

RAW COPY

WHO-ITU WORKSHOP ON: DEVELOPING STANDARDS FOR SAFE
LISTENING IN VIDEO GAMING AND ESPORT ACTIVITIES

JANUARY 30, 2024
AFTERNOON

Services Provided By:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
+001-719-482-9835
www.captionfirst.com

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

>> CHAIR: The time is for us to restart, 2:31 in Geneva. All right.

Before we broke this morning, we were discussing the scope. I suppose we are -- do we have any more things to talk within the scope? Should we move on to the next title.

We can go through the references, I think it is straightforward. We don't need to discuss that. It is mechanical.

Then we get to the fun part of definitions.

Maybe if you want to drive the discussions, I have that on the screen.

Thank you.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Yes. We have some changes to the definitions based on our discussions last time. Also included on definitions of loudness scale, loudness unit, full scale, and we welcome your feedback about any of these definitions. If there is any feedback you would like to provide at this stage, and, of course, also after you

consult with other groups, then that feedback is very welcome.

So for dBFS, so the 3.1 clauses are foreign definitions in other documents. We just refer to them. Clause 3.2 is definitions that are done uniquely in these documents.

This is the organization, the ITU template for those so that you know.

>> Just to say, of course, we have not made changes that was defined elsewhere, the change is related to the terms that have been defined in this and where we received a lot of feedback last time.

So like I said, we are open to further feedback in this respect.

>> CHAIR: Yes.

From the discussions this morning, I suppose that this would have to be updated to refer to events rather than to people.

>> Is this a temporary, 3.1.32, media player, will that be replaced by video gaming devices or is it deliberately in there.

>> CHAIR: Which number is that?

>> The 3.1.32.

This is a definition that we're using in H.870, when you talk about personal media player, that's what we mean. Yeah. No, if the -- for the additional uses, then we should have other definitions. It is not replacing but in addition to. We make a reference to the H.70 context, the terminology may be used, therefore we should be, you know, making clear to the reader what we mean when we make those.

>> So that gives an opportunity to give a good definition of video gaming device or something. Do you have any industrial definition of that? That we can refer to.

>> I'm looking at the 3.2.7. That is always the balance, whether to reuse the definition done elsewhere, if there is a solid, stable, well accepted definition that we can refer to is always preferable to create a new one here.

Many times there are many definitions in the industry that was not well defined. We say, okay, for the purposes of this document, this is definitions that are used.

So we can do -- those are the usual approaches. Right. Preference is given to something that was stable, well adopted, but if lacking that we can't always customize the definition to make it clear, the scope of what we're referring to.

Here we do have a definition of the video device, the game console, handheld, portable console, video game, things like that so just be mindful that we have put those here and that can be improved or we could refer to.

All right. So should we assume that there are no particular definitions, I mean issues at this point to refer to and move forward --

>> No, quickly. I think that our concern would be more like if that definition is inclusive of everything that we want to include in the standard or not. In general terms, the definitions have improved a lot. We would be sending some feedback. It is more not as a change, totally changing the definitions, but just making it clear that they are precise on what they mean, for example here, the video game play device, the definition, it does not make it very clear if computers are included or not. That's what we're going to be sending.

>> It has to be good enough for the purposes of this document, they don't have to be absolute.

>> We won't do that, don't worry.

>> CHAIR: Just to make clear, in the standards document, the context is important and it is definition or used in context.

You want to say something.

We'll try to think of a different name, non-essential gym audio, thinking if we can find a less reduck active term for that. I think just in terms of how it plays with the audience of the document. Don't want to brainstorm here but I will take a note to try to think of a better term than that.

I understand the semantic meaning.

>> CHAIR: Peter?

>> I want to raise a point based on that, I added a note that said underneath game console and portable console definition of video game play device, there is a specific note about a personal computer and mobile game play devices that you consider to be a multipurpose game play device as further the advice from the last workshop. There was an attempt to make it clear, that personal computers and mobile phones or devices are not considered as specific game play devices.

Trying to catch up here.

Peter, personal computers are not part of -- again, gaming device, is that right? Is that what you're saying? As per the definitions from the last workshop, it was kind of two buckets, there were devices that were specifically designed for game by purpose and the classic example is the

gaming console, and there were other devices that were capable of game play but they were designed for multiple function, a special computer was considered one of the multiple purpose devices as a mobile or a tablet. That was the suggestion based on discussions from the last workshop, if that makes sense.

>> CHAIR: I must admit, I don't remember that from the last workshop. I thought it was the opposite, that personal computers, anyone could play a game on a personal computer. The personal computer, people do. At some point in the game, on a laptop for years, as teens. Yes, of course, I think --

>> One of the -- I think this distinction comes in the context of the idea that game consoles, the specifications for them are more controlled, type of control by the manufacturers of the consoles so that they can give specifications on what the requirement should be. That is software implementers, they would have to get by those, and there is the more challenging environment, let's say the platform, more difficult to impose those.

>> Yes.

>> This is the context where this comes from.

>> I understand that. What I don't want to do is create a two-level playing field, one with consoles and one with PCs. It should be both on the same level.

The game playing capacity, they're capable of playing games, but in the essence of the definition console, it has been designed and it is debatable as well, they're capable of playing music, surfing the Internet. In the context of the definition discussion, it was my summation of the point from the group at the time, that there were two sort of different devices. One that is multipurpose, capable of playing games but also doing other things and then we have the game consoles themselves, we should make that distinction. If that distinction is no longer important, we should discuss that now.

>> We can make the distinction, that's fine.

As long as they're treated the fine, that will be my point.

>> Of course. Yes.

>> Okay. Okay.

I think it may be a little difficult to treat them identically the same. I think that the distinction is not necessarily multi purpose and game play purposes, it is open system, closed system.

>> Do you have something to say or --

>> Just in general terms, I agree with what Brian has

just said. Open and closed systems. We have to consider they are strictly speaking gaming consoles out there that are also open systems that are not -- I mean, an Xbox, a PlayStation, but for example, that you can play or do modifications to them.

There are dozens of gaming consoles out there.

>> In terms of implementing this, that is what it comes down to ultimately. Who is going to be applying these features, and how. That is where the distinction, as I see it comes in. There are the gaming consoles, which are designed, the game play devices, which are designed for game play, primarily, and where these safe listening features are of crucial relevance.

Can those same features be implemented in all let's say personal computers, laptops, there is no limit to what you could potentially use for gaming, for game play.

Well, yes, I think that makes the scope of the standard in my opinion really very, very broad based and potentially with minimal considerations then we are currently keeping in our purview. That would be the logic, of course, for us, we would be happier to have more and more devices that provide safe listening options, they provide information, but is it practical to expect that within the context of this particular standard. Would let's say a laptop -- sorry -- just for a -- a laptop that I'm working on potentially could use it to download software and play a game, would they identify this as a video game play device?

>> Please.

>> Yeah, I just want to go back to the point earlier, that the standard is for turning -- for telling people what to do rather than being how to implement it.

So with that in mind, I think -- you could have a person playing on a pc, the same games that they're playing on the console.

You're saying they should have different requirements, just because one is easy to implement more than the other.

It is a good point. Richard, remote?

>> I think I just want to support what was just said. The ears are the same. That's what we're trying to protect.

Ultimately, there shouldn't be any difference in the outcome of what we're trying to do apart from people's ears being protected.

I would say one of the -- just getting back to the point, some requirements may be easier to be implemented from coming to the console, because the manufacturers, they

have more control of the specs out of that, rather than from the general software. Not talking about again, but -- if you say something that's part of the operating system APEs, that would facilitate safe listening, something in that direction I think. The sense I had from the previous workshops, the discussions, they were going, that aspect, so that's a -- that's a distinction. The end game is the same as riched had said, it is what matters, what is played out and how it affects the person playing the game.

Certain things may be more reasonable, quote, unquote, to be expected, to be effectively done from the game console and then from a general software requirement, may require more hopes to have certain safe listening features implemented.

There are things that are general and will go across the board, doesn't matter which ones.

At least it was what I understood from our discussions in September.

Richard?

>> In which case, I'm not sure what technology independent really means. There was the request earlier on that whatever comes out of this should be technology independent.

>> Technology neutral. It depends on how you define that, how defined technology is, if you're talking about technology as a well-known algorithm, how to calculate the level, for example, if you call that technology, I mean, then it is maybe not neutral, it is not incouple bettered and could be implemented. If you talk about something that depends on a trade secret to run, then it is not neutral. Right. So those are the kind of things that would be looking to as we go forward.

You wanted to say something.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: Yes. Thank you.

I just wanted to mention that if we wanted to exclude, include, or -- you know, treat them all equal, different, I think we have to define those words. This glossary is about -- definitions are about, you know, what we are talking about. We are defining the terms that we will use within this standard to define the scope and also the applicability of the requirements. I think if we are going to talk about dedicated game consoles, as well as general purpose personal computers, as well as tablets, everything, then I think we probably have to include them in the vocabulary so that we can talk about them.

