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>> Although I would love to join you in person today, it is nonetheless a great pleasure to offer a few words in support of your meeting. Let me begin by welcoming and congratulating our new Study Group 15 Chairman, Glenn Parsons, as well as our seven Vice Chairs. Leadership is a highly significant commitment to the goal of ITU‑T. I thank you all very much for taking on this responsibility, and I extend the same sense to all of our rapporteurs, editors, and delegates.

This meeting welcomes around 350 experts from 45 countries, more countries than your previous meeting, which I'm very glad to see. I also see that this meeting will consider 310 contributions and that 46 drafted texts are proposed for consent. I sincerely appreciate Study Group 15's great productivity, and I wish you every success in your work to continue delivering the value for which you have become so well known.

Looking at the contributions received by this meeting, we see evidence that the reorganization of Study Group 15's questions is achieving its goals. Contributors have been received on questions on access, on networking, technologies, interfaces and cables, transport network, architecture, synchronization, and management. This demonstrates industry's investment in your work, and I am certain that Study Group 15 will continue to meet this strong demand.

Let me also take this opportunity to applaud Study Group 15 on your promotion of your work at workshops and exhibitions. This promotion highlights standardized tools already available, as well as opportunities to contribute to your work. It benefits developers and implementers alike. It is, of course, my final remarks to the Study Group 15 as director. It has been a great honor to serve you in this role, and I thank you all very much for the support that you have offered me.

I would like to highlight my gratitude to every Study Group 15 expert for giving life to this group's work. Your dedication to ITU's work is of great service to the public interest. It is highly appreciated. I thank you. I wish you a most productive meeting.

>> GLENN PARSONS: That I want to discuss networking reception and a couple of information‑sharing tutorials that we're planning. So, that's the schedule. We have booked two periods for this because we have a lot of the beginning of the Study Group material to go through, with the appointments, and so, we wanted to make sure that we had sufficient time for that.

So, with that, ladies and gentlemen, we have the agenda before you in TD1 of Plenary. Are there any comments on this agenda? Being no requests for the floor, I take this agenda as approved. Thank you very much.

Let's proceed, then, with the Agenda Item 4, which is the Study Group responsibility and questions assigned by the WTSA‑20. This is in Contribution 1. Contribution 1 is available in all of the languages of the union, but we'll be presenting the English one.

This contribution is sort of the excerpt, if you will, from Resolution 2, that identifies the questions assigned to Study Group 15. So, if we'll just scroll through this one, Hiroshi, to identify the material here that identifies the Study Group 15 title, which is ‑‑ this is as we had requested from the last Study Group 15 meeting, that our title is "Networks, Technologies, and Infrastructures for Transport, Access, and Home," and that our mandate is as shown here.

The lead Study Group roles are shown here as well. So, if you can scroll down, Hiroshi, we'll see the rest of the material here with some points of guidance on our focus. And if you continue to scroll, Hiroshi, we'll see the background that we had provided that's in Resolution 2 of our work area. These are a list of questions.

The mapping here of the previous question number and the new question number that you see on the left. So, if you'll scroll down, Hiroshi. We'll go down through here. And then we have all the wordings of the questions. And so, this, then, we have Question 1. And so, you can just scroll through all of this. We will not go over all the text here. I'll just, I'll note that this text that appears in Resolution 2 was unchanged at WTSA‑20 from what we had provided in Study Group 15 to them.

Okay, thank you very much. Are there any comments or questions on the excerpt from Resolution 2 that's in Contribution 1? Okay. Seeing no requests from the floor, let's continue then with the organization of Study Group 15. So, we'll look at, first is the working party structure. And so, this is in TD38 of Plenary. Ah. Hiroshi.

>> Hiroshi Ota: I wanted to inform you, there is realtime captioning service for this opening plenary to continue. This morning. And also, the closing plenary to be held on 30th of September. Then Friday, next week. On the text which was captioned will also be stored and accessible for you, for your convenience. And the link to follow the captioning text will appear on the Study Group 15 web page in a few minutes. Thank you.

>> GLENN PARSONS: Thank you very much, Hiroshi, for that useful information on how to access the captioning for this meeting. So, let's continue with TD35 of plen, the structure and leadership. We'll start with the working party structure. So, if you scroll down a little bit here ‑‑ scroll up to the text for a bit. A little bit further up. I want to see this. Okay.

So, WTSA assigned us the 13 study questions that we just saw in C1. And as I mentioned, these are all continuations from the previous study period, and all but two have retained the same question number. And so, in order to do that, we skipped one of the numbers in the assignment, and we are also proposing that this be organized into the same three working party structure as the previous study period.

So, the structure that we have is a Working Party 1 that will contain Questions 1, 2, 3, and 4. So, Question 1 on coordination of access and home network transport standards; Question 2 on optical systems for fibre access networks; Question 3 for technologies for in‑premises networking and related access applications; and Question 4 for broadband access over metallic conductors. That's working Party 1.

Working Party 2 contains Questions 5, 6, 7 and 8, although also a mistake in the editorial on Working Party, which is 5, 6, 7, and 8. So, Question 5 is characteristics and test methods of optical fibers and cables and installation guidance. Question 6: Characteristics of optical components, subsystems and systems for optical transport networks. Question 7: Connectivity, operation and maintenance of optical physical infrastructure. And Question 8: Characteristics of optical fibre submarine cable systems. Those questions make up Working Party 2.

Then Working Party 3, skipping Question 9 to keep the same question numbers, we have Question 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14. So, Question 10: Interfaces, interworking, OAM, protection and equipment specifications for packet‑based transport networks. Question 11: Signal structures, interfaces, equipment functions and protection and interworking for optical transport networks. Question 12: Transport network architectures. Question 13, network synchronization and time distribution performance and Question 14: Management and control of transport systems and equipment. Those questions make up Working Party 3. So, that is our proposal for the Working Party structure for Study Group 15. Continuing effectively the same structure as the last period. Are there any comments, ladies and gentlemen? I don't see any comments. And I'd like to see here agreement for that. So, that structure is so agreed. Thank you.

So, if we'll move on now to the Study Group leadership. I had introduced the leadership that was appointed by WTSA‑20 already, and so, this just repeats that here for your information. As I said, this is for WTSA‑20 to appoint. And so, if you'll continue on, as we've already introduced these.

So, next, we'll move on to the Working Party leadership. And so, the Working Party Leadership, according to Resolution 1, the Chair of the Study Group should establish a management team to assist in the work. And I can appoint working party chairs and working party chairs from the Vice Chairs or are experts from the group with experience. And so, as a result of that, we have discussed in the Management Team, and I have made the following proposals that you see before you here. So, if you'll scroll down, Hiroshi, we can see that the proposal that I have for Working Party 1 is to be chaired by Mr. Tom Starr, representing Huawei in Switzerland, with Vice Chair of Mr. Ian Horsley from BT in the UK. For Working Party 2, I'm proposing Mr. Noriyuki Araki from NTT in Japan, the Vice Chair Mr. Paul Doolan from Infinera in the United States. And for Working Party 3, the Chair, Mr. Malcolm Betts, representing ZTE in China, and the Vice Chair, Mr. Tom Huber, representing Nokia in the United States. So, that is the Working Party Leadership that we are proposing. Are there any comments, ladies and gentlemen? I seek your agreement for these new Working Party Chair appointments. So agreed. And congratulations to the Working Party Chairs on your appointment.

So, next, I'd like to proceed to 5.3, which is the appointment of rapporteurs and associate rapporteurs. And so, the Chairman of the Study Groups and the Working Parties were encouraged, of course, for Recommendation A.1, to delegate the responsibilities of the work, of course, to rapporteurs for the detailed study of individual questions. And rapporteurs may be appointed or terminated ‑‑ unappointed, effectively ‑‑ at any time, with the agreement of the working party Chairs or the Study Group Chairs.

