I think, is a good idea. Yeah. For those reasons, I think it should be removed.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just an important part. For example in the esports in video games. It's very separated. To me in track -- 24, the club organized in esports championship, and view possibility for me on interventions of review of this regulation in race, but it is very integrated in line in a view in general in esports. It's very different. For example, esports, you start the video games. Okay.

Second, experienced professionals in video game, but driver, reality drivers to pass esports and go on in reality. My point of view and this track marshal in automatic championship, it is very clear, position in esports, the regulation in the regulations. And it is very important to it and others in international, federal esports parts, in for example international federal motor vehicle, exactly, to using this that exists in the club of the west in 24 -- esports parts and discuss any really important. And just for me, it's very busy and slowly in very separated is in video gaming room from the home, and esports in big show for esports participants. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Yeah. Thank you. Sergi? And then Shelly and then Greg. We'll take a 15-minute break after these two comments.

>> SERGI MESONERO: I concur with Patrik and karl. I insist -- recommended now the chart is very appropriate. I mean individuals when standards, they're saimed at professionals in a particular industry and they need to implement the standards, professionals that would be looking for specific features for esports, they won't be finding them in this text, so the title will be very misleading.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: I'm afraid I have to completely disagree with the line of thought. Firstly, I don't even understand what the comment means about including professionals in a study. We exclude professional equipment, but not professionals. If somebody is a professional using a smart phone, why would they not have the same protection? I don't understand that perspective.

Likewise, here, we're not talking about the outside environment, let's say, we're talking about the devices that are being used in any sort of esports, whether it's a competitive stage or when they're preparing and practicing and getting ready for esports. So

without really going into a lot of further back and forth on this, I only want to say that I really do not see the rationale here for excluding esports when all that I'm hearing from everybody who has spoken is that devices for esports are already covered. Why then is there a hesitation to clearly mention it in the document so as to be inclusive of all of those people.

To Patrik, I would like to say that in sports competitions and also to Karl that endorsed the suggestion. At the moment, we don't have an intent. It doesn't mean that we could not have intent to develop some kind of guidance on it after two year's, four year's, five year's, ten year's, whatever the timeframe may be. I think when we do that, we will have a strong basis to refer to this standard as the devices, the equipment, personal equipment which is being used in esports competitions must align because it is already clearly stated in this particular standard and all we need at that point then to do is to refer back to this and add the other requirements which is specific to a competitive event. So that would be my response and contention to that point.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. I think we need to discuss a little bit more because there are two ideas. So, we take a break for 15 minutes, and we'll continue our discussion if that's okay. Thank you. We'll take a 15-minute break.

(break).

>> CHAIR: Okay. More people are coming in. There are two people from Sony now.

(break).

>> CHAIR: Hello. Simao is not here yet, so can we wait a little bit more? I'm sorry.

Okay. Let's reconvene. We can continue the discussion of the scope as well as the document. I think there are some contentious issues, and it may be a little difficult to resolve at this moment, so maybe we can go ahead and take a look at the other part of the contribution or the current draft, and then we can come back to the discussion of the title. Is that okay?

Okay. Then, Shelly, do you think you would want to share the document again and take a look at the other parts?

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Sure, Masahito. Yes, I will do that. Please let me know when you see the document.

>> CHAIR: Yeah. I can see it now. So maybe we could go down. Maybe we could just briefly look at the text that Sergi has suggested. Do you see the text in the chat box?

>> SHELLY CHADHA: In the chat? But I had to actually leave and join back, and I don't have the earlier chat anymore. I think Sergi also sent it to me by email if I'm correct. Yes. So, what he has suggested is that we use the document provides -- so I'm going to just switch off the track changes for now so that we can see it here.

>> CHAIR: Okay. There is an email one.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: This document provides comprehensive safe-listening guidelines for devices used for the purposes of -- I'm sorry. What he suggested is that we include for devices, video game titles that is in brackets, software, and for the purpose of video gameplay either in home entertainment or esports contexts. Devices are video game consoles, hand held, mobile devices, and personal computers. Audio is headphones, headsets, also those gameplay focused. Yeah. I think I like the scope. I'm going to just copy it from the email and paste it on the document if that is okay for everybody.