Whether, how we treat them, as far as our requirements

are concerned will be a different question. That will be also debated, whether -- how we treat those different types of devices or are they all the same, all requirements are applicable to all devices at the same level or not. Things like that. Okay.

>> Just let us not mix issues, talking about definitions, maybe you have two buckets. I went to work on the other parts of the document where we'll get things and put in the buckets. It came up, yeah, you have this bucket that's empty, it is not an issue so remove that.

This can be an adjustment after the fact as well. So it is for us to learn through the process, what would be the different things that would be included or not. Yeah.

>> Yes, just to say that from a health, hearing health point of view, the standards are the same, don't change, even if the device is multipurpose or designed only for gaming. For us, the standards are the same. We know the level which is safe, the level of sound that is unsafe.

On the other hand, we have the implementation as Shelly had said, that part is completely technical, not -- and they don't have the knowledge of that.

Of course, it is important to know if we can implement the same standards in different kinds of devices and also the wording, the way we're going to talk about or name the different things, for me, these three issues.

>> Okay.

>> I think in terms of the context of definitions, what we define as a video game play device, it is something that is made for that purpose, as opposed to a multipurpose game play device, it is still a game play device even if it was created for other purposes and as we move down in the actual requirements we include actually both of them.

It is not that they are not within the scope, it is not within the definition. Does that make sense? The difference?

>> I see in this definition you have included VR and AR devices. Later in the document it says that out of scope, and so I think it is just -- can be a little confusing for when later in the document you then refer back to the definition.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: In order to say this is out of scope, you have to define what's out of scope.

That's the point. For example, in H.170 we say professional equipment is out of scope.

We have to define what we mean by professional equipment.

>> So should out of scope definitions be part of

definitions or should it come up later in the document?

>> In the scope, you mentioned something, right? That has to be defined somewhere, otherwise you don't know what it is. Right.

In order to say that this is out of scope you have to define what is out of scope, what it is.

>> Okay.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: I have another question.

I'm trying to find something like dedicated game console, and I checked the wikipedia, and it says there is a definition, dedicated console, it is a type of video game console, but it is dedicated to one type of game. It is not just gaming console, specifically for gaming, but gaming, particular type of game, it is dedicated console.

Shelly, go ahead.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: It was not to your point, I was actually going to Christy's point. Christy, you say that -- where did it read it, mentioned in the document that AR and VR are out of scope?

>> Let me look through and I'll find the section.

>> All right.

Any more comments.

>> If I were to comment, on your comment, yes, for me, it is not important if the console is dedicated or restricting a single game or whether it is -- it is something like a PlayStation that you play many different games.

What matters, it is the volume, the sound that is producing, in the end, on the other side, if we go with the way that we understood the discussion, there may be certain cases that we may want to have certain provisions that apply specifically to consoles because there is a tighter control of the implementer of that over the hardware and the operating system that may make it more meaningful to implement certain types of controls there as opposed to a general software -- a general -- it is going to be implementing, you know, Microsoft Offices. As well as playing certain games.

It is not at that level, it is more of the final issue. But it is the matter of the level of control, or that they were able to -- the required requirements that we understand the point, the reason that I looked into dedicated console is I wanted to have a definition of dedicated game playing device or dedicated game playing console or something like that. Dedicated in the context of game playing means dedicated to a particular type of game.

So whether we can say something like -- you know, the reason is, I want to have a definition like DVGD or something. You know.

Go ahead.

It is not a dedicated console, no the a particular type of game. It is a particular game or games. Because the console has already the games inside. So you can only play those games. But it is not like a type of game. It is a specific game or games.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: My question is --

>> You're right. Using sometimes, you would like to use that concept, that the console has been taken with another meaning. You are totally right.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: For example, we have to have a definition of dedicated video gaming console and we give it an abbreviation like DVGC or something like that. And we talk about VGC in this document and so on.

That's -- from the standardization point of view, that is easier than referring to some devices or different names. That's why I wanted to create a common term for us, for example, general purpose, devices versus dedicated gaming devices.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: Go ahead.

Correct me if I'm wrong, can't we turn it around, a device dedicated to playing video games.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: That's okay. As far as we can define something.

>> You have the video game industry and then we'll take this, and we have my console, it is not a dedicated console.

>> A suggestion, let's not use the word dedicated, change it, already zests for a type of --

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: That's the point. dedicated means in this context, meaning a particular game, not dedicated device. Whatever term, I don't know, rather than dedicated, maybe we can say specific or whatever. We can define a term to refer to that thing.

>> To say that that is also included within the scope, is that what you mean.

Yes. Yes.

>> Well, that will be a different discussion, but --

>> No.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: We have to have some kind of term to refer to that device.

>> It is not a different discussion. It is at the end of the day a video game playing device. Whether it is dedicated to one game, can be used with multiple games,

respective notwithstanding, it is still a game play device.

We could define that simply for the purpose of saying that explicitly stating that this is included, but not for.

Being practical on this, there was only one occurrence of the word dedicated in the document, this is on the screen. I don't think we need it. It is just an objective there and the definition will go without it.

>> We just had the word purposed. It is being an alternative.

>> State that again? Purposed.

>> Purposed.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: I trust your native --

>> (Chuckle).

>> It may be taken, it is a problem in the zero draft, it is one of the improvements that have had the draft.

I think it is Michael's suggestion, it is good. It is just one definition on the screen, so -- there is a definition of game console.

>> Okay. Yes.

So doesn't say anything about the number of games that may be played, whether it is burnt into the system, could be loaded, it doesn't say anything, it covers everything. It is generic.

Are we done with definitions for now.

>> I'll just follow-up, on the last line of 6., considerations for virtual reality and immersive experiences are earmarked for future analysis. This is maybe the intention, it is not to refer that that meant out of scope, but it could be interpreted that way.

>> Sorry --

>> The last line of 6.2.

This one?

>> Yes.

>> To just say, before that, we say that devices equipped with virtual reality, augmented reality, finksalties and the examples of BGDs, so, yes, but, of course, we haven't focused on the requirements specifically of AR and VR in which would still need to be studied more.

>> All right.

I just reworded it, as we normally say in the standards, which is something is for further study, that means we don't know yet and we'll work on that.

Back to definitions. Again we're done with that. All right. Abbreviations, acronyms, they'll still be connected later on as the text is developed, conventions, we don't have any particular conventions, this would be something like what shall means, should, whether there is a

particular mandatory optional, what those mean.

If there is something that we use consistently across the document, this is going to be documented back here.

Shelly.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: So as I understand, and going back to the H.870, what we always used was shall or mandatory requirements and should for optional and then could or can for really good practice, suggestions, or something. As we continue with the same, that's how we have been writing the document.

>> That's the normal Convention. Yes.

I think we could actually take the step to copy and paste from H.70 of what you have in there and we use here. I think just to do that.

I have to download from the website. Masahito Kawamori --

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: About the definition, in the -- in clause 6.2, we have video game play device, and there is a abbreviation, VGD.

And I don't know if we have the definition, this word in the definition.

We do? We do? The game console, video game play device, there are two words. Okay.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: We have to have the brother Craigs.

>> Yes. Just a second.

The conventions, none, that's H.70. We have to work on that. Yes. If you could remind me, so for 4.870, that's an ITU-T recommendation and the guidelines.

>> It is in the title, yes, we could have. I think that the guide lines in the title may be misleading. Yeah.

I think we missed removing it, last time we revised it. Yes.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: Because we started out with that title. WHO has a different usage of guidelines and so on, the difference between ITU --

>> Yeah. The recommendation, yes.

>> Technology is loaded and they're Mott mappable directly. They're difficult to find between thematically and the health sector, technology, the Telecom sector, standardization. Understanding the word of recommendation, guidelines, they are loaded terms in WHO in particular. Guide lines in particular.

At this point, should we just make a note that potentially the title of the document would need to be, you know, reflective of the discussion, discuss how the title is discussed of the document? Is that going to be standard

ITU as for ITU Convention.

>> The title now is neutral. Safe listening for video gaming and sports. Doesn't say whether it is guidelines or -- we won't get into that, it could contain different types of content on the title.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: I find one thing --

>> Sorry, back to definitions?

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: Yes. Still. Sorry.

>> Sorry.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: Definitions, it is very, very important. Later on when you start talking about, you know, you go back to the definitions --

>> Which one.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: About the video game play device. It has something about video game console or portal.

So this -- so for example, the video great many device, it can be designed to be stationary, such as a video game console or portable, what do you think of game console, it is not a portable device.

For example, Nintendo.

>> That's the B.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: There are two distinction, there is a distinction between a portable console and game console. The stationary.

>> The level of definition. The level of usage, I would say there is.

Is it relevant, the context of this document? We're not sure. We have included it, I think for awareness, but may not be needed in terms of refinement.

Peter?

>> It could be -- it was discussed in the workshop, console like a PlayStation, a Xbox, designed to be stationary, a handheld, portable console, like an Nintendo switch, a steam deck, a PlayStation, I think it is called -- they have got speakers on board. They have a completely different audio system and the audio systems have inherent limitations as well. I would consider those two items as separate enough to consider them differently in the definitions. I'm sure Brian would correct me if I'm wrong on that, or if he has an alternative opinion.