And further, where the work so requires, a rapporteur may propose the appointment of one or more associate rapporteurs. So, the difference ‑‑ the subtlety here is that the management team appoints the rapporteur, and then the rapporteur advises if they would like assistance and suggests who would be the most appropriate associate rapporteur. So, we've taken consultations with the various rapporteurs and candidates on who would be appropriate and to complete the work and how many rapporteurs would we need to handle the work, and as a result, we've proposed the list that I'm going to show you here now.

So, if you'll scroll down, Hiroshi. So, what we have in Question 1, we have the rapporteur proposed Jean‑Marie Fromenteau from Corning in the United States, assisted by the associate rapporteur Dekun Liu from Huawei in China.

For Question 2, the rapporteur frank EffenBerger representing Futurewei in the United States with associate rapporteur Junichi Kani from NTT in Japan. For Question 3, the rapporteur, Les Brown, representing Huawei of China, assisted by associate rapporteurs Marcos Martinez, representing Maxlinear in the United States, and Tony Zeng, representing Huawei in China.

Then, Question 4, rapporteur frank Van Der Putten, renting Nokia in Finland, with associate. Rapporteur of Les Brown, representing Huawei in China, and Miguel Peeters, repping Broadcom in the United States. So, those are the proposed rapporteurs for Working Party 1.

Next, I'll go through the rapporteurs and associate rapporteurs for Working Party 2. For Question 5, we have Kazuhide Nakajima from NTT in Japan with associate rapporteur Vincent Ferretti, Corning, United States. For Question 6, for rapporteur, we have Fabio Cava lifs ere, Erickson in Sweden, with associate rapporteur Bernd Teichmann of Nokia, Finland. For Question 7, we have Chihiro Kito from Ntt in Japan with Zhuang with MIIT. For Question 8, Omar Ait Sab, representing Nokia in Finland. So that's the set of rapporteurs and associate rapporteurs for Working Party 2.

Now, for Working Party 3, we have Question 11. The rapporteur is Steve Gorshe, representing Microsemi in the United States, assisted by associate rapporteur Bert Klaps from Intel in the United States. For Question 12, the rapporteur is Stephen Shew, representing Ciena in Canada, assisted by associate rapporteur Haomian Zheng from Huawei in China.

For Question 13, we have Stefano Ruffini as the rapporteur representing Calnex in the United Kingdom, and assisted by the associate rapporteur of Silvana Rodrigues representing Huawei in China. And then finally, we have Kam Lam as the rapporteur representing CICT in China, assisted by associate rapporteurs Scott Mansfield, representing Ericsson in Canada and Liping Chen, representing CICT in China. So, those, ladies and gentlemen, are your rapporteurs and associate rapporteurs for Working Party 3. So, that is the set of rapporteurs and associate rapporteurs that the management team is proposing for your agreement. Any comments, ladies and gentlemen? Being none, the rapporteurs and associate rapporteurs are appointed. Thank you.

The next I'd like to move on to the appointment of liaison rapporteurs. So, this is in TD42 of Plenary. So, one of the things that the management team did in the review of the liaison rapporteur list is that we identified whether the liaison rapporteur role was still necessary if we were having relationships with the body that was indicated, that was necessary to have a liaison rapporteur prepare a report for the meeting, and also discussed whether those individuals were willing to continue.

So, as a result, what we've provided ‑‑ so, I guess there's some notable change or churn with the list of liaison rapporteurs, and so, what we decided to do for this list is to show these as change mark from the last study period. And so, we scroll down here, noting that ‑‑ so, we were going to remove the liaison rapporteur for 3GPSA5, and for BBF, we will retain the existing two liaison rapporteurs, frank VanderPutten for 1 and 2 and David Sinicrope will remain as liaison rapporteur for BBF for Working Party 3.

Then for TC210, Working Group 11, we decided that was no longer necessary to maintain a liaison rapporteur for Cenelec, so we've removed that one. Then we decided then to continue with Cenelec TC84, both BXA and TC84A and Daniel Daems agreed to continue in that role.

For then the Conformity Assessment Steering Committee, or CASC, we have assigned one of our Vice Chairs, Fatai Zhang, to be the Study Group 15 liaison rapporteur to that committee.

Then for ETSI ISG on 5G, we have retained Tony Zeng as the liaison rapporteur there. But for ETSI TM6, which was vacant, we decided that we no longer needed that.

For the EWM Coordinator, what we have done is identified three representatives, one from each working party. So, Tony Zeng for working party 1, Paul Doolan for working party 2 and Jessy Rouyer for working party 3, or least for this meeting of working party 3, with Yuanbin Zhang taking over for the rest of the study period. And these individuals will decide amongst themselves who will make the report to the Study Group 15, or if they'll do it together as the report. So, in any case, we appoint each of them as the EWM Coordinator for their respective Working Parties.

Then, we have the G3 PLC Alliance. The view was that we would not need this going forward. Stefano Ruffini retains the liaison rapporteur to IEEE and 1588. Jessy Rouyer takes over for me as the liaison rapporteur to IEEE 802.1. Tom Huber takes over as the liaison rapporteur from 802.3 from Mr. Stassar, who has retired.

And then, Scott Mansfield remains the IETF Liaison on Transport Network, and Jessy Rouyer remains as the MEF/ITU MoU Steering Committee Liaison.

Then we have the liaison rapporteur to Study Group 13 on 5G IMT2020 issues. We decided that given the focus group has ended and that the work has mostly concluded, there's no longer a need for a liaison rapporteur on IMT2020, and so, we decided to simply remove that one. And then for the JCA on CIT, again, we decided that was vacant ‑‑ we decided it was no longer needed.

Then, for the ‑‑ it was requested by TSAG for us to appoint a liaison rapporteur to the JCA on accessibility, and Taesik Cheung has volunteered to be our liaison rapporteur here. We have the JCA on IMT2020, and Scott Mansfield, who is the chair, has also graciously agreed to continue being the liaison rapporteur for Study Group 15.

We have MEF, Jessy Rouyer, again, continuing as the liaison rapporteur here. For ONF, we had previously two liaison rapporteurs for different topic areas, and so, on discussions here, we agreed that it was probably better or more appropriate to just have one liaison rapporteur, instead of two, and we agreed that Xiang Yun would take over that role.

And then, promotion and coordination, Jean‑Marie Fromenteau continues, and we're appreciative of that, as the Chairman of Promotion and Coordination. And we're happy to welcome a Vice Chair to assist in the work, because it's certainly a lot of work in the promotion and coordination activities that we have with Vince Ferretti to assist with that.

To our liaison rapporteur to the group on vocabulary, SCV, we have appointed Mohammed Amine Benziane, which is one of our Vice Chairs, to be our liaison rapporteur there. For Study Group 2, we decided the work is completed there and it is no longer needed to have a liaison rapporteur, so we have decided not to continue with that.

For IEC, there are several here in TC86. So for SC86A, we have asked Sudipta Bhaumik to take over as the liaison rapporteur for this one. For SC86B, Makoto Murakami continues. And for TC86C, Peter Pondillo continues as liaison rapporteur.

Then, for OIF, we have two tracks in OIF, and Jonathan Sadler continues as the liaison rapporteur for the Networking and Software track, and Bernd Teichmann continues for liaison rapporteur for OIF. So that is our proposal from the management team to both update the list of liaison rapporteurs that we have, which groups that we have them to, and who the new liaison rapporteurs would be starting for this study period. So, do we have any comments, ladies and gentlemen? If not, I'd like to seek your agreement for the appointment of these liaison rapporteurs. That is so agreed. Thank you very much!