>> CHAIR: Yeah. That's okay.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: So we can take it look at it. I'll do it here in this spot. This is what Sergi has suggested.

>> SERGI MESONERO: Shelly, scroll up a little bit to the yellow is on the screen. We have captioning in the room and it was obliterating the view. Good. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Any comments on the proposed text, proposed replacement of the scope? Mark?

>> MARK LAUREYNS: Yeah. Just want to add that this is a very valid statement. I think it adds a lot of value to what we do and may also solve some of the issues on the title of the document. I think very good proposal and very clear to me from my side.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any other comments or questions? Karl? Then Sergi?

>> KARL BROOKES: Yes. Thank you. First of all, my apologies. My headphones weren't working. I hadn't realized the meeting started, I was listening to nothing, and then switched to the speakers and everything was okay.

First of all, yeah, happy with that text. Just a question. What happened with the title? Did we resolve that or are planning to go back to it? Again, my apologies.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Oh, I'm sorry. Yeah. The title we will get back to that discussion because we haven't been able to resolve an issue. We'll discuss the other parts of the document, and now we're looking at the sentence that Sergi provided to replace the text in the scope.

>> Just up with thing for clarity, there are a couple of sentences that should be deleted or sticken through. I think when Shelly copy and pasted, they are there but they shouldn't. The part, the part between also includes video game titles to extend to video gameplay should be deleted. Yeah. Correct.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Richard?

>> RICHARD GLOVER: I'm not quite sure anymore. There was -- oh, yes. Audio -- now I'm confused. Audio without capital A, perhaps, but that's almost irrelevant. Also, those gameplay focused. Are there some words missing?

>> SERGI MESONERO: No headphones and headsets, normal ones and also video game focus --

>> RICHARD GLOVER: I didn't understand also those video gameplay focused. I didn't understand that phrase.

>> Maybe question delete that sentence because we say headphones and headsets, they include all of them.

>> RICHARD GLOVER: Brilliant.

>> CHAIR: Any other comments? I see none. Is it okay to adopt this text at least for the time being.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: I'm happy with that.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Good. Yeah. Peter.

>> PETER MULAS: We may not need the last "include."

>> CHAIR: There were two "includes." Okay. Any other comments? Okay, so we will accept -- yeah. Ralf.

>> RAFAEL GREFF: Two times may be better. The first time is peripheral, and then this time. Just to be consistent.

>> CHAIR: Any other comments? Okay. For the time being, at least, we will adopt this modification.

Now, let's move to the next section. Shelly, we can go down.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Masahito, since this is not the document that you are working on, and it may be, I don't know, better to share that. But what I will do is I will put this in the chat so you could -- so that the output document can reflect this.

>> CHAIR: Yes, or can you just say the editor's note or something.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: I would rather not do that. I would rather I didn't make an attempt to be the editor, but I added to the chat if that is okay, we can just -- you can include it in what will be the output document. Is that okay?

>> CHAIR: Yep. Go ahead.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: All right. Okay. The next references, let me, I'm sorry, put mark-up options. We see there weren't really any changes there. Shall I move to definitions?

>> CHAIR: Go ahead.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: So definition, just the addition of H.870 as was requested last time so that it is reflected there, where the definitions are coming from in terms of definitions used elsewhere. And then there are the definitions which are new to this and start here. Terms defined in this recommendation, so the changes here, please let me know how you would want me -- where you would want me to stop. No changes to dynamic range compression or esports or esports-like event. Some changes to game player, simply to remove the types of devices since we have already listed the devices. We removed that as was requested last time. Definitions, no change, multipurpose, gameplay device is removed

because it was sort of replication of -- of what is already below it. However, if you notice, the numbering has not been changed and this was a discussion or based on the suggestion from the editor that we're now to avoid a lot of track changes, even more than we currently have. We can just leave it like this for now in terms of the numbering, but of course they would need to be renumbered in this way. These are not really changes, except that personal computers and instead of having laptops define it separately, it just included -- it is included here as was mentioned last time. Again, no significant change here. Gameplay audio has been redefined, basically refers to the video gameplay sound track produced during passive game play moments or game play session and passive game play audio sound effects, music, voice check, dialogue that occur during moments of a video game where gameplay is not actively part of participating in the gameplay.