I would agree completely. I think -- leave the definitions as they are, and if it turns out in dealing with the spec, we treat them the same, we can eliminate the distinction. I would say we leave it in for now.

Yeah. I think that goes a little bit in line with what I said before in terms of -- here is the taxonomy of

what it could be, you look at filling the buckets. You can just remove them, or collapse them.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: I'm sorry, I'm still -- so game console, there are two words used in this video game device. One is the video game console. The other is game console.

>> Maybe if I can suggest for the table consoles, usually in those three, uses home control, the other are handheld, portable hand consoles, maybe that can help clarifying the distinction between both? I don't know. It is true that a video console is strictly including handhelds and portables. Right now, it is not super important. I see it is causing some confusion.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: I would like to ask Brian's expert opinion.

>> Thank you for putting me on the spot.

That may be precise to say home game console, versus happened game console.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: Let me clarify. So there is a bigger category of video game console and then there are two branches. One, it is home game console and the other is portable game console. Is that correct? SG number people would call the switch game console, a game station, a console, one is portable, one is -- that's probably the distinction.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: Okay. Thank you.

And another question is, is it a video game console or a game console? The same?

>> I would say both are acceptable.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: Okay.

They are -- they're equivalent, synonymous. Okay.

We can have the video in front of the game. In parenthesis.

And then we have home game console, and handheld or portable game console.

>> 3.2.12A and C, I don't want to prolong this discussion. But I'm wondering if there is actually a difference between the two is it going to be more or less the same thing or exactly the same thing?

>> May not be the case as Brian had mentioned. You know, portable, handheld, usually I mean, it has like its own loudspeakers and they're very much not very powerful for you to listen with headphones, stationary, a home control, you may connect to an -- like, you know, it is a bit different.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: Thanks.

>> I think you have a point. we have 3.2.12, the

generic definition of the device. Then you have the again generic things. Is video game console, is it the same thing as video game play device.

It may not be. It may not be. For example, you can have an arcade machine, that right now probably we're considering out of the scope, the arcade machine, it is a video game device, but it is not a control.

There are other types -- it may be useful for the purpose of the standard, it may or may not.

I don't know. It is different.

One of those empty buckets maybe.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: Again, just to clarify, VGD, video game device doesn't include PCs? It doesn't. Okay.

>> Oh boy. Now we have this discussion now, tomorrow afternoon, but I'll keep raising it.

Maybe just put a note that my preference would be to keep what we had in there before. It could be a multipurpose system, such as a person with a smartphone.

>> And to be considered VGT.

>> This is quite an important point for us.

>> Sorry, where exactly are you referring to?

>> So where it was before actually.

>> The 3.2.1, right? The VGD.

>> It was at the end of the sentence. The game console, portable hand gaming devices. How -- it \$did say -- it could also be a multipurpose system such as a personal computer or smartphone.

>> This started as a console definition.

Here you're going back to the generic thing, I don't know. It could be the comment, he did the edits.

I have to revise why it was recommended to split the issues, there was a previous comment to consider those devices differently. It may be due to implications on H.870 as well with a smartphone, tablet, it may be on an operating system that has -- I would have to go back to the previous workshop just to confirm as to why they had to be separated or it was recommended to us to be separated.

>> I think that's what they're trying to capture there, put in square brackets, we're not sure how or why we got here. You make sure that you can make sense of it.

>> In that case, I would go -- it was there before.

I think that before we didn't --

>> There is no reason to remove it. We're checking that. Okay.

I can live with that.

>> Okay. It is not a judgment of value, but just making sure that we're doing the right thing. That's all.

>> I don't mean to further con complicate this. These are defined in the definitions, you can imagine some of the multipurpose devices, they're also communication devices and you can imagine also that augmented reality might muddy that water even more.

I wonder if the purpose of this is really -- that then even if we add this as a definition of what you mean by communication-focused devices, it is then going to get a little mud years when talking about what are we -- what's -- what's being regulated? Is it just the gaming activity on that device? Are the other audio signals also being regulated? When I go back to the scope, that doesn't really -- it is not really clear that we're regulating the gaming activity, it is more that we're regulating the devices.

>> I think we should just delete it.

I don't recall where it is coming from. Peter or Brian can recall why. Where it came from.

>> The listening device?

>> The communication focused devices are beyond the scope of this recommendation. We didn't define what communication focused devices are and why they're beyond the scope of the recommendation.

>> Firstly, to answer your second point first about other sources.

Firstly, we're not regulating the gaming activity, but rather we are providing some guidance for safe listening through the consoles, so on.

Secondly, to say, yes, things like chat, voice calls, they were excluded in H.870, and we don't typically consider those as part -- there are other standards as I understand, which apply to coms, kind of regulating the aspects. We don't really focus on they're not really the major sources of exposure.

Yes. I understand that that could create a confusion, of course, what we imply there t would be good to be clear about it, is that devices are focused only on providing a means of communication, maybe a telephone, which doesn't necessarily have all of the smart functions, et cetera, would not be under the purview of this.

Peter, do you want to add anything to that? I saw that you raised your hand and then put it down?

>> Yeah. If you pretty much articulate the point, it is a carry over from 870 which we used as a part for the basis of this template. Everything else, I would agree with.

>> I don't know. I would suggest to delete it.

Brian?

>> Yeah. As far as the communication goes, I kind of recall, it was the telephone devices. I think you raise an incredible issue, I was thinking a little bit ago, if I watch two hours of YouTube videos, I may be playing a game for two hours, have I been listening for two hours or four hours, then it goes to what we were talking with the different kinds of -- this is the device that we're talking about, the game play, the element of it.

The communication being one subset of that.

>> In H.870 we exclude the voice. We don't exclude the other sources of media other than, of course, music that you play through it, but also music that you stream through it, it is included.

The same should apply to this particular standard as well.

The only thing we exclude, we would come to that in the diagram as well, it is really the spoken communication that people have with the devices.

>> All right.

Any more definition issues at this point in.

>> I just put mine in the chat, 3.2.2 and 3.2.3, should that be spore or esports?

>> Usually for ITU, the editorial guidelines is that they try to keep things in singular. Now, if that does not make sense here, then we can use that plural form. This will come back to me, asking, making it go back to the singular.

It was just your input please.

>> I would ask the room, I have never really used singular unless someone said what is an esport? Like a esport title, to my knowledge, it is always with an S, I would have the room weigh in.

>> It is in the Oxford dictionary, the all American press association, the guidelines, so on. So I can provide some examples.

>> No, it is okay. We trust you.

>> And the APA.

I need to know the justifications of that, that doesn't creep back in.

>> Furtherer further, within the sentence itself, it says an esport live event, we would want to make that pleural as well, in 3.2.3, in the first -- yes.

>> Correct.

I don't know if we can do a search in the document, but somewhere else, make it esport. Thank you.

>> Thank you.

Michael is speaking off microphone, saying that Google is using the pleural form. That's okay. Don't worry. For the sake of the captioner and for the remote participants.

All right. No problem.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: Sorry. One more. Yes.

Following our discussion of devices, we go on to software, title, video game software doesn't have a -- it is not including the definition.

>> What is the number?

>> Video -- so we have devices first, 6.3, we will be talking about video great many software titles. I think maybe it is a good idea to have definition also in the 3.2.

>> I have the definition for --

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: I think it is important.

Video game play software.

>> Software?

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: Yeah. Software.

>> All right. Any more definitions for today? So this is quite cop fusing for me. I think probably going through a document that was based on the original zero draft, we don't have track changes. I'm sort of flitting back between two documents in the meeting, it is very difficult.

Do we still have video game hardware definition, then the list of A to F?

>> The video game play hardware, and Karl, if it is okay, I can email Karl the annotate version with the awareness that some of the numbering is not exactly the same because it was further changed after that. It has the changes, and to say that's been changed to video game play device. That's -- it is the definition has also been updated, but it is the terminology based on the last time discussions, it was changed from video game hardware, to video game play device. That is -- sorry.

They were both there last time. Before you had video game device, and a paragraph, basically what we have got there.

After that we have the video game hardware definition.

That's a whole section that's gone.

Is that correct?

>> Yes. The video game play device has been deleted and we have the video game device in place of video game play hardware, game hardware. Sorry.

What was earlier, 3.2.10, it has been changed and what was earlier, it has been deleted. Let me send you the one with the track changes, which is following that.

>> Just to confirm. What happened, it is we did have

video game device, and you have now changed that to read video game play device and it is virtually the same as it was.

Before and after that, we had video game hardware definition with all of the hardware definitions for personal computers, hand hold mobile device, laptops, et cetera. All that is gone.

It is not -- it is not gone,.

>> We have the video game-held device, which refers to a device designed for executing software instructions, et cetera, et cetera, video game play device, it can be designed to be stationary, a console, an arcade game device, which is just added, or a game with handheld affordable consoles and then under that we have video game con spell, handheld, portable consoles. The only thing we delighted or rather combined was these two in one, video game play device, and video game hardware. We did not now distinguish the two. The device is itself a hardware. Right?