So, let's move on, then, to the Working Methods of Study Group 15. And so, we have in Item 6.1 WTSA matters of relevance to Study Group 15. And so, what I've done here is I've provided a short summary of the activities in WTSA that's of relevance to Study Group 15. I'm not going to go over them in detail. I'll just highlight them and I'll bring out a couple of issues that I'd like us to focus on. And so, if you'll scroll down here, I'll just remind you that WTSA actually met in person back in March, finally. As you know, the previous study period was extended because they had to meet in person in order to decide the appointment of the new study period. So, if you just go back to the top, Hiroshi, please. Yeah, just look at this introduction here.

So, one of the things that was interesting is that there was ‑‑ we were here in this building, and it was quite a large meeting. There was over 900 delegates in person here, with about 400 remote. And it was a test of the remote participation. And so, we had lots of people in person as well as some remote. And I would say that the remote participation worked well in that setup, and I think it worked well because of the support that was provided by TSB in providing a room computer that we would connect to and making sure that the room was connected so that the Chair didn't need to deal with that. And so, I hope that's what we'll have for us this week as well.

So, what we then have with this Study Group 15 questions and mandate, as I had mentioned before, and we went over in Contribution 1, the study questions have all been assigned as we had requested, and we remain the lead Study Group as indicated here for access network transport, home technology and optical technology. And as you recall, we deleted our lead responsibility for smart grid because we believe that it had reached a sufficient stage of maturity, so we no longer needed a lead Study Group.

So, if you'll scroll down, Hiroshi, to the next section. This is your leadership, as I mentioned already. So, we'll just keep going.

Now, what I have listed here now is a list of resolutions. So, WTSA revised 36 of the existing resolutions, adopted two new ones, suppressed four, and maintained ten without change. And so, 20 remain unchanged since the last WTSA. And we have a number of A‑Series recommendations that were revised. So, three were revised and three were unchanged. So, I may talk a little bit about those here as well. But you can review the notable changes. There's two links here that the TSB has provided in a summary of the changes of the work programme and the working methods. And so, I would encourage, at least the rapporteurs, to look at those, but certainly, everyone is welcome to look at those. And the full set of resolutions are available at the link indicated here as well.

But let me provide you some key highlights. In Resolution 1, there was some updates of several sections, and this is mostly a tweaking of some of the deadlines and some of the terminology around the process. There's nothing particular here I'd like to point out from Study Group 15 perspective, but there's a few tweaks that were made.

Resolution 2, of course, we already went over, the Study Group 15 mandate that was updated there.

The other resolutions that are of relevance to the work of Study Group 15, I believe, are Resolution 31 on Associates; Resolution 32 on electronic working methods; Resolution 44 on bridging the standardization gap; and Resolution 55 on mainstreaming. And so, some of these were not changed and some of them were revised, but these are all key resolutions.

So, other ones to note. Resolution 67 on the use of the languages and the SCV, so, the standardization committee for vocabulary, as we note that we have an issue outstanding on the use of vocabulary, certainly in the synchronization context, that's with SCV right now.

We have Resolution 68 on the evolving role of industry in the ITU Telecommunication Standardization Sector. This one I'd like to highlight, because there were significant proposals to modify Resolution 68, to highlight the value that industry provides, especially, for example, in Study Group 15. So, despite multiple proposals to change this, it was not changed. There are, again, multiple proposals on promoting the value of industry that will be discussed at the Plenipotentiary starting next week, so, that will be of interest.

Next, we have Resolution 77, which is on software‑defined networks. Resolution 80, which is on the involvement of membership in ITU, and no changes there. Resolution 90, which is on open source, again. So, Study Group 15 had recommended to TSAG that there was no further need for this resolution and that the work had been done. And again, despite that indication and similar indications from other members, there was no change with Resolution 90.

Resolution 92, which is the IMT resolution, and the non‑radio aspects of IMT. There was instructs revised in direction here that specifically mentioned Study Group 15. So, basically, our role in supporting IMT networks through front‑haul, back‑haul, over transport networks, was indicated here. So, that's something to take note of.

Resolution 93 on interconnection of IMT was unchanged but is also relevant. Resolution 94 on cloud networks was no change. Resolution 98 on smart cities, there were some revisions there. And then finally, one of the new resolutions is Resolution 99. Resolution 99 is on what they call organizational reform of the Telecommunication Standardization Sector. So, many of you may remember this with the restructuring that was proposed for Study Group 15, in the last study period, one of the proposals was to break up Study Group 15 and merge it with some of the other study groups in a smaller Study Group structure for ITU‑T. So, what has been done now with this resolution is that there is a committee that has been formed, directed by this resolution, that will work over the next two years to come up with a proposal for a reform of the structure. So, they're going to come up with what the new structure is going to be and propose that to WTSA‑24. So that is something we'll need to pay attention to and will be monitoring through our engagement ‑‑ my engagement ‑‑ at TSAG, and we'll let you know if there are any actions that we'll need to take from a Study Group 15 perspective.

So, those are the resolutions of interest that I have noted for you. If we move on, I'd like to highlight the recommendations that have been updated. The full set of recommendations, of course, is available on the ITU site, but let me just highlight the three that were updated. The first one is Recommendation A.5. This is something that we use quite a lot here in Study Group 15 when we're presenting documents for AAP, and we need to provide that justification for references to standards outside of ITU‑T. And so, there was a number of clarifications to various text here, which is just clarifications. But one of the notable things is that what was added here was the request that Study Group 15 had made to TSAG during the last study period on the handling of references that were added during AAP, and what's the process for that. And so, the process that we had agreed in Study Group 15 and we suggested TSAG adopt, that's what was included.

The other thing that was added was the ability to attach reference material to that justification document that the editors or rapporteurs would prepare for the final meeting, for the closing plenary, when we would do the consent. The reason for this was because of the clarification to the text that indicated that, if there were any specific details on IPR that needed to be included ‑‑ and so, whether these were copyright notices, copyright releases, because you're using a trademarked term, for example ‑‑ those would want to be, would need to be attached, and so there's an ability to do that. So, this focus on what was the IPR specifics and what needed to be attached, what did not need to be attached, this is part of the clarified text that's in A.5, and so, I would encourage the rapporteurs and editors to pay attention to that as you prepare your A.5 justifications for documents consenting at this meeting.

So, the next one to note is ‑‑ well, the next one I'll note is A.25, which is the last one here. That was ‑‑ A.25 is for incorporating text from other organizations, so that's if you take the text directly, take a figure directly. We typically do not do that in Study Group 15 recommendations. We typically just reference, which is what A.5 is. But, so, A.25 is that same process, if you were going to use the text, so a little bit more involved process there, but, so, that's just to highlight that one. But it's a similar additions/changes, as per A.5.

So, now A.8, which is the AAP process. This is the consent process. There were some updates here. So, two notable updates. The first one is the Table of Comments. So, what we would typically do in AAP is that the editor would prepare a Table of the Comments. You would compile the comments that came in from the delegates into one document, and this is the list of comments, and you would provide that, and you would use that to prepare your disposition, your resolution of the comments.

The change now in A.8 is that that compilation of comments is now required to be uploaded to the AAP system two weeks after the close of AAP, so this is a new change and a new process that we'll need to adhere to with the documents that we consent after this meeting.

The additional thing that was added was that there was additional deadlines for this, dates for deadlines being added. And so, as a result of that, the ‑‑ and we're not sure if this was the intent, but the AAP process has been now lengthened as a result of that. So, I'm going to highlight that point here now in a minute on a particular change that is coming that we want to look at.