The most common intended application of this definition will be towards a section of gameplay, in between rounds of multi-player game where gameplayer has been excluded from participating in the game until a new round begins.

So that is the definition which has been reworded, and I think a lot of this came from Brian, if I'm not wrong, but Peter may clarify if that is not so.

Okay. Please let me know if you need me to stop. I may not necessarily see hands, Masahito, so please call out to me. Otherwise, I will keep moving ahead.

>> CHAIR: Yeah. I think you can -- yeah, move ahead. And if anyone has any comments, please just raise your hand and we will call on you.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Safe video game device, gameplay, speakers, video gameplay device simply to make sure that we are consistent with how it is written in the scope and in the other definitions, so that is it the only change that has been made here to delete happened-held and portable game console and just say video game consoles as I said was written in the scope. We would like to be consistent.

Again, game console was specifically added as game console which is the time to be stationary. Video gameplay software. This is a definition that we did for the have last time. It was not defined. Now we have it as video gameplay software in context of digital entertainment, refers to computer program and applications specifically crafted to facilitate interactive engagement to video gameplay content. And video gameplay software title is the name or title given to a specific video game software, program, or application used to distinguish one video game from another.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hello?

>> CHAIR: Yeah, we can hear you. Yeah. You're at the end of the definitions.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Yes. I wasn't sure because my earphones ran out of battery and then I wasn't sure if you could still hear. Okay.



>> CHAIR: So maybe we can ask for some comments on the definitions.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Sure.

>> CHAIR: Yeah. Are there any comments on the definitions that we have? Okay. Yeah, Brian?

>> BRIAN SCHMIDT: Yeah. I just had one quick question. I guess I didn't recognize before, in video gameplay device or arcade game device was added in. Are we intended the spec to handle or to cover location-based arcade game systems? Because I don't recall us discussing that before.

>> There is an exclusion later on in the document that excludes arcade device, location-based entertainment I think it's called.

>> BRIAN SCHMIDT: Okay.

>> CHAIR: Any other comments? Yeah. Sounds good. Then let's go down. Karl? Go ahead.

>> KARL BROOKES: I'm sorry. Just a quick question. Pete, have you gone through the document and just to confirm all of these applicable, all of these terms? Or is it something that we need to do? Just randomly I looked at passive, do we still use that in the text?

>> PETER MULAS: Less talking for the captioner. Yes, we updated all of the terms if I understand your question correctly.

>> KARL BROOKES: Okay. I noticed that we use, was it a passive gaming -- so we use that in the document?

>> PETER MULAS: We moved away from the alternative term, which was nonessential game audio because that could be -- it was slightly offensive to the sound engineer to say or to the soundtrack to say that we're not essential, so we now talk about it as passive gameplay audio.

>> KARL BROOKES: Great. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Any other? Shelly?

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Yeah. Only to say that, yeah, of course, I think we did a check to see that these terms were still in the document. It's still possible that we may have missed something which is still there but not in the rest of the document, and that clean-up, of course, we will do before we finalize this document for sure. I don't think we should spend our time doing this right now during this limited time we have together.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments? Yeah. Okay. So, let's go on to the next session, I mean clause, which is I think Clause 6. Yeah.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Yeah. I'm sorry to unmute myself. It took some time. That's essentially the same introduction to safe listening coming from WHO's documents. And the only line that we have deleted is and I'm not sure if we deleted it this time, but earlier was this reference to hearing loss as an emerging epidemic

because WHO is a bit careful about how it uses the term epidemic, so we didn't really want to put that term here. Yes, that was all in this. Not really anything else in the introduction. In 6.1. Then we come to the video gameplay device. Here we have had some update to the video game listening ecosystem. You remember that we also had a diagram last time contributed by Brian Schmidt, and he has made based on our discussions also some changes. Brian, would you like to take the floor to just explain that?