>> Yeah.

>> It is not that the device is something separate from the hardware. It is the hardware.

Makes sense, yeah.

Okay. So the things that are missing, it is the gaming laptops --

>> Sorry.

That is included in the multipurpose play game device, 3.2.6, it is in alphabetical order. Multipurpose game play device, which is currently 3.2.6 if you go up, so that is what refers to various devices such as computers, mobile, smartphones, tablets, game play laptops, desktops, which are in reality an augmented reality device.

>> Okay. Right.

>> You see my hesitation to add this square brackets there because it is here and just for reference.

>> It is important that you keep that, later on, we just refer to VGD in other requirements, which excludes all of this.

Moment in, VGD doesn't include things like gaming laptops. It has personal computers now. It hasn't got gaming laptops. It is probably the only one that's missing now actually.

Just -- yeah, it is quite a change.

So -- okay.

Sorry, just in the -- in that one we had put square brackets before, I just replaced the terminology with definition of both. Yeah.

>> No. No. You can keep that, that's fine. Keep that, please. Yeah. That's fine.

Maybe add personal computers, slash laptops, that would probably --

>> Personal computers, it is there.

Yeah, then slash laptops.

I see laptops as computers. It was just listed differently before that. Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

>> We have that here. Personal computers. Video game play laptops. Yeah.

That is one place. Let me see if there is another.

Personal computers, laptops, okay.

I don't know if that makes sense.

So list that subcategory of personal computers. Game playing --

>> I think we get to your point very well, Karl.

I think that what would be required, it is for us to reflect it very clearly, either to have this multipurpose -- whatever, as a subcategory of video game devices or to mention that explicitly in the document where these are included rather than somehow trying to reflect it in both places could be the way to do it, and we can work on doing that.

>> I think we have to harmonize a little bit further this terminology. Keep that for homework.

>> Just in the editorial, you're in that -- the phrase game play hardware device appears several times in the doc. I think that needs to be updated as well.

It is mostly in the dosimetry sections.

Any further comments? Masahito Kawamori?

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: Yes. 3.2.13, video great many peripheral. It has ear level audio devices. I think this is very important because it talks about different kinds of devices that would be used for audio, listening. It includes headphones, ear phones, ear buds, in-ear monitors, wireless, non-wired, so on, producing components as well as sound capturing components like microphones. So it is just headphones as well as headsets. Right.

Headphone, headsets.

>> Yes.

>> So I was wondering if we want to kind of harmonize with other standards so that we can refer to other documents as well, like H.870 has -- I think it is a little different definitions.

I mean, we don't need do it now. I just want to raise that issue here.

I suppose that Peter, he had added this definition, it

was -- that we could have it, that it is -- the sound source, it is at the ear level, it is outside, then there are -- so these are types of peripherals, the other peripherals that are input are not audio related, but keyboard characteristics, but they mate include the microphone. That's the way he categorized that. The way it is written, it is not -- we're not making definitions of the ear level, devices, the input accessories, the only definition, it is the 3.2.13 itself. This is just the bullet items within the definition. Right?

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: These are examples, such as. Yeah, examples of -- if you make it in line, it may be difficult to read, that's why it is broken in two separate lines, even though the definitions, they don't like the multiple line definitions, the editorial team, they don't like that.

I don't know if Peter wants to comment on that or misinterrupted his intentions, please let us know.

Could you repeat the question?

>> No. Just saying that Masahito Kawamori has suggested to align the terminology here with what we're having in H.870 in in terms of ear level, devices, things like that. I was just saying these are not definitions here, they are just part of the definition of the video great many peripheral, they're not defined separately. Yeah.

>> That was in -- in A and B, trying to make a distinction between things that -- sound sources that are at the ear level. And others that are let's say the environment, and like a speaker, so on.

>> Correct. This is to categorize all of the peripheral devices, hence why the definition remains. Whether that is going to be an empty bucket at the end of the day, it could well be. Some of the concepts were required with some of the more advanced features that probably will make their way to an appendix or removed.

If there is a definition for the headset, that could be a useful edition to terms defined elsewhere.

>> Yes. Okay.

All right.

>> How many times did I ask this question, do we have anything more about definitions? I'm sure that we have, but yes, for today? All right.

We had tried to start 6.1, maybe we can start that now? Okay. Remote? All right.

Shelly. Would you like to lead us?

>> SHELLY CHADHA: So 6.1, essentially, we did not make

much of a change accept some editing, like gaps and correction. It is essentially a background to what is safe listening, and what is the context, let's say, of the document.

It is likely that as we move forward we will work on this a bit more. Right now, we're so focused on revising the actual, you know, recommendations, the definitions that we haven't focused a lot of attention on what needs to be changed in this particular section.

It wouldn't be too much. If there are anything that you think should be there, in addition to what's already there or what is redundant, inaccurate, please let us know.

>> So in that contribution, this sentence is -- can you see that on the screen, the gray? Let me select it. It is gee on mine. This one. This one is deleted in Karl's document. I made the note here on the side, that's why it shows pink. We were just going to discuss that. Probably there are other additional corrections from your document of how we could discuss. I didn't have the time to capture this one.

So this was introduced this morning. Yes.

>> Yes, I noted that as well, it is a point well taken. Like I said, we haven't focused a lot of attention on this. The point is well taken, we can modify.

We're not going to do that now, we'll take it away, do it, how does that work.

I think there has been a notation on this, we have the draft as well. We will cross-check against that and reflect.

>> Thank you.

>> Just make that general note then. Mark?

>> Yeah. Just want to add on this one, I fully follow Karl's logic that there are now standards in place. I think it is important to double-check that.

Although the first part, I didn't see why we should delete that. I think it is important to be aware that all of these aspects of gaming are on top of the other usage of other devices as such. I think that I would suggest not removing the first part.

Maybe refer that this is on top of the fact that young people are doing this all day long, whatever. I would maybe cut apart from the despite the emerging pandemic, there are currently no standards. That's the part that I would now delete because I think we have been quite active to get the standards in place. I think it is going in the right direction.

>> That's your suggestion?

>> Yes.

>> Is there a specific reason, Karl, that you want the first one in.

I can live with just the second. I think, yeah, in light of what you said, that's fine.

>> Super, thanks.

There are other edits that come from the contribution that we'll take for this, the WHO will check that later. Okay.

6.2.

>> So in 6.2, again video game play device. Here we essentially what we had here, it is the kind of diagram presentation of a personal audio device and we will have Brian share with us the revised proposal for -- not the revised proposal, a new proposal for game play device, architecture, which I will request Brian to share with us.

>> Somebody has to stop sharing so that I can share. The purpose is to replace the diagram of the personal media player, with a video game system, video game ecosystem. I tried to model it after the 1.870spec. How things can work, trying to cap churr, the eco system, probably should adopt the proper terminology and the listening devices. Maybe that's the other document did.

>> Can you -- is it possible for you to Zoom in a little bit? I can Zoom in on this part here.

Yes.

We can separate this in the video system, the video device, based on the preview, main thing I wanted to get across, in the video game system, you have the game software creating the game audio mix, which is the game content that goes to the speakers, it comprises music, dialects, dialogues, in game voice chat in some circumstances, not in all circumstances, and that they are often volume controls associated with some of the elements of the game content itself. That's why the box is yellow. The volume controls are yellow in this diagram.

So all of the cop tent from the game is created, mentioned together according to the criteria of the creators, plus whatever control the game player has been given by creators of the game, that's all mixed together, on top of that, it is common to have a separate audio stream that's unrelated to the game for voice chat. I would probably argue that we should probably include the voice chat audio in the dosimetry. We don't have to decide that here. Often coming from an app completely unrelated to the game, discord, team speak, something like that. In addition, there could be auditor report Joe coming from an

external music player, Spotify, iTunes, whatever, that's for the scenario where a game player decides to mute the background music that's shipped with the game and instead play their own sound tracks, which is not an uncommon scenario. There was recently an article that I apparently closed, that said that 42% of GenZ gamers, sometimes they're often playing their own music while their video gaming. That's why I wanted to get that in.

The bottom box here, any other audio that the system may be making, ranging from notification sounds, system sounds to complete other applications, right.

YouTube, something like that.

Each of those tend to have their own volume controls, I can set my discord chat volume separate from my game volume, separate from my Spotify volume, and again, as noted down here, you can't see my mouse.

The in-game voice chat is sometimes provided by the game itself, as part of the game mix, sometimes provided by an external player and likewise for the music for the game.

If we extend the ecosystem now to include the listening device, a listening device itself may have a volume control, whether it is a headset or a speaker, and the exact location of the devices relative to the deck may vary a little bit.

Again, I didn't want to make the diagram too complicated.

And in some cases the make and model of headset may be known, USB headset may report what kind it is, if there is -- in the same way that an iPhone knows that Apple air pods were connected, it may have better information like that.

For the most part, the listening hardware is not.

This is the first or second draft spec of what the game system may look like.