So, if we scroll down here, Hiroshi, to the section on A.8, so I have some additional text here. The Table of Comments template, as I mentioned, this already aligns quite well with what we're doing in Study Group 15. However, the last comment resolution table, the point that it needs to be posted now, 12 days before the Director's call ‑‑ and this is Director's call for additional review ‑‑ and not the Study Group, so as was previously implied. So, it becomes specific now as to where this ‑‑ well, the 12 days was added for when the comment resolution table should be posted, and 12 days before the Director's call. And the Director's call, of course, then should be issued three weeks before the Study Group meeting. So, as a result now, if we have a longer period of AAP and additional review and additional ‑‑ so, the Table of Comments now needs to be posted 33 days before the meeting. So, that now reduces the time that we have had for review in the past. And so, it's because of this reduction in the time that we're going to be asking ‑‑ or we propose to ask TSAG to clarify if that was indeed the intent to increase this time. So, we'll look at that proposal shortly.

The next point that I want to raise ‑‑ and this is based on a contribution that was submitted to WTSA but was not agreed. And so, this contribution was from one of the regions, proposing a new resolution on the use of in‑person and virtual options on an equal footing in the activities of the Telecommunication Standardization Sector. And even though it was not agreed, the report from WTSA‑20 indicated that it would be continued to be discussed in two locations. The first is in the TSAG ad hoc group on the governance and management of e‑meetings; and the second is in the Plenipotentiary Conference that will be starting next week.

So, since the conclusion of WTSA‑20, the TSAG Ad Hoc Group on the governance and management of e‑meetings has continued. And as a result of its continuation, what I have provided is what Study Group 15 has used as our virtual meetings guidelines. And so, we've created additional guidelines, in addition to the ones we had for remote meetings, to guide us during the pandemic era, where we were all meeting online and how we dealt with that. And so, we provided them the guidance for that. Because where they are is that they're looking at proposing amendments to Recommendation A.1 that both defines the types of meetings, defines a new type of meeting, a hybrid meeting, which is currently undefined, and defines the conduct for virtual meetings. And so, if you'd like to review this information, it's on the FTP area for this TSAG group. You can look at the details here. This issue will be discussed in the context of Resolution 167 at the Plenipotentiary, and there are a number of contributions against that. So, that's something that I will be paying attention to and I'll make this group aware of. But we'll also be paying attention to this topic that's in this ad hoc group of TSAG. And as a result, as this is an important point for Study Group 15, as we already have guidelines in this area that we'd like to continue, I think it's useful for us to provide TSAG a liaison on those ‑‑ on our current way of working. So, I'm going to propose that as well, and I'll go over the details there shortly.

So, that, I believe ‑‑ is that the end of this TD, Hiroshi? Yes. So, that is the summary of the activities of interest at WTSA and TSAG for Study Group 15. Are there any comments or questions, ladies and gentlemen? If not, then let's continue with the guidance for the work of Study Group 15 in TD39. So, if you'll bring that up, Hiroshi.

Okay, thank you. So, what I have here, showing here now, is the guidance for the work of Study Group 15. So, what we've done here in this document is providing a number of guidelines that provide some clarity on the working methods of ITU‑T and how they are applied within the context of the work of Study Group 15.

And what we've done previously ‑‑ so, these guidelines have existed for, well, ever since I've been coming, I guess. But they have been provided in various levels. Like, some have been just provided to the management team; some have been just provided to the rapporteurs; some to the membership.

What we decided in the management team this time is to provide all of them to the membership. And so, what you have here is a list of guidelines. We have them sorted by the topic areas, but there's 24 different guidelines on various topic areas. So, I'll just summarize what these are.

I provided these to the rapporteurs earlier. And in the management team, we discussed these for some months now as to what we would need to update. There were some, I would say, editorial updates and other updates based on the changes in the documents I had mentioned, A.8, for example, and some of the other WTSA documents that we have done. But otherwise, there is no significant change to any of these guidelines that we've had.

So, we've structured them in different areas, so we have the Management Team Guidelines. This is the appointment of Working Party Chairmen and Vice Chairmen, so the guidelines we would follow basically identifying what the rules are and how we would progress, identify working party chairmen and Vice Chairmen. There is the structure we have for the working party reports, and how we would handle stand‑alone working party meetings, if we were to do that. And so, those are sort of the Management Team Guidelines in Annexes 1 through 3 here.

Then, there are guidelines for the rapporteurs. Appointment of rapporteurs and associate rapporteurs, so the process that we followed, that I mentioned already. Then there's the conduct of rapporteur group meetings. And this is how rapporteurs are responsible to build consensus and identify that consensus in the meetings and how they are responsible for the agenda and so on.

Then also the IPR inquiry, and so, again, how the rapporteurs are responsible and how I as Study Group Chairman, am responsible for making such a query when we go for a consent or approval of documents.

And then there is the guideline on the work programme and how we fill out the work programme. And so, those are provided in Annexes 4, 5, 6, and 7.

Then we have the Liaison Rapporteur Guidelines. And so, what the liaison rapporteur is responsible for, which the highlight is providing a report to Study Group 15 at every plenary on the activities of the body that they're liaison rapporteur for, but also in facilitating discussions or details between the two organizations. So, that's in Annex 8.

Then we have the Editor and Document Guidelines. And so, this is highlighting editor assignments and responsibilities, reminding everyone that the default is that the rapporteur is the editor for all documents. And if there is a work programme in process, then the rapporteur may decide that too much work for the rapporteur to do, and they would like to assign an individual to assist as the editor. And then, what are the responsibilities of the editor in preparing the document and how they need to prepare the document based on what the question has decided. And then guidance on correspondence activities. Correspondence activities, of course, between meetings. Living lists ‑‑ how we handle living lists. What non‑normative texts are. And then the development lifecycle of our recommendations and our approval and publication process. And so, we, of course, updated the approval process with our new information, assuming this new 33 days for A.8 and what the maximum time that you would have ‑‑ or the minimum time before the next Study Group meeting, and also detailed in the AAP Best Practices. That's in Annexes 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15.

Then we have a set of guidelines on meetings. And so, there's the deadlines for the meetings and what is recommended ‑‑ well, what we have in, of course, A.1 on the deadlines for the plenaries, but also then the deadlines for the interim rapporteur meetings. How we handle remote participation and how we plan between physical and virtual. And so, for example, deciding if a meeting is going to be virtual or if it's going to be physical or if something happens and we need to switch between them. And so, this is our guideline that we created on how we would do that, and that provides us guidance on, you know, how we would make those changes with the collective letter.

And then, finally, when we're meeting all virtual, how do we do that? This is the one that we created during the pandemic on how we were going to do a meeting all virtual, and we did some minor changes to this one based on the process that we found has been working well during the pandemic. So, that's what we have for Meeting Guidelines in Annexes 16, 17, 18, and 19.

And then we have some General Guidelines. And so, this is general guidelines on the scope of the work. And so, the scope of the work that is in Resolution 2 and how that scope applies to the work in Study Group 15 on the various questions. Our process on releasing information on Work in Progress. And so, the work that we have here in progress, of course, is certainly available to the membership, but it's not available to the general public. And so, this is our process of how we would, you know, in liaisons or other external promotion, how we would indicate that.

A description of our lead study group activities and how we handle that. The Promotion and Coordination Group, guidance for what we're doing there with our great work on promoting the activities of Study Group 15, both within ITU and outside ITU, in conferences, webinars, magazine articles, and other activities.

And then, finally, on the selection of approval process. So, generally, all of our recommendations, since we're very much focused here on industry, is that we follow the AAP. But in some cases, if there's a request to move for TAP, which is the traditional approval process, this is the guideline on how we would go through that. So, that, then, is provided in Annexes 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24. So, all these guidelines are also provided on the IFA site at the link that's shown here, as individual documents, and they will be updated as necessary, if necessary, during the study period. Certainly, during the last study period, we created the new one on virtual meetings. And I guess this study period, depending on what either Plenipotentiary or TSAG decides on remote participation and virtual meeting, I guess changes or amendments to Recommendation A.1, we may need to look at that together. So, these are the guidelines here. I guess you can quickly scroll through the full set, therefore, you can review them in detail afterwards. I have summarized the high‑level view.