>> BRIAN SCHMIDT: Sure. So the purpose of this diagram would say to sort of match the level of complexity of the H.870 diagram which is right above it there. So, again, it basically describes the video game system as having multiple sources of sound, the primary one being the game audio itself. It is possible to have other pieces of audio that get added to the game audio soundtrack, voice chat, external music player, things like that. It's a fairly straightforward block diagram, I think. Again, some details are left out for simplicity, but that's pretty much it. Yeah. The game system has a master volume control that goes through the A converter. Listening device may also have its own devicelistenning control, may have input from voice microphone. Also added possibility of headphone status September back from a USB headset that could give more information about the headset to the system. I think that's about it.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Richard? Go ahead.

>> RICHARD GLOVER: I recall a conversation, I think last year, where the possibility of the listening device actually monitoring the dose, being able to send information back, I thought that got into this diagram, but I could be wrong. It's certainly not there now. Maybe as a note underneath.

>> CHAIR: Any comment from Brian?

>> Status may also include dosimetry. That I think is a very important phrase.

>> BRIAN SCHMIDT: I don't believe the headset, very many headsets now that do that. There are devices that do do it. It's just not something that we are requiring. Although it's definitely something that would be great for a long-term plan.

>> RICHARD GLOVER: There is a growing number of headsets that do.

>> CHAIR: Shelly, do you want to say something or is it an old hand?

>> SHELLY CHADHA: It's an old hand. I'm sorry. Because I'm sharing. Yeah.

>> CHAIR: Okay. And, Richard, you still want to say something?

>> RICHARD GLOVER: No. I just don't want that phrase to disappear. It's really important because it solves a lot of problems if that's where the dosimetry takes place. Otherwise you don't know what processing is going on inside the listening device, which you will not be aware of inside the video game system.

>> CHAIR: Karl?

>> KARL BROOKES: Yes. I think that's worth putting in the diagram. Thank you.

>> BRIAN SCHMIDT: Would you like me to update the diagram to add that information specifically?

>> KARL BROOKES: I would.

>> CHAIR: That would be good probably, unless Shelly disagrees? Send the diagram to Simao.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Any concerns from you, Brian?

>> BRIAN SCHMIDT: I suppose I mean, is there any place in the document that would require a compliant device to do something with that data?

>> SHELLY CHADHA: I must say I'm not sure.

>> BRIAN SCHMIDT: There is a requirement in the whole system to somehow monitor what the hearing dose is.

>> RICHARD GLOVER: If it's not there, then you have to convey information about what's happening in the hearing device if it's anything other than the bit of wire.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Masahito, may I?

>> CHAIR: Sure.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Simply to say that maybe take these remarks under consideration and discuss it with Brian, and if Brian requires, we can also discuss it with other experts in the field and see if it is relevant to update it in the way that has been suggested.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Yes. Okay, then please go ahead, move on. Yeah, please.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Moving down, we come to the -- so this is, again --

>> KARL BROOKES: I'm sorry. Can I jump in.

>> CHAIR: Carl.

>> KARL BROOKES: If you scroll back down and look at Note 4. Scroll a bit further up. Status may include dosimetry. I guess it's included.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: I don't -- at least I didn't understand your comment, Karl, I'm sorry.

>> KARL BROOKES: I'm sorry. We were talking about whether under headset status, whether that was included, dosimetry. And in Note 4, it says that it may include that. I think that may be addressed.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Okay. That's good. Thank you. Scroll down.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: To 6.3. So, and just to get back to your earlier concern, Brian, this is clearly stated here that the provisions applied do for the apply to hearing aid equipment and

other specialized devices for assistive listening, but as to analogue such as location-based entertainment, arcade games as we discussed last time. And while -- yeah, so that is what is there and that concern addressed.

Then 6.3 is just to give some background about the video gameplay software. Not much change here except for some editorial corrections and aligning the terms with the revisions in definitions.