Especially love the Sony and Oculus folks to make sure that In't over simplified something.

There are definitely pieces of software that have left out, for example, on a personal computer system, there may be some software that is stuck somewhere in the system here by a third-party that is designed to enhance the audio in some way.

Really common piece of software for that, a psycho acoustic bass software, software that tries to compensate for the fact that the speakers on the laptop cannot produce low frequencies, it uses some o processing magic to process the sound to give the illusion of bass, although the speakers cannot physically give you that bass.

Laptop manufacturers often -- the PC manufacturers, they will often bundle that software in with a system, again, part as a differentiator.

That is part of the separate thing all to itself.

Somebody has a hand? Now I have to figure out how to see the chat again.

>> Can I -- am I --

>> Go ahead.

I would like to say first of all, congratulation, very good attempt to make this easy to understand, very complete.

The only thing I would suggest, is to remove the voice chat part.

Not because it is not there.

To avoid discussions afterwards. There is a line between a telephone call and a voice chat, a discord, whatever.

Since you already have other audio systems, sounds, other applications, I think it may be safer to remove only that part. I don't know what others think about that point. .

I understand your point. The reason I call it out separately, it is a common scenario, incredibly, it is really, really common for when people play games online for them to use something like Discord, to talk with their friends as they play, to talk with their teammates. So I'm curious as to why you thought it would be best specifically to be removed.

Because in the other standards, we excluded typically the direct force of the direct microphone and we also heard that in the discussion of esports, that they want to avoid that because of the sounds of the crowd coming in, very difficult to control that at some point.

>> It varies a little bit. In fact, there are some games, legal legends, an esports game, where the voice chat is the prioritized audio of the system because it is five on five game where you are in communication with the teammates, it is more important than the game sounds themselves.

I'm certainly happy to remove that if you think so. It strikes me as a pretty -- it is a common scenario and there definitely is a lot of voice chat that happens in a game, so I would hate to think that we're deliberately not measuring some audio that might contribute to hearing damage.

>> That's not my intention, to be fair, on most equipment that would be -- it would be included and the

sound level evaluation, that's not the point. I just want to hear if others have an issue about it. The more that's included, the more happy you make me. That's perfectly fine.

I want to double-check if there is not an issue with the standard or issues later in approval the standard at some point.

Maybe some of the others have a view on that.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: H.870, we excluded that because as I mentioned earlier, there were other -- there are other regulations, Telecoms, regulation which apply to voice, phones, so on. That was my understanding at least. The question is, if included, are we conflicting or conflating with something else that may make it, you know, kind of a clash with each other, or somehow reproduce the same thing or say something else. That is my question. Maybe you have an answer? Maybe Tatiana, others, somebody has a answer about what exists to regulate that. If not, then I'm in complete agreement both with European and with Mark, that we should include it.

>> I think we're talking about two different things. One, as I understand correctly, this figure is trying to describe what the game system is. That's part of it.

What Brian is saying as well, it is a distinctive feature that's quite frequently there. Should this be used to count towards those or not, that's a different issue. I think it should be in the description of the system. If it does not count, then say these things don't count.

For the description of the system, I think it should be.

>> I agree. If we don't have it in this there. Somebody will ask, have we considered it. I think just because as you said, just said, just because it is in there, doesn't mean we have requirements, it is just the basic setup.

Thank you, Brian for this, this is great.

We don't specifically have a streaming video. We have external music player but --

>> I was trying to put that in, like other linear media play back, and I thought it would fit under other apps but maybe I should be explicit that --

>> Maybe. Yeah.

>> Maybe say other audio, other media.

I could make an extra box, digital media player, something.

>> You could change it, it's title of the box, other audio, other media. And then --

>> Oh. No, not like that? Oh?
>> No. What did I do.
Control Z to undo?
>> Yeah. Yeah. Good. I will edit it, not live in
Zoom.
That's what I wanted to do.
>> Yeah.
Then send me the file that's included in the document.
Something like that.
Remove the word draft.
>> The watermark, yeah. Thank you.
>> I guess we have a new figure for the video game
systems.
>> I think you mentioned this, having the headphone
status, so maybe we could elaborate on that in a bit,
that -- that's not all, no. Wow., you could remove the
particular good example.
>> Let me Zoom in on the text on here. I was trying
to figure out how to put this in a diagram, and decide the
best way, is to put a note in.
Headphone status, being -- you know, USB headsets, you
may not know what make or manufacturer it, that may allow
us to know, actually the dosimetry levels and iPad with
apple ipods, you are know, a known status, so we can
actually determine the actual levels.
>> I have two hands raised. Peter and then Richard.
I wanted to make an observation that the diagram is
amazing and starting to look like a multipurpose device
where it is capable of doing more than just the game play,
perhaps it was intended to do this in the first place. Now
we're talking about adding streaming video. We have got
music, other apps. So I want to pose a question, perhaps
this may -- perhaps we should remove the concept of a
multipurpose device, the video game, a device, it will make
it one and the same.
I think that may not be a bad idea, in part, because I
was trying to focus on the game play scenario, even on the
game play scenarios, you have a game going on a
PlayStation, and separately the Discord app running on the
PlayStation in the background.
>> I completely understand, you're right. It is a
common scenario, as to listening to non-game music as well.
I'm going to the bucket, sort of the analogy, do we really
need to have the two definitions and going back to the
recording and whilst the recommendation is in the video
game industry, both of those terms are used, the
multipurpose with a video game device, you need to have the

two definitions, perhaps, you may have a different opinion, but perhaps it doesn't serve the standard to have that distinction.

>> Richard?

>> I just want to address the status, the headphone status, and perhaps coordinate. There are headphones that will actual do the monitoring and calculation of the dose within the headset.

That could be regarded as one aspect of the status being fed back to the console. It is likely to be -- it could be more accurate than anything the console itself could estimate.

That's an excellent point. thank you for pointing that out.

I will work on the wordsmithing of that, to make sure that is listed.

All right.

So any further thoughts concerning a more fundamental aspect of whether we need all the details or not, should they collapse, the definition, or it was Peter's last comment? We leave it as this now, and reflect on this later? We go back to definitions?

>> I will stop sharing.

>> We can go back to sharing. The document.

So, all right, so this figure will be replaced for now with the more complete figure from Brian, then subject was revising the concept, whether we should try to keep it simple -- all right. Shelly.

>> SHELLY CHADHA: So the rest of this, of 6.2 is really a further description beyond just the definition of the video game play device, and reflecting on the discussions we had just now. It would be good since the multiplayer game devices are also sort of reflected within it to assume that definition within the broader video game play device deaf figures. We do go back just in reference to definitions. I'm not asking you to go up.

Moving the screen.

>> Yes.

But -- no. No. Don't move it for now.

Just to say that -- so that it is clearly reflected because we don't mention them explicitly here, but only in the sense of not the terminology, but, yes, we mentioned those devices but not the terminology, it is better to keep it consistent and to have it reflected under a singular group. Okay.

All right.

So that was -- there was no other change in the text

as compared to what we gave earlier. We would like to really have a chance from our side to reflect on this further, and in light of the discussions we had, also the definitions to revise it.

One thing, closing on that, we may want to make sure that the language is such that even though we define or a system is having the ability do games, Voight chat, music separately, that there are going to be some hardware devices that only do the one game play thing, you know, some of the dedicated devices that was being brought up earlier, that would fall under that, the genesis with 100 games built in, all it can do is play those games, it is not a built in music player, a chat, maybe we can just put this as -- or just note that some devices may only play games.

>> I just want to stress test this section with an example to see if -- to make sure that this is intended. This kind of probes the line between accessibility and safe listening.

Some people use their iPod and AirPods Pro as a hearing aid. Would that device be considered a potential gaming device or system, but I think based on the figure drawn, that because it doesn't use the microphone input, that it wouldn't be regulated under the dosimetry regulations. Is that correct? Does that make sense?

>> Yes. What you're saying makes -- I understand what you're saying, however, this is part of the H.870. Mark can speak better to the fact, when people using their air pods as -- as hearing aids, how advisable or not is that, but yes, it is a reality. People uses the devices to make sounds more accessible to them so that they can amplify them and listen better.

What we are doing here is giving them the tools and giving the option for volume reduction. Nevertheless, I did notice and we provided the feedback also to Apple particularly, they were in some of the, you know, reviews, of the safe listening implementation, which Apple did, there was a comment like I need to amplify or increase the volume to be able to hear.

So Apple is being insensitive in asking me or giving me that information again and again, that I'm putting my hearing at risk, et cetera. Whereas I'm already hearing impaired. I need to turn up.

It is something that we brought to the attention in the sense that probably it is wise to ask at the time of the volume setting and so on if the person has a hearing loss and so something to that effect.

Can be configured according to the individual requirements, of course that is not a part of what they say or mandate in H.870, it is how you implement it without -- so in consideration of the users, the headphones, the smartphones, the video game play devices.

>> Mark?