The management team has reviewed these in detail, and we believe that this is a competent set that we would like to seek your agreement on. So, ladies and gentlemen, are there any questions on the guidelines, the guidance for the work of Study Group 15 in TD39? Seeing none, I'd like to seek your agreement on these guidelines for Study Group 15. Thank you. Those are so agreed.

So, we've got a few minutes before coffee break, so maybe we can show the proposed liaisons to TSAG then. So, we'll start with the one in TD37 of plenary. And so, this is on Recommendation A.8. So, this is proposed liaison to TSAG. So, this one and the next one are both proposed. I'd like to seek your comments here. If there are any comments that we have, we will review those in the Promotion and Coordination Group meeting. And the intention is to seek your agreement to send these as liaisons to TSAG at our closing plenary.

So, the first one, let me just highlight in this proposed liaison. This is the update I'm highlighting here in yellow, what the change in Recommendation A.8 is, and that is that this documentation ‑‑ which is the compilation of last call comments, or at least that's what we think the documentation is, because it just says "the documentation" ‑‑ should be published 12 days prior to the Director's call, with the table in Annex A ‑‑ and that table is that last set of comments, the compilation of comments ‑‑ indicating all comments not agreed in the consultation with those entities who made those comments.

So, this change indicates that, as I said before, that it needs to be posted 12 days before the Director's call and not 12 days before the Study Group meeting, which is what the previous implication was. And that, therefore, changes the amount of time to 33 days. And so, if you'll scroll down, Hiroshi, I have two examples here, using the previous A.8. If we were going to have a last additional review before this Study Group 15 meeting with the previous A.8, we could start an AR on August 1st with a comment deadline on the 21st of August. And then the TD for approval would be posted on September 6th, which is the same as the contribution deadline. So, that is ‑‑ so, August 1st would have been when we could have done it with the last one. But with the new A.8, the deadline moves back. And so, we would have to start AR two weeks previous on July 16th in order to make that 12‑day posting before the deadline, which is then 12 days before the deadline, so 33 days in total before the start of the meeting. So, as a result, the point is, is that the new A.8 requires us to start that AR, one AAP cycle earlier, which is two weeks earlier. So, that's the thing that we noticed.

So, if you scroll, keep scrolling, Hiroshi. What we have asked them is to clarify. So, our view is that there was an intention to formalize the documentation and ensure it was available, because the feedback from some members was that not all AAPs were making the documentation available. They would just go for additional review, and the members were like, well, but where is the list of comments? Where is the document? We can't find it because it's on the Study Group's web page. Some study groups use SharePoint, some use the FTP, some of it's in FTD. So, members were having difficulty finding it. So, this clarifies that it's all going to be available in the AAP system of where the comment resolution and where the document for AR are. So that's clear. But it's not clear, what is the documentation that needs to be made available, in addition to the table, the comment resolution table. So, that's something that we would like to clarify, if both the intention was to extend the period, if that was the intent, because we don't think that was the intent. We thought the intent was just that you want the documentation formalized. And then, what is the documentation? So, that's the request that we have. So, are there any comments, ladies and gentlemen, on this proposed liaison to TSAG? I'll let you think about it. I see there's no requests for the floor now, but if you think of something, we can bring it up, as I said, during the Promotion and Coordination meeting, or certainly talk to me offline any time during the next two weeks.

So, let's move to the next one. We'll fit one more in before coffee break, which is the second proposed liaison to TSAG, which is in TD89. And so, this one is on the guidelines on e‑meetings. And so, what we want to do with this one is to make TSAG aware that we have several guidelines. They're already aware ‑‑ previous Study Group 15 chairmen have indicated that we have guidelines in Study Group 15, but we've never ‑‑ at least not that I'm aware of ‑‑ made Study Group 15 ‑‑ I mean, made TSAG aware of what they were.

In this particular case, since there is that TSAG ad hoc group working on the governance and management of e‑meetings, we think it's valuable to send them what our guidelines are. And so, in relation to e‑meetings. And so, what we are doing here is that we're indicating that we have had guidelines in Study Group 15 for multiple study periods and that the ones that are of relevance to the work on e‑meetings are these three: One on remote participation; the planning between physical and virtual meetings; and virtual meeting procedures. And so, we've attached these for the benefit and consideration of TSAG.

But then, we go into the specifics on the TSAG ad hoc group on governance and management of e‑meetings, knowing that they've been meeting, that they are looking to propose rules, which is an amendment to Recommendation A.1 that would be more prescriptive on the study groups than what we're doing right now with our guidelines.

We indicate that what we have done ‑‑ what I have done on behalf of Study Group 15 ‑‑ is present our virtual meeting guidelines to this ad hoc group, and that it has been some aspects of it have been included in their draft amendment to Recommendation A.1, but none of our justification or rationale on why we are doing this that we have in our guidelines are included.

And so, I've noted here some of the strict rules that are added. One of the rules is that virtual meetings can only be scheduled between noon and 1500 Geneva time, and that's the only time that are allowed during the day. Keep scrolling here.

In our guidelines, we have ‑‑ this is a recommendation. It's suggested core hours is what we have. In addition, it is, you know, requiring ten‑minute breaks every hour, mandating no weekend meetings, and of course, and requiring the Chair be physically present at a physical meeting.

The latter is typical practice in any case, but this is making that explicit.

So, the current understanding is that the Chair is going to be restructuring the document for the TSAG meeting, but that's, of course, not available yet, since Plenipot is continuing to discuss this. But the point is that from our perspective, we'd like to support the diversity of the way the different study groups apply the direction. And so, we think, perhaps, this goes a little bit too far.

The final point is to note that we're aware that the Plenipotentiary Conference is going to be discussing this, as I had mentioned before, in the context of the Plenipot Resolution 167. And so, that will be discussed. And so, we need to wait for that to happen. But that will have happened by the time TSAG meets.

So, what I'm proposing here that we make three points towards TSAG, noting that we would not like them to change the working methods of Study Group 15, which we have in our guidelines. And noting that it would be premature to make such changes as that these changes are under way currently in the Plenipot, in TSAG, likely in Council, and I would suspect that this is going to take a long time to discuss because it's going to affect the ITU's General Rules. And that's likely going to take until the next WTSA to sort that out.

The second point is that establishing guidelines for application by all study groups does not capture the differences in working methods and deliverables for the different study groups. So, some study groups, like Study Group 2, are very focused on Member State consultations through TAP, and so all of their recommendations are through the traditional approval procedure, and they have regulatory implications. Whereas, in Study Group 15, the vast majority of our recommendations are technical, and as a result, we use AAP. And so, it's premature to change A.1 without the benefit of clear direction from participating member states and sector members on decisions that would come out of Plenipot or Council.

And then, finally, that the working methods of all groups within ITU‑T should be based on principles of efficiency and mragmatism and that the methods, the guidelines I have just mentioned again in Study Group 15 have stood the test of time and that have been in place for multiple study periods and have been proven to work over the pandemic, and as a result, we'd like to see those unchanged for our work in Study Group 15. And so, that's what I would propose in this. I think that's the end, Hiroshi? That's what I would propose for this liaison, and I have the Annexes 1, 2, 3, of the guidelines that we had just agreed.

So, ladies and gentlemen, do you have any comments on this proposed liaison to TSAG? Again, if you do have any comment, please come and see me, and we will look at them briefly to see if there's any further comment in the Promotion and Coordination meeting next week, just to confirm, and we'll look to approve these as liaisons to TSAG at the closing plenary. Thank you! I went a little bit into our break time, but we'll continue. We'll take a break now until quarter past the hour, and we'll resume at that point with Agenda Item 7. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

>> GLENN PARSONS: Let's continue our discussions, ladies and gentlemen, with the remainder of the agenda that we'll start with shortly. But before we do that, I just want to highlight for everyone that we are having captioning for this meeting, and the captioning is available, if you go to our Study Group 15 web page ‑‑ and of course, there's a new link ‑‑ there's a new study period, so you'll find that. There is a link for captioning for this meeting at the very top here, and if you see, Hiroshi will show us where ‑‑ see it's the third one down under "Meeting in Focus," and there is captioning. And if you click that link, that will bring up the captioning for our meeting. And you can see the captioning progressing here.