6.4 is the description of esports-like event. So just what are we referring to and if there are any further contributions. I don't think we got anything on this. We made changes based on discussion but I don't think we received further contributions on this aspect.

>> CHAIR: Sergi has a comment.

>> SERGI MESONERO: Yes. I think that the inclusion of this point here makes it very confusing, a very confusing reading. Okay, so I would suggest that this point is merged and put over at the end with Point 12. Because the fact is that we read the topic that I insist that there are no specific features but this is like in the rest of the scope. I think it would be much better as a kind of Annex.

Also the inconsistencies in the text. If it's okay, I can do it now or I can send them in written form.

>> CHAIR: Go ahead.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Yeah, and I think I don't have any objections really to putting this down. If it's considered confusing here, we can put it in Clause 12. I think it's fine for me, but I'm happy to hear also from others.

And regarding inconsistencies, if you think it is relevant to the point that is being discussed, good if you point them out and we can address them here, but as of course, could you make them -- yeah, I guess contributions.

>> SERGI MESONERO: Yeah, they are minor points, and I mean --

>> SHELLY CHADHA: May not be worth spending time.

>> SERGI MESONERO: I I think it is important.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Yeah.

>> SERGI MESONERO: In the beginning it says professional and then so I think there are some important to discuss.

>> CHAIR: Thank you. Brian?

>> BRIAN SCHMIDT: I concur very quickly. Given we don't have things to do in this spec for esports, it's a little confusing to have it here, so I agree to move it down.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Yep. Shelly, can you go down to the next one, the next clause.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: The next one is damage risk criteria, and it has taken a copy and paste from H.870 and we have noted also,

because of course H.870 may get updated at a different time point compared to this, so in case of any discrepancy, the provisions of H.870 should prevail with respect to the damages, especially the operational modes, because as you know we have two modes recommended there for assessing the sound allowance for sounds.

Please let me know if you wish me to stop at any point.

>> CHAIR: Yeah. Sergi, your hand is still up. Is it an old hand? Or are you going to say something?

>> SERGI MESONERO: Apologies. It was an old hand.

>> CHAIR: Pardon?

>> SHELLY CHADHA: It was an old hand.

>> CHAIR: Okay.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: I'll keep moving down, but please feel free to stop me. What was added here, again taken from Clause 7.2, is uncertainty of those estimates -- again, it's more or less a copy and paste from H.870 and the provisions of H.870 must prevail in case there is a discrepancy.

8 is the business end of the standard, 8 and 9 where 8 is where it starts, and this -- so Clause 8 relates to video gameplay devices and that is the hardware -- and again the initial changes are more in terminology and some grammatical corrections that we made. Yeah.

Then we have until the subsequent subclauses, 8.1, 2, 3, we have the safe listening features for video game devices. This is very much aligned and only tweaked where required as to be relevant in terms of the language, in terms of the context to video game device but otherwise it is very much aligned, 8.1 to H.870 that is about the dosimetry with potentially with two options. So nothing was really changed here in 8.1 or 8.2 other than to align this with the terminology.

>> CHAIR: Shelly, Sergi and Karl want to speak. Sergi?

>> SERGI MESONERO: Yes. We think that voice communication should be excluded from the dosimetry to save H.870 not taking into consideration some exposure.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Are you commenting on 8.1 or 2? Yeah. And I would like to -- but just in principle, I would like to make a comment to that.

>> CHAIR: Chair go ahead.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Which is to say that the reason for excluding voice calls let's say from H.870 is because those calls are governed by another -- by other regulations and also -- well, there were different issues which came up related to that, especially in terms of regulations.

Now in the case of video game play, and of course for those representing players and esports participants, please feel free to give your perspective. As we understand the chats are often a huge

source of sound -- of sound exposure, in case of gameplay because often they may be louder or with the background noise of the game itself, and so on and so forth, and hence, deserve to be included within the scope. Happy to hear from others and especially those involved in gameplay.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Any comments? Karl, you wanted to say something or you decided not to?

>> KARL BROOKES: Yeah. I'm sorry. I had like to say something. Yeah. Just this edited note is in square bracket, so I guess everything in there is set up for discussion and we'll address that at the appropriate time. Yeah.