>> Yeah. Just want to add, because ITU, we have H.71, and that's the one looking at personal sound amplifiers or amplifier systems, and there we include in fact amplification for people with normal hearing. This is also now the smart hearables, but also under the discussion within the IC discussions at this moment.

The moment you move towards hearing aids, then you have a different fact. I think we never considered medical devices under these regulations and under these standards.

I think that you're more in the safety standards for medical devices rather than hearing aids, which is also under development. I would exclude that. I think for now, when we look into this, when you have the video game, you're playing, with a smart device, that is giving amplification, it is in the transparency mode so you can amplify, that would fall under the safety aspects of personal sound amplifiers. At that moment, intended for people with normal hearing that want to another more the moment it is a medical device, intended for people with hearing loss, then we have a different balance game and that is not normally implemented here. As you may have heard before, people using more powerful hearing aids, cochlear implants, you can connect and stream to the devices and then the sound that is regulated by the medical device which is no longer part of the standard.

All right, Brian.

>> A quick comment. Thank you for the stress test. The items in dashed boxes were designed to be optional, that's why they're dashed, I made that explicit items dashed, may or may not be present during game play. Hopefully that solves the -- if the device doesn't have a microphone, it doesn't count.

>> All right.

If we're done with section 6.2, I would suggest that we have a coffee break. Just putting pressure on Karl, thank you for the intervention, so --

>> Yeah. Karl.

>> Nothing to do with this document. Just with the room, with the ear phones, they don't go down to a lower level that's acceptable for me. It is too loud. It is ironic in this discussion, other people were having the

same issue. You can only reduce it to certain levels of noise. It is pretty loud.

>> The ear piece.

Yes.

>> Thank you for being concerned about safe listening, Karl.

>> Better, you asked for the floor.

Sorry for stopping everyone from having a coffee. I wanted to follow-up on the hearing aid equipment. I don't think anyone would consider a iPod to be a hearing aid, but the term in that sentence, it could be troublesome, devices used for assistive listening. Perhaps you can reconsider that last part, one could argue using an iPod with the hearing features activated is using it as an assisted listening devices. That phrase would come directly from H.870 because we use that as a guideline. At that h870 was conceived, nobody nut of this being used as a connected listening device. It is worth reviewing at some point. .

>> That was explicitly excluded from H.870. That's why we have H.8.7.1, dealing with the assistive listening type of devices. Here we are basically repeating the language for H.870 as Peter mentioned.

The question is, should we still exclude other devices for assistive listening from the scope of this video gaming centred safe listening, the specification.

There are no specific comments on this. Maybe I just put the note here. That reflects that.

I think it is safer that that is then regulated by standards specifically for assistive listening devices and hearing aids as we have also H.871, regulating that, you're talking a specific case and I think it is maybe safer to exclude them here. It is handled by another standard at that moment.

>> I agree.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: Can you -- can you repeat your point again.

>> I guess my point is that we are trying to regulate devices with all of these standards yet there is devices that serve different -- all of these use cases, that's one device. What's going to happen with that situation if we're in the regulating the actual activity of the use case rather than a regulating of devices? Does that make sense?

>> They are probably defined as different devices depending on the purposes, as mark had said. For example, I think smartphones are not considered as medical device yet.

Especially the United States, the discussion about OTC

hearing aids, I don't think that smartphones are considered as OTC hearing aids yet.

>> Okay.

>> MASAHITO KAWAMORI: So -- and that is a different category, that's what Mark had mentioned. There may be another category coming up, like hearables, and those -- I don't know. Maybe we could include them within that but they are regulated by different standards.

For example, in the United States, they have ANCI standards, and Mark has more to say.

Go ahead.

>> Yeah. It is just a matter of approach.

What I have seen, it is that now at ITU, they have typically a separate standard one for gaming, one for personal sound amplifier, one for personal sound music players, while you may have seen that like in seeing the different approach, having safety regulation for all kind of electronic equipment providing sound to the E. level, that's a different approach. I think that both are workable. On the one hand, I think sometimes it makes sense to put them altogether in one standard on safety, because as you are rightfully saying, if the device can do multiple things, it should be as safe on the ear if doing one thing and the other. In this case, if you want to be very specific to a specific target group, or to specific manufacturers, then the ITU approach seems to work quite well, to be honest, we tried to align all of them, we talk about the same logic at some point. that's a matter of approach. I fully align, that those devices should be safe anyway, however you're using them. That's the main intention, of course.

>> Thank you.

>> Christy?

>> That's it. Thank you.

>> All right.

Brian?

>> I have one more comment on this particular section. The second intent there does not apply to antique arcade cabinets? Is there a reason we're -- arcade games are being manufactured today, do we want to be explicit that this is not covering those.

>> Is that a correct designation, arcade games.

The location-based entertainment is the term we usually use, at least in the U.S.

Sorry, location based entertainment.

>> Location based entertainment.

>> Maybe just change the word antique.

>> Can I request keeping arcade games within parenthesis, and just --

>> Yes. Yes.

Likewise, outdated seems an imprecise term. I'm not sure whether the analogue video game device is either. I guess it is analogue --

>> Yes.

>> Michael? Has everyone else finished? Can I put a request in, I would love to take a photographer at this stage, everybody is so keen, fresh, people are already -- we have lost two attendees, I noticed.

That was the first one. If we could take a photographer before we go for coffee.

Second, we have got some incredible contributions coming from outside. There is no way to get the basis of those attending on the screen I suppose.

>> If they turn on all their cameras, I can stop projecting, that would allow them to appear. However, I want to make sure that we're breaking for coffee now, and that it is okay.

Yes. So let's do that.

When we come back, we can do 6., but before we do that, let's indulge -- remote, turn on the cameras. Don't be shy.

They should break for some 15 minutes, we come back to 20 to 5:00. Okay. All right.

We have four remote turning on the cameras. (Break).

>> CHAIR: We'll go back to the discussion of the documents. We had stopped at 6.3 -- I mean, 6.2, now we'll start with 6.3.

Shelly, if you want to guide us? 6.3 is completely new, following our workshop in September of 2023, we have included here a section on video game play software. That is what this section pertains to, and it -- well, it describes what it refers to, and then the key features of game play software. In line with -- that we give some background about safe listening, then some background about the hardware and now some background about the software.

Hardware as in the device, and software as in the gaming titles, and what this software includes.

Your submission wouldn't have anything on this, this is the new one, only in the new submission that was made.

Would you like me it read through it or is it okay.

6.4, esports live events. This is really again to give the background in context of what is a live event. What is an esports live event, and the idea here, it is because we are trying to give a background on everything

that has features recommended for it.

And even though we have not -- we are not making new recommendations for esports live events in terms of the event, the environment, the participants, so on, we do mention it in our draft, later in the draft to say that this should align with WHO's recommendations on or WHO's standard on safe listening and venues. As I said earlier, a technical paper on this, it is part of the work that the question 28 is doing.

So that is the reason for retaining this part. This has not really been changed from -- wait. Let me see that.

Before I say it was not changed.

Let me just make sure. Yes.

So this, we haven't really made a lot of extra changes to it, but for changing gaming to game play, so on.

What we have done, it is added a note, right at the bottom, of it. There are a couple of notes. This exemption is -- one, it is about the provisions, but then this recommendations, made in this guideline, apply to the hardware, software used during esports, the external sound in the esports venue, the game play, hardware, software, it is outside of the scope of this guideline or standard, whatever it is called.

Features of the safe listening entertainment venue, they're covered in a separate technical paper.

So that is the notation that we have made to clarify that this part is described here, it is not in the context, that there are not specific recommendations made for this particular standard.

>> Comments or questions? Not at this point, it seems. That much risk criteria. And start with 7.1. So 7.1, for the video game devices and this is almost a direct copy of the 8.7 o 0, it is exactly as we had presented it last time. It is copied from that, the 7.1. It really is talking about the two modes, for those not familiar with H.870,ers the standard or the recommendations for safe listening, they are audio devices and systems, what we have, it is that every device, it must have a way to monitor the consumption based on an algorithm, and that algorithmic can be one of these two. Mode one, mode two, mode one, it is based on 80 decibels, 40 hours a day over a weekly period. 88 decibels, and the other is the decibels over 40 hour period over a week, a rolling type of measurement that goes on.

We have done a lot of work to come up with these two modes, and in discussion, of course, with industry, as well as with experts, and with Civil Society. There is no

discussion regarding actually the suitability of this, and we have maintained them as they are, just copy and pasted them from H.870, pretty much reformatting it a bit and pasting it as such from there. And these two modes, be they are -- they're not mandatory to have. But suggested to have, that we have a mode for sensitive users, and children who may prefer or need to have a lower sound input.

Stop there.

Any questions or comments? Seems not, Karl.

>> A more editorial comment really. Notes 2 and 3 look like associated with note 2. That's -- what's there, it doesn't seem to be the case.

Do you see what I mean?

>> I think actually looking at -- into H.17. Just -- yeah. The way it is, for -- no. Sorry.

Yes, you're correct. The indentation is correct. Here. Should be like that.