So, let's continue then with Agenda Item 7 on our agenda. So, Hiroshi will close this and move us back to the agenda. So, if we could just bring our agenda back here, Hiroshi. So, now we're on Agenda Item 7. So, this is Feedback and Status Reports on interregnum activity since our last Study Group 15 plenary.

So, first of all, with 7.1, we will review the meeting reports from the eighth Study Group 15 meeting of the last study period, and we will look to approve these. So, these are in R32, R 33, R 34, and R35. So, R32 is the report of the Study Group. And then R33 is the report of Working Party 1. R34 is the report of Working Party 2, and R35 is the report of Working Party 3. So, this is from our December 2021 e‑meeting. So, these are the reports that we reviewed and have been available since January 31st of this year. Are there any comments on any of these reports, ladies and gentlemen? I would like to seek your approval for these reports. Are there any comments or objection? These reports are so approved. Thank you.

So, next, let's move to 7.2. This is the interregnum activities and matters of interest to the plenary. So, what we're showing here in TD41 of plenary is the interim, interregnum activities that happened since December. And so, we'll scroll down here and just note, the Working Party 1 has had a number of e‑meetings, and the reports are available, as indicated. Working Party 2, again, has had a few e‑meetings, with the reports as indicated. And Working Party 3 has had a number of e‑meetings with their reports available, as indicated.

There have also been some correspondence activities. Correspondence activities were taken out in Working Party 2 on a number of topics that you see here with the reports so indicated. And Working Party 3, as well, has had correspondence on a number of issues with their reports, so indicated in the TDs. So, this is for your information, ladies and gentlemen. Are there any comments or questions on this list of interregnum activities, both the e‑meetings and the correspondence activities?

Okay. Next, we have Agenda Item 7.3. This is the ‑‑ (no audio)

(No audio)

 (No audio)

>> GLENN PARSONS: Okay, this is TD44 of plenary, which is the status of texts that have been under AAP since December of last year. And so, effectively, all of the ones that we have prepared have been approved. And so, these are the ones that have been approved by AAP and the approval dates showing here. So, Hiroshi, if you can just scroll through all the documents here, then we will see the documents and their approval dates. And so, there are none outstanding that we need to review here. So, are there any comments on this document, ladies and gentlemen? If not, let's move on.

The next is the objectives for this meeting. This is back in TD1. This is the annex of TD1. And so, as we have done already, there is many objectives that we need to complete for this meeting. We just reviewed the interregnum activities. We're reviewing the WTSA‑20 outcomes and our mandate establishing the structure and leadership and appointments, providing guidance for the work, progressing our lead study group issues. Many of these we've done already.

Then we're preparing texts of recommendations for approval, determination, or consent, or agreement, as appropriate. And then we will review if there's any documents for agreement and deletion of existing ones, liaisons from and to other groups that we will review. We will plan interim activities, review and update the work programme and review our involvement in future workshops, external events, and promotion activities. And so, those are the objectives that we have set for this plenary meeting of Study Group 15. Are there any comments on these objectives, ladies and gentlemen? Okay, seeing none, let's move on, then, to the time plan for this meeting.

So, this is in TD26 of General. So, Hiroshi will show this. And this is updated from the collective letter, and there are a few changes here. Maybe, Hiroshi, do you have a mic working over there? Maybe you can highlight the additional changes that are here.

>> HIROSHI OTA: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes. This TD shows the update from the collective letter and the changes are shown with revision marks. And as you see on the first page, there are some additional sessions. On the lunch break today from 1:00 to 2:00, there is a newcomers session in ITU. I think it's C1 or C2. So, please, check the screen for the room. Even if you're not newcomers, you are welcome to join the session, if you are interested.

And there's another one, is the tutorial session on SharePoint. And this is mainly for rapporteurs who manage rapporteur‑level discussion, but this is also useful for everyone, so everyone is welcome. Under this tutorial session will take place next Monday during the lunch break and the place will be displayed on the screen. So, the SharePoint tutorial session will happen next Monday, 26 September, 1:00 to 2:00.

And for this meeting, we will have a networking reception in cafeteria on 22nd of September, Thursday this week in the cafeteria. And this is kindly sponsored by Ericsson.

And in the timetable, there's only one change. The joint meeting J between Question 5 and 6 was canceled. Using this time slot, Question 5 and 6 will meet individually. These are the changes.

And the further update will be shown in the revision of this TD to be posted as necessary. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> GLENN PARSONS: Thank you very much, Hiroshi, for the update, indication of the changes on our time plan for Study Group 15. Are there any comments or questions on our time plan, ladies and gentlemen?

I guess one thing, I guess, to note is that we'll be split between meetings here in the CICG as well as in the ITU building, and you will need to look at the daily meeting schedule to identify where your working party or question meetings will be. Okay?

So, let's continue, then, with Agenda Item 10 on meeting facilities and logistics. And so, perhaps I'll ask Hiroshi again to provide us some background on the logistics for this meeting in TD45 of plenary.

>> HIROSHI OTA: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, this TD45 explains some logistics for meetings. This is the regular document for opening plenary for each meeting. So, I guess many of you are familiar with this document, but there are some changes. The first, section 1 explains how contribution on TD's organized using TD/PLEN, TD/Gen, and TD Working Parties. And the documentation is explained, and I would like to emphasize that for TDs, you can simply submit by sending your draft prepared TD by email to TSB. And the email address is tsbsg15@itu.int. And this address doesn't look human, but this address is safer than sending your email to myself. And both of us are watching this TSB SG15 mailbox all the time, so the risk to be overlooked is much lower if you send your email to tsbsg15. So, please make sure. It is fine that you put CC to myself or eManuele just to make sure, but please make sure you include this tsbsg15 when you send your TD or any document to be posted.

When you submit a TD, you need to obtain TD numbers beforehand. You can just send us your TD, then we assign the TD numbers and post. And of course, if you need your TD numbers beforehand, you can reserve it, but ‑‑ for example, if you want to reference from other document, this might be useful. But if you don't need to know the TD numbers beforehand, then you don't need to reserve it beforehand.

And also, please note that there is a new template for TDs, which is basic template. The new template is a bit simplified, removing the field purpose and key words. So it's simpler to use the new template. And this also says some work in TSB as well.

Meeting facilities. This is a physical meeting after two years, so a little bit not familiar, or maybe you need to remind, remember, how was that before COVID? But this is a physical meeting with remote participation. So, the meeting rooms are displayed on the screen and MyMeetings is also shown on the MyMeetings platform site. And all the sessions will be now with remote participation, so you can participate remotely for any sessions during these two weeks. And there are some details of MyMeetings, remote participation is explained in Section 2.2. And you can see how it works and how you can ‑‑ it shows how you can find your session. And you can also join a test session to see how each function works.

Section 2.4 explains some details for rapporteurs who are chairmen, who needs to handle the screen sharing sitting on the podium. This is something that our chairman, or myself, is doing now. So, please see under TSB's colleagues on the information technology, which is called EWM, electronic working method team, will help you, especially in the start of the session, to make sure that the remote participation and also meeting in the room runs smoothly.

And mailing lists on FTP site. There is no change, but we switched to the mailing list on FTP directory for this study period, which is 2022‑2024. So, please, make sure that you use the new one. Okay. I found my mistake. This should be 2022 instead of 2017. So, it might be a problem, but please make sure that you use the new one.

In terms of the mailing list, all of the existing subscribers in the previous study period were migrated automatically to the new one, so you don't have to subscribe again if you are already on the mailing list.