>> CHAIR: Okay. All right. You want to do that now or you want to.

>> KARL BROOKES: Up to the meeting. Just what the square brackets -- we've sort of gone passed it so just bringing that to the meeting attention.

>> CHAIR: Shelly, yeah, okay, can you go down and continue? Brian?

>> BRIAN SCHMIDT: Yes. Thank you. I had a comment. I concur with Shelly that for a video game system, the audio and voice chat should be included in dosimetry, sometimes it's integrated into the experience and sometimes it's quite loud. I think it's a different thing than a phone call versus playing a game.

>> PATRIK ZUDEL: Just to say I agree with the statement also.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Thank you. Moving down to 8.2. So 8.2, first, refers to the dosimetry use interface. It's more or less the way it is almost. In H.870, this information should be available to the player. And then 8.2.1 which goes specifically into the messages about when the message is related to dosimetry and what kind of messages and when. And here it is to say, as I already mentioned in my brief overview introduction that the video game device, it is required that it provides a message about the sound usage, what time this is done and how it is done is left really to the manufacturers and how they wish to implement this particular feature, which is that the user or the player should be able to see, should be able to know how much sound exposure they have or how much sound they have been listening to. So information in that respect. So this message can be -- initially could be provided on the initial boot, at the end of the gameplay, or through realtime notification, et cetera. So how it is done, when it is done, is not, as we've been repeatedly told by our colleagues from the private sector that this is not something that industry wants to be told, which is how to do things. They only want to be told -- or want to be informed about what is the intent and what's the requirement. That is what we have tried to portray here and I hope this will be suitable.

What we talk about here is also so besides the notification as I mentioned, where it exceeds 100% of the allowance, where somebody has exceeded the allowance, at that time point they should receive

a warning. And again, a warning or message or however we call it. And it could be through text or other visual notification, but basically informing them that they have reached this and then having a cue for action, which should be linked either to them being able to access the volume settings, or using the safe limiting options. So either they go to the volume settings, lower the volume, or they ignore and continue. Those kind of cues for action has to be provided. We already heard in the morning the concern from Patrik related to, this but this thank is more in relation to the volume-limiting option. So if it's okay, this is about the message, and we can leave that for when we come to the volume-limiting option, Patrik.

All right. I'll keep going down.

>> CHAIR: Go ahead. No hands yet.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: All right. Then there is the volume control system, and this is of course not there in H.870, I think, but ultimately this is that there should be an easily accessible -- there shall be an easily accessible and configurable volume control system which is in accordance with the selected operation mode, the mode 1 or mode 2, which can help to mitigate the risk, and that is all. We have not made any change to this particular feature, except to change the terminology from gamers to game players.

8.3.1, subpoint of 8.3 refers to volume control limiting, or volume limiting, which is when headphones are detected, and this of course will be active only when headphones or earphones are detected. But volume limiting option message shall be automatically provided when the user reaches 100% of the weekly allowance. The user shall be given a message as indicated in 8.2.1.1 which is the cue for action, asking them that they can accept and continue listening or they can go to the settings and change the default, and also that they could simply allow the device to reduce the volume to a safe level. No greater than 80 decibels depending on the mode selected.

Here we also mention that it's possible that users should be given the option to customize this level to what level they would like their volume to be reduced. Again, it's really an implementation issue. We only make it here as we should as a recommendation or suggestion and not as a mandate to a feature. Okay. All right. I will keep moving down unless you stop me, Masahito.

>> CHAIR: Yeah. I think we can continue until the end of this section, the clause 8. And then we stop here for the morning -- I mean for the workshop because there will be another meeting starting, you know, in the same room. So we will continue our discussion as part of the Question 28 Meeting in the afternoon. As a continuation of the discussion. We can review until the end of this section. Yeah.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: So 8.3.2 refers to password protected volume control. Which is a feature of H.870 where parents or anybody who with parental control can actually set a password protected volume

level. Basically, this is a feature which is already existing in many of the smartphones where parents can limit that are child's sound exposure. This is, again, a direct copy from H.870.