Let me show the H870, it doesn't. The ¶ 2 and 3, they are in line -- in line with the paragraph, meaning that they're not specific to the bullet or not.

Ryan?

>> A 6400 question, it is required that a VGD estimate the call level and usage of exposure, is there a supplementary document on giving guidance, and it is with the vast majority of cases, it is not possible to get accurate estimates of sound level. Might be interesting to pair this with something that gives the manufacturer something to grab on to.

If I'm Sony, I'm Sony, I have no physical mechanism to be able to track the user exposure time.

If you do something else with the document.

We deal with that with H.870, we have a clause, uncertainty in those estimates.

Basically telling me a feeling that we have it is better not to copy and paste from H.870, but better to go to H.870 to read it there. There are two modes, see what they are there.

That avoids copying and pasting and unwittingly introducing divergencies between the two. You want to apply the exact same principles there, and the normative language comes from there, we don't want to change that. I believe that's the intent.

Shelly.

>> I may have misunderstood Brian's comment, do you mean guidance on how the measurement can be done or on the

modes and --

>> Guidance and how -- I know we don't want to prescribe how something gets done, I think we have to acknowledge the fact that given the status of how these things are. There is no way to meet this without sort of a guesstimate of the example of that being once you have an analogue headphone jack, you have no idea how loud the SPL is, you could be wildly off depending on the headphones, the brand, and that is there some middle, some reference standards, something, that could be -- I'll look at H.870.

Look at H.870, it was also our understanding that we don't provide very granular kind of proposals of how the implementation is to take place.

>> I can show H.870. It does not allow me to switch. I have to stop and start again. All right.

Or not. No. Sorry. Yes. So this is H870, so there we have also a clause 7 with the risk criteria, the operational modes, and then the tables, and then this is about inserting the estimate so that explains the issue.

Still doesn't say how to measure.

Then clause 8, it talks about measurement methods and then how you measure those dosimetry, what you test it against. Right.

And so this specifications, it is provided elsewhere. Then the definition of those, in the context of the dosimetry, and the asking of the dosimetry functionality, so this is all defined in the H.870, so maybe what we need to do, it is to actually make references in the clauses in 8, 7 and 8 of H.870, what are the modes and how you measure it.

Maybe you can put just a very simple summary of what the modes are for the facility rating by the -- no, by the reader of this -- of the new standard, but refer back to what H.870 says, I don't think we're introducing any difference in measurement for those dosimetry. The mechanisms. This is exactly the same.

Just we're saying what we're taking into account or not for that measurement, right?

>> Yeah, I'm seeing that in 1.12 and the 870 spec. That looks great. As a design principle, let's agree that change is going to be made. It can be implemented and come back to that, at the next iteration.

I see Karl -- I don't know if you are.

Yes. Yes. Thank you. Yeah. I don't -- this is H.870 on the screen now.

I don't think it addresses your point though, Brian, completely.

It is something recognized in the document. That we don't have the sensitivity levels and the characteristics of the headphones, you will not get as accurate doses as you would otherwise. I think that that's -- and that's a concern. I think that's something that we need to document in the standard itself, to highlight that, you can be get away from it, there is no point in hiding it. It is just the swigs at the moment.

Yes. Well, just to refer again, it has 7.2, you be certainty in the estimate. So that technologist, those sources of uncertainty. one is variation, types, tolerance, those issues are recognized.

We say at the end of the section that further details, row maining for further studies, recognizing that is not totally closed.

So that's what we have for H.870, then H.870 goes on, relies on the year-end standards, the standards to say how we do the measurements.

I guess that's the best we can do right now.

Anyway.

Sure, sure.

And I tend to think because this is so important, this issue, that if -- it would be better if we had it in the document rather than just referencing it.

>> Copy and paste you mean?

>> Yes.

>> I generally agree with usually with what you say, better to reference. In this case, it is -- it is very important issue that needs to be visible. Thank you.

>> In that case, what we're talking about is section 7 as a whole, plus section 8, 8.1 or 8.1.1. 8.1.2, it is more for reference. It was not so complicated, maybe you want the 8.1.3, testing the dosimetry functionality. What is good that we just referenced and what should we copy and paste is basically the question.

This is not like what you have to pay to have aspect to these -- these are all free downloads from the ITU website and WHO website.

>> Can we stop at section 7 again. Maybe that's all we need and then we reference the rest of it.

>> Section 7.1, it is copy and paste. There was a problem there. So the operational modes, and then we have uncertainty in the estimates, which is not in the new standard --

>> Maybe that section, 7.2.

>> All right.

>> Then we have the measurement methods. Maybe what

we're suggesting is that we do hard copy of the 7.2 into the new standards. We make a cross-reference, a measurement method, what we have, the reference is to this standards.

The main related standards, that doesn't say how to measure, actually, and then it is 8.1.3, that talks about how we test.

Mark?

>> I have a short question. I think that there was most manufacturers today that find a way to comply to the standards and typically they take a worst case scenario with a non-identified headphone and they prefer handshakes, then they identify exactly the levels of the headphone.

The question in gaming consoles, is this possible, can they know that the correct headset is connected, yes or no?

>> Yes and no.

In a limited set of circumstances windows PC, something, can know the headset, but again, if somebody is hooked up with an analogue jack, there is currently no mechanism to know what type of headset.

Actually, I'm looking at the 870 spec, the interesting information, it is in the appendix, appendix 1 of 870. That's where it says, hey, if you don't know what the headset is, then here is how you make the estimation.

>> Thank you.

>> A handshake would be ideal. The problem is that the headsets don't implement it right now. Again, unless -- I don't know if so many headsets matched with a Sony PlayStation, something like that, but that's definitely the exception rather than the rule right now.

>> That's the good news of the current standards, that if manufacturers see that they have more a -- that they have a more accurate way of measuring those, at that moment, that the levels can also be at a somewhat loud level, they know exactly what that is at the moment, right. They're all encouraged to work with more reliability on outputs and game set levels, headsets compared to not knowing where you're going. I think it is encouraging them to be more accurate in the estimates at that moment.

>> Do you anticipate a system interface with a system that believes it has accurate dosimetry information versus one that does not or is that something --

>> This is already happening today, right? Most manufacturer, when they want to ensure the safety of their device, according to the IC standards, that's exactly what they will do, when they don't know what the output is, they will take a safety estimate to ensure that they don't

exceed the safe levels.

Right. That is already happening in places today and music players, whatever.

I think it is a normal trend that the manufacturer has all of the reasons to be as accurate as possible, and function to be sure that those devices are safe and manufacturers do show good will, that they want to have safe devices. We're quite happy with that.

>> Please.

Maybe so much as a comment as a question. From a legal perspective, I think that we would prefer not copying and pasting from 870 but cross-referencing. If 870 changes or is amended, we risk the discrepancies with what we have copied and pasted here, and it would also make this maybe shorter and more streamlined.

>> Thank you.

Just, Brian, you mentioned appendix 2 of H.870.

>> I think I'm looking at appendix 1. I'm looking at a pretty formatted document. I'm not looking at a raw text. I'm not showing it any more.

>> What's the title of the appendix. The title, it is -- where did it go.

>> Appendix 1, the implementation of a personal audio system --

>> You're looking --

>> Reproduced from -- okay. I'm looking at some summary document. It is -- I forgot about that.

>> Append Dicks 2. Yeah.

I think this document could use some explicit, every software developer I mentioned, this is the first thing I mentioned. We have no way of knowing what headphones they are. We have no way of knowing what the SPL level is. I think just having it, you know, some -- maybe just pointing to appendix 2 is fine with that. Maybe just acknowledging that, yes, this is -- we well understand the problem, and hear is the solution, to estimate in this kind of way, go see appendix 2 of 870.

He understand the comment, a way of addressing that, it is just the escape clause, it says if there is indifference, H.870 prevails. So this is for the convenience of the use of the reader.

Richard.

>> The comments on the problem with headphones. The way I see this problem, it is to define a permitted maximum sensitivity of the headphones. Then everything has to be better from that, more conservative. A is the assumption that is used there.

All the comments on really needing to know that, so that you can be going up to the safe level rather than being subject to something that's too quiet doesn't seem to make a lot of sense.

That's the approach, H.870, it didn't really address the listening devices the same way.

Is this an acceptable approach we can have now for the moment. We can always review this. So we'll provide some information expected in the estimate.

And I had here, this reference to appendix two.

We have here, something about the measurement --

>> And section 8, which is on measurement may also need to be referenced here. Section 8 of H.870.

Is that the one -- that's the one.

>> Yes.

>> All right.

>> So that is both 7, new clause 7.2.

>> I was looking at that last bullet point, the music, it is accounted for -- is that -- it is in here.

That's copy and paste from --

>> Yeah.

>> Leave it for now. That's fine. It is just --

>> There is content for the -- it used to be -- it used to be accounted for, something like that.

>> Audio. Change it to audio. Change music to audio. The disclaimer here, it is even more important.

All right. I guess we -- we did what we could here.

Should we go to clause 8? We have 10 more minutes.

>> So, clause 8, it is about -- it is about the features in the game play devices and also the multipurpose game play devices. It really is about the hardware so to say.