And then, other tools I explained. Section 4, for guidance in case of COVID‑19 infection. So, if you don't feel well, then don't hesitate to contact TSB or doctor in ITU directory. There is a doctor in Varembe Building, Room V16. The other end against the cafeteria. So, the opposite side of the cafeteria, there is a room of the medical service. So, feel free to contact, if you feel any necessity.

And there are some guidelines explaining how you can behave if you feel infected or if you are actually infected.

Then some additional information is explained in annexes. Thank you.

And also, for this week, our meeting rooms are split in CICG and ITU. So, for example, Rooms C1, or other rooms, if you are familiar with, it's fine. It's in ITU. And if the room is simply indicated by numbers, like 10, 11, 12, like that, it's in CICG, either the first floor, one up, upstairs, or in the minus one level, basement. So, please check your room, and also make sure you go to the correct building, either ITU or CICG. And this applies only for this week. And then next week, all the meeting rooms will be in ITU. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> GLENN PARSONS: Thank you very much, Hiroshi. Are there any comments or questions on the TD45 that Hiroshi has presented? Okay. So, Hiroshi, I would ‑‑ so, if you go back, there were some mistakes that you made with the note with the links for the previous study period, right? And you've indicated the previous‑previous study period. So, I think it would be appropriate to update these links and provide a revision of TD45, so to provide the correct 2022 here, and as well, you can delete the "will be set up shortly for guidelines" because it's set up and the documents are there.

And then, if we scroll down a little bit before, a little bit down, you say the IFA area from the previous study period ‑‑ that's the wrong previous study period. At the beginning ‑‑ let's see, the old IFA. That's the previous‑previous. That should be '17‑'22. So, if you could make those minor editorial changes, Hiroshi, and provide an update in R.1. That would be beneficial for the membership. Okay. Thank you.

So, given that, let's move on, then, to Agenda Item 11, which is TD46 of plenary. So, this is the document allocation for this meeting. And so, the list of all the contributions and TDs, I'm sure that you're aware of, can be found at these links. I'm sure many of you are reviewing them already.

And then, we have the document allocation for each question. So, there are a number that are assigned to all questions that you see at the beginning, and then with contributions, and we reviewed Contribution 1 here in Study Group 15 in the opening plenary, and there are a number of Gen and Plen documents for all as well.

And then you see the individual allocations of questions based on the indication in the contributions. So, this document is generated based on what the contributions and the documents indicate they're going towards, and so, this is provided for your information. And if necessary, we can update it, if there are any misallocations. So, I would ask the Working Party Chairs and the Rapporteurs to confirm that this allocation is correct, and if there are any changes to be made, then please let Hiroshi know so that he can update the information regarding either the contribution or the TD in the Document Management System.

So, are there any comments or questions, ladies and gentlemen, on the allocation of documents? Okay. I see none, so let's proceed.

So, the next agenda item is Agenda Item 12. So, this is miscellaneous topics. So, the first one that I want to bring your attention to, that I alluded to at the beginning, is the new building project. And so, this is in TD46 of Gen. So, I'll wait for Hiroshi to bring up TD46.

Okay, so, if we scroll down to the background here, what is going to be happening, as many of you know, or maybe you don't know ‑‑ I'll let you know now ‑‑ that ITU will be demolishing the Varembe building, which is the building out here, shortest of the buildings, in a project beginning next year. The intention is that a new building will be built to replace it, and this is based on a competition that was held on the design of that that concluded back before the pandemic, in 2018. And there's all kinds of details on the design and the background and the planning for that at the ITU's new HQ building website.

But the relevant point here is that the intention is that ITU will not be able to hold any meetings, because the entire complex will be closed for hosting meetings until the new building is completed, which is currently scheduled for January of 2027. So, as a result, for the next five years, the responsibility to find hosts for in‑person hosting of Study Group meetings falls to the management teams. And for Study Group 15, we are hoping to leverage CICG, which is where we currently are, for our next meetings, except this is a popular venue, and it is booked for the times, or even around the times, when we would normally meet in our nine‑month cadence. So, as a result, we're looking for hosts for Study Group 15 plenaries.

And so, just to give you an idea of what the Study Group 15 plenaries are, what we're proposing ‑‑ of course, this is the first plenary of the new study period, and we're only going to have a maximum of four plenaries during this study period, if we follow our four‑month cadence. We had originally, when we had started, proposed specific dates within these periods at nine‑month cadences that were not overlapping with what we understood to be, you know, existing meetings, that we don't want to overlap with. However, right now, we're at a situation where we don't have any hosts for these, so we're a little bit more flexible in when the dates could be for the second, third, or fourth plenary of Study Group 15.

The study period will end with WTSA‑24, which will be in October of 2024. So, our last meeting has to be at least one month ‑‑ it has to end at least one month before WTSA starts. So, that's a little bit of the background.

Now, let me just highlight some of the rules of hosting meetings at ITU. And so, it's relevant to note some of these constraints and that these are described in WTSA Resolution 1, Plenipot Resolution 5, Council Decision 304, and in our ITU‑T Recommendation A.1. And so, I have pulled out the relevant text from all of these to give you an understanding of what those rules are.

So, the first one from Plenipot Resolution 5 basically indicates that the host is the host government and that they need to provide at least adequate premises, free of charge. The only exception in that case, where it's not free of charge, is in the developing country case.

Next, we have from WTSA, their Resolution 1. If you scroll down a bit, Hiroshi. That recognizes the provisions of Resolution 5 that I just mentioned, but also, Decision 304, which I'll mention in a minute, noting that the agreement shall also be accompanied by an agreement that the host will defray the costs, additional cost, to hold a meeting outside of Geneva.

Then, Council Decision 304 is focused on who can attend. And in this particular case, it indicates that the host government, and in this case, the host government ‑‑ so, whether the host is a sector member, then their government needs to ensure that all of the delegates from the meeting can obtain visas and enter the country where the meeting is being hosted.

Then we have in Recommendation A.1, noting that there should not be any charge for meetings when meetings are held outside, unless there is an agreement in advance by the Study Group, and meeting charges should be an exceptional case only. If the Study Group is of the opinion that a meeting charge is necessary for the work to proceed properly.

So, in summary here, what these rules indicate for us is that, generally, the host bears all meeting costs, and there can be no meeting fee for a Study Group 15 meeting that is held outside of Geneva, unless the Study Group agrees that there can be a meeting fee for the host.

The second point is that TSB travel expenses. So, it doesn't indicate what the additional expenses are. Traditionally ‑‑ or in the past ‑‑ as I had mentioned before in my first Study Group meeting, when I had my stack of papers in front of me ‑‑ those stack of papers had to be printed. And so, the host would be responsible for the printing costs and the distribution of those papers. That's not the case anymore.

And so, also, it's tradition that TSB would attend the meeting in person because it's just an in‑person meeting. But maybe if we have an in‑person meeting with remote participation, TSB could participate remotely. So, if we had a venue in Geneva, where we were hosted in Geneva, perhaps in a hotel or at a different conference center, there would also be no charge for TSB travel, because it's in the same city.

And the third point is that the ‑‑ it's the host government ‑‑ if it's a government hosting ‑‑ or the sector member ‑‑ so, the hosts government, needs to provide an assurance that they will offer visas and that the free‑of‑charge option will be upheld, unless there is, again, that study group exception. So, that's the summary of the rules that would apply for hosting.

So, then, what I want to present to you are some options of what we could look for in Study Group 15. So, typically, Study Group 15 has a two‑week plenary. And for all questions and Working Parties, and that we are following this nine‑month cadence. And from a management team perspective, our view is that the in‑person meetings are critical to the progress of the work of Study Group 15. We've managed to continue the work during the pandemic. Certainly, groups that already have that level of trust amongst them and working on work or ‑‑ you know, if they're existing, they have already met before, perhaps that can work okay. But if you a new topic, a new work item that's trying to be proposed, or if you have new members, new participants who have never met anyone before, very difficult for them to build consensus around their new work proposal. So, as a result, we believe it's very critical to have these in‑person meetings.