Then we have the headphone safety mode, are so 8.4, which was earlier there has been removed and we have aligned --

>> CHAIR: Mark has a comment.

>> MARK LAUREYNS: A short one. We can continue in the afternoon. When you talk about headphone safety mode, I see you have to reduce something by 3LUFS. This is not a correct term of LUFS. You say 3 LUFS, loudness full scale, LUFS is always relative to full scale. I also see in the definition it's not clear, just as reminder we don't forget corrected ins because reducing by 3 LUFS doesn't mean anything and you can't do that because LUF is always relative to full scale in your recording.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Thanks, Mark. From my side, I would defer to Brian and to Peter about this because.

>> BRIAN SCHMIDT: I was going to raise my hand on the same issue, Mark.

>> MARK LAUREYNS: We are aligned.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: I suppose Masahito or Simao, you have made the note? Yeah. And Karl's hand is up.

>> KARL BROOKES: Carl we don't support this requirement, so maybe we can put -- for the sake of efficiency, put it in square brackets for now and discuss it later, but we think this is a odd way of trying to manage headphone safety and the standards is trying to get away from such way of using it.

>> CHAIR: Karl, which part are you talking about? 8.4 or 8.5?

>> KARL BROOKES: 8.4.

>> CHAIR: All of it or just this part?

>> KARL BROOKES: Yes, please.

>> CHAIR: I mean the whole 8.4 in square bracket?

>> KARL BROOKES: Yeah. Thank you.

>> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you., so 8.4 is reviewed. So 8.5, that's the last one?

>> SHELLY CHADHA: There is no 8.5. It is 8.4, so it is about the headphone safety node, and we note your concern with this and also others. And for us, it is simply protective and it is specific to this because, of course, can you play the games in a free field, and then at some point decide to switch over to headphones with the risk of having the same -- or continuing with the same exposure level much closer to your ear. As a result of it, you get much more sound dose. Whereas when it is automatically reduced by whatever, and I will come to 3 LUFS in a bit or 3 loudness units in a bit, but the reason for having this there is so that users can be protected. It is not in any way going to prevent them from



let's say raising the volume a little bit more if that is not comfortable.

So why? What is the reason? I would really like to understand? We have heard this from many people. I would like to understand why?

>> CHAIR: Shelly, I think we can continue the discussion in the afternoon because we have to finish in two minutes.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Okay. Good. All of us different. Sure.

>> CHAIR: Brian?

>> BRIAN SCHMIDT: I apologize. If this is slightly off topic, but it's the same Zoom meeting the one for the afternoon or is that a different meeting? I don't think I have it.

>> CHAIR: It's a different link. It's a different one. Yeah. It's available from the same platform, My Meeting, so we will send you the link.

>> BRIAN SCHMIDT: Okay. Thank you.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Brian, it has to be registered and approved.

>> CHAIR: Yes. Registration has to be done. It has been done though, I think. Anyway, thank you very much to everyone that participated in the Joint ITU/WHO Workshop on Safe Listening on Esports and Video Gaming. Thank you very much for all of your active participation and discussion. I would like to thank also the captioner for the work. I'd like to finish with this. We will continue the discussion in the afternoon as part of the Question 28 Meeting. As I mentioned, the access is the same -- I mean it is not the same link but from the same platform from the ITU website. Looking forward to seeing you this afternoon. Thank you very much.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Could you tell me what time we are resuming?

>> CHAIR: 2:30, yeah, French time.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Right.

>> CHAIR: Two hours from now.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Two hours. Okay.

>> CHAIR: Thank you very much.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Thank you. Bye-bye.

>> CHAIR: The workshop is adjourned. Thank you.

(session completed at 12:30 CEST).

.

Services provided by:  
Caption First, Inc.  
P.O. Box 3066  
Monument, CO 80132  
800-825-5234  
www.captionfirst.com

\*\*\*

Attachment 1 to SG16-TD197/WP2

This text is being provided in a realtime format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) or captioning are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

\*\*\*

---