Based on a -- it is based off of H.870. So game -- so it starts by saying what hardware includes. It is -- it is same as what we had. It is pretty much similar, the same as what we had earlier.

We have here dosimetry, it gives again what is dosimetry, and it refers here also to appendix 1 for information on implementation of dosimetry. We don't have the appendix 1 yet, it was also going to be mirroring what H.870 says, if the agreement is not to explicitly say that, but simply to refer back to the amen Dicks of H.870, I think that is perfectly fine for us as well.

Comments, questions.

>> Yeah. Thank you. So the suggestion, we had in this part, it is -- it is in -- are we there yet? Not yet. So the next -- okay.

>> Thank you.

>> So maybe you want to talk about 8.1.

>> 8.1 -- dosimetry.

>> Yeah.

>> So the 8.1, it is really again about dosimetry, and gives states again two modes. It is again about dosimetry and states again the two modes that are recommended in H.870, and using similar language, as the same as H.870, it talks about how this calculation should be across multiple devices used by the individual wherever this is possible.

So wherever this is possible, it should be -- it would be good to have that.

For example, if somebody is playing on a particular software kind of environment let's say on an IOS, on different devices of IOS, perhaps it could be integrated across all platforms, not just on a single platform.

However, this is revised, this is not always possible, so wherever possible this should be done.

So that an individual can have the single estimate of their listening or sound dose rather than having multiple things across different tablet, phone, game play device, et cetera.

So that is the idea behind this recommendation, which is the same as H.870.

>> Thank you. So I would suggest that we say a gaming hardware device connected to headphones or ear phones shall track.

I think we recall from September, it was Mark that recommendation that we simplify things a little bit by limiting it to headphones. Did we do that or are we doing free-field and --

>> The free-field, it was removed.

>> In that case, the last sentence of the paragraph of 8.1, above appendix one, and free field devices, does that have to be removed then?

>> Should be able to calculate knowledge for both ear level on devices, we're saying remove --

>> Understanding that this is not going to be a mandatory requirement, and this is really to say if possible, it should do that.

Do we -- do we foresee that it may be possible in certain environments of a certain devices to actually do this in which case we would prefer to maintain it rather than remove it completely. We can make the wording softer, rather than saying should, we could say possible, again, repeating the possible, we could repeat that, but we would prefer not to delete it completely.

>> If should is a softer shall, maybe it is okay as is.

>> Okay.

>> Maybe it is just it is recommended.

I think that you see it is a mandatory part, you kind of recommend it that at that moment, it would be great, of course, they don't care where the sound is coming from, right? If it is too loud, the dose is too much, it is --

>> Karl?

>> Just fighting with --

>> Okay. Fighting with --

>> Okay.

>> This sentence, it is new compared to the zero draft. It is where it is recommend of the from there on, that's new.

It is recommended, it has been added, this sentence, it is already there so it is not a track change in my document. This is just the first sentence. What we're saying here, so to cap the doses for both the overview devices on speaker, surround sounds, that's all media devices.

>> How do I do that?

>> May I clarify that here? We have -- what we're saying is, is that as part of this requirement and standard, it has to be able so, shall be able to assess what is the dosage, when it is connected to a headphone, perfect. We also know that many of the devices have pick up sounds from the environment, they have microphones, so there is -- where there is a free-field, it is possible to also -- it could be possible, I'm not saying it is possible for every device, but potentially, could be for some devices. That's why we say wherever it is possible, where you have that opportunity to actually monitor it, it would be good to give a person a single kind of a figure, which includes the consuming of the free-field source and threw the headphones. Let's say somebody has been -- yes, you know the rational, it let's -- let's say somebody is playing with the headphones, then on free-field, also, they're listening to music, loud volumes during that time, it should be into this estimation.

We recognize that this is probably a reach at this time. We only put it here for the sake of having it there. In some systems, it may be well possible, not in the meeting, not now, but maybe after a couple of years.

>> And the free-field audio, it is what I have the issue with. You have the mic that is recording the environment, it is the one in the ear, this is -- you know,

it is -- people don't have any control over this. And what you're saying is that it will add to their total dosage.

I think it is unrumble I think. Maybe it is not that strong, but I don't think it is practically possible. Thank you.

Again, what I'm trying to stress here, it is not practically possible maybe today, but it could be possible after a year, it is not a requirement of the standard. What it says, it is where possible we can soften the language even further if its, you know, instead of saying it is recommended. We could say that wherever it is possible, it would be useful, something like that, but only from our side, we would prefer not to completely delete it.

>> Let's see. Mark?

>> Telling you that that feature already exists today.

When I'm connecting to different sound systems today, I look at my weekly sound exposure. I do see the combination of the sound exposure listening through my headphones, I even get an estimate of the sound level I was listening on to loudspeakers at some point, some factors are already doing that. I'm not seeing -- saying it is 100% accurate. For the time being, what we mow, it is that there is a slow way to work with ecosystems that are calculating everything you're listening to as long towards Digital Transformation as it is the same smart device driving it, with maybe the future could show, inaknow, Karl, honestly speaking, I don't see that happening overnight.

It is not bad to look into the future. I think that the issue with the standard is that we need to allow future good positive developments to happen. It doesn't hurt as long it is not a mandatory requirement and it is a recommendation, I don't see why we couldn't have it in to show that in fact we have to look at it as an ecosystem.

>> Let's look at the wording of it. It would be nice if you have future or something in the sentence.

A bit -- not a direct recommendation.

Thank you.

Maybe we recommend to whatever is possible, possible compromisely, a game where hardware can also calculate or something like that.

I hate to say when you're in the middle of typing that word, I think possible is kind of a scary word.

Anything is possible. We could redesign the entire Xbox around this feature. That's possible. I think, you know, same -- you know, I think there was a great point, a clear distinguishing between these are required, you have

to do these, and these are things we should look at, if you're able to.

>> And I see the hand there, I want to say in ITU standards, those sentences that include shall are the mandatory issues. It shall include the dosimetry. Including dosimetry, it is essential. The other things, the should, they're really good to have. You should have them there, like optional, but at a high-level. Then there are the cans, the coulds, and possible, that kind of thing.

As I understand, ITU terminology, after many years, of struggling with the shalls of course and the should, but, yeah. That is clear. The mandatory is clear.

>> Can we include an ITU cheat sheet, should means this, shall might mean this, possible means this, where possible means that.

>> It is actually not just ITU, it is IE EG-ITRs E, anywhere in the standardization bodies, they are usually having three levels, one is mandatory, the second, it is should, it is highly recommended, the feature, and then may, may is optional. Most of the times, people don't implement it.

Yes. These are the three levels of requirements.

>> Would a way out be instead of where possible, where feasible, and on this, you know, shall, should, for those that find it difficult to fall asleep every night, I recommend the Vienna Convention law of treaties, Article 30 which provides treaty interpretations, it is exactly what has been said.

>> I don't blame you, Brian. It took me more than a year to wrap my head around the shall and the should and understand what exactly they mean.

>> I'm impressed that Titaiana pulled this you the off the air without looking it up.

>> You're off mic. Are you off mic? So it is already minutes past our meeting time. Are we done with 8.1? Maybe we should pause for today and continue tomorrow with 8.2? We're a little bit behind schedule, in the sense that we had planned to have gone up to clause 9.

Let's see what we have, substantive important elements, dosimetry interface, notifications, volume control system, auditor reportic volume reduction, audio device compensation, and then 9, we have the safe listening features for video, game play software, warnings, notifications, initial load on the screen. That will be a lot for tomorrow.

Probably the most contention part, I don't know how

you would like do with we are already over time with the captioning.

Maybe we should maybe --

>> We could shorten lunch tomorrow.

>> Yes.

>> And we can start early, I don't know.

>> No. We have the -- we have the limitation is the captioning that we are contracted for 9:00 -- sorry. 9:30. Sorry. 9:30 and we still have lots to go over.

>> We can have homework.

>> Maybe that's what was going to be suggested.

>> Exactly. Took the words straight out of my mouth.

We got the document on Friday. I don't think spending another hour now is going to make too much difference. That's in addition of tomorrow.

When we have the document, well, 24 hours, so, yeah. I'm happy to --

>> So what is being suggested, is that you guys shorten your dinner time, and work during the night. Great. That's what you suggest, right? I'm not suggesting that.

>> He was suggesting that the ITU is inviting us to dinner.

>> And discussing over dinner.

>> I'm joking, joking.

>> Yes.

>> Thank you.

Let's on the practical level, tomorrow we resume from 8.2. Hopefully from today's discussions, you could maybe have -- you know, the focus point for tomorrow's discussions. We don't talk about definitions tomorrow. Just joking.

So we start at 8.2 and go as far as we can during the day. We have until 12:30, maybe we forfeit a coffee break tomorrow. We would gain a half hour in that sense.

And then we see where we can get. All right.

Thank you very much.

Have a good homework. And see you tomorrow, 9:30 in the same room.

>> Thank you.

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in

any way that may violate copyright law.