And as a result, we'd like to be flexible on what's the actual layout of the meeting. So, we know what we traditionally do, but we could do some other things, depending on what the hosts could provide. So, but the first thing that we think we should do is that exception that I just noted, is we think that we should ‑‑ Hiroshi, if you scroll up to the italicized text. I think we agreed that in the plenary we should have an exception, so recognizing the exceptional closing of the ITU Headquarters buildings for meeting hosting until 2027, and the fact that Study Group 15 is the largest ITU‑T Study Group in both attendance and our requirements for simultaneous meeting rooms, that Study Group 15 resolves to allow hosts to charge participants meeting fees. So, that's kind of what I'm ‑‑ suggest some text like that I would like to bring forward to the closing plenary to seek your agreement on that.

But now, the second thing is, well, what could we do for hosting? What sort of arrangements could we have? And so, here are three examples of different plenary meeting configurations that we could entertain. But there are different ones available as well that we could also do. So, the current arrangement that we have is we have ten days of meetings. And of course, there could be 12 days of meetings, if we have, you know, ad hoc meetings on the weekend in between. And then seven days of question meetings with up to 11 simultaneous meetings, so that will be 11 different rooms that you'd need to have. And then three days of plenary meetings. So one day at the beginning, two at the end, with up to three simultaneous meetings. So, that's our current arrangement. And so, that's, of course, the preference, is that we keep the current arrangement. However, if that's too much of a burden, then we could look towards a one‑week hybrid arrangement. And so, in this case, we would split it between an in‑person arrangement, which would be just the questions. So, all the questions would meet together for just one week. So, five days of question meetings, instead of seven. And we would still have the plenary meetings, but they would be in the week before. So, we'd have the opening plenary virtually the week before, opening Working Parties virtually on the Friday before, and then on the Monday and Tuesday afterwards, we would have the closing working party and the closing study group plenary afterwards. So, that's hosting up to 11 simultaneous meetings in the same location in person.

Now, a variation of that is, in Option 3 here, is instead to group those five days of meetings by Working Parties. And so, in this case, instead of having one host, we could have three hosts, and one host per working party that hosts each of the Working Parties' set of questions in a certain location and have that virtual opening plenary and virtual closing plenary at the end. So, again, looking at flexible options so that we can have the majority of the work in person for the group and looking to make it easier for hosts to be able to offer.

Of course, we'd like a host to be able to offer our current arrangement, but I've been indicating this, you know, since I was appointed in March, and we have no offers to host yet. And so, this is why I want to present to you here and focus on that we can be flexible with the hosts. Okay.

So, then, next, the third thing is that we can meet more often for fewer days. And so, what that means is that our current cadence is nine months. We could change our cadence to every four months and meet shorter. So, I have here this example where it's five days of meetings and we meet outside. We could squeeze everything with an opening and closing into five days and just have more plenaries so we can progress the work that way. So, that's the proposal, the third option of flexibility.

So, for next steps, I want to invite all of the members to consider hosting a Study Group 15 meeting and to explore this with ‑‑ and so, the sector members ‑‑ I'm looking to all the sector members who are here to consider hosting a future Study Group 15 meeting and to explore whether your member, your administration, your country, would support that, because you will need support from your country, according to the rules. So, it can't ‑‑ so, in addition to a sector member hosting, you need your country to indicate than they will support the visas for hosting.

And so, if you can scroll down, Hiroshi, to the end here. The point I want to make at the end before I open it for questions is that if no hosts can be found, we will continue the default arrangement, which we've been doing throughout the pandemic, which is a two‑week meeting on our nine‑month cadence in a virtual format. And so, that's what we will do if we have no host options.

And so, as I had mentioned before, the management team believes that this lack of interaction that we'll have will be very detrimental to the progressive work, if we have to continue or go back to this in‑person plenaries. So, I would encourage everyone ‑‑ and I'll talk with many of you offline, and I encourage you to come talk to me offline about the potential of hosting a plenary. And so, I think that we have made it flexible enough that it's not that much more of a burden than hosting rapporteur group meetings. So, with that, I'll open up the floor for any discussion. So, are there any comments or questions, ladies and gentlemen?

I see one question right here, Mr. Abbas, please.

>> Abbas: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just the comment on the proposal of having hybrid and multicity. I see this arrangement, if we proceed with it, it means all the joint meetings with which we have between questions from different Working Parties will not be able to do, and we lose that because we, you know, especially like working party 3 and Working Party 2. There is a few joint meetings between them, and that would be, you know, quite a loss, and we noticed that during the Corona pandemic. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

>> GLENN PARSONS: Thank you very much for that comment. And yes, that is one down side of this third multicity option. But we wanted to put it on the table so that we at least get an opportunity to ‑‑ if that's the only option that hosts can provide, then we'll go for that. But the preference is for our current arrangement. So, if you just scroll back up to the three options, Hiroshi, 1, 2, and 3. Our preference is for the first one. The second preference is for, you know, all of the questions together, so that will enable, as you mentioned, that interworking party joint meetings and the ability to do that. And the third preference that is this multicity, that at least we're meeting in person by working party, but we don't get that opportunity for cross‑working party interaction. So, thank you.

Are there any other comments or questions? Ladies and gentlemen. Over here. Yes, please.

>> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, one additional, at least, piece of information that would be nice to have under, let's say the number 1. So, for the 8 to 11 simultaneous meetings, how big of a room slot do you have to have per meeting venue, whether it's 30, 40, because that will go into the planning for the sizing of the rooms? So, if we get statistics, or at least some information, that would be helpful as well. Thank you.

>> GLENN PARSONS: Yes, thank you for that. No, that's a good point. I have that information, but I haven't provided it in this TD, I guess. So, I'm happy to provide that, if you would like to explore it. We can provide that. Or we could ‑‑ I could add that information to this TD. Maybe that might be better, so that everybody gets to see it. So, I'll take that action with Hiroshi, and maybe we could provide the numbers we typically use. For example, for this week, Hiroshi, for the sizing of the meetings that we would use. And so, there's ‑‑ I guess there's the numbers that we use, right? So, for example, for the opening plenary, there is 350 people registered for this opening plenary, of which 220 indicated they were coming in person. Now, okay, not everybody comes to the opening plenary. I understand that, right? I came the first time I came, because, ooh, cool! My first time, I'll come to the opening plenary. But as my attendance went on, yeah, I don't need to go to the opening plenary, perhaps, right? So, there's probably delegates like that, right? So, practically speaking, maybe you don't need the biggest room for the opening plenary because there will be some attrition from that perspective. But as I understand, TSB provisions for the full size, right? So, we'll have those numbers of the full size that we could add, and maybe we'll do a revision to this TD to provide that information, so that's a good comment, so we'll do that. Thank you.

Are there any other comments, questions, or suggestions? Yes, please.

>> Thank you. So, the question is that if you compress the plenary to five days, do you ‑‑ since we also have drafting session sometimes during weekends, so do you think that we should also plan for the room to have, like, some evening session or night session for drafting?

>> GLENN PARSONS: Yeah, so, thank you. So, just to clarify. So, the question meetings are five days. And so, the plenary would be longer. It's eight days because we're having the virtual parts on both ends. So, this is a proposal to make it easier on the host, such that they don't need to provide two weeks of meetings, right? And so, yes, it would be recommended, yes, to have ‑‑ you know, we could have ad hocs in the evening, that time. And if the host can provide for like the weekend before, weekend after, we could do that as well, but it really depends on what the host can offer. And so, what I'm looking to provide here is sort of flexible options so that we can get a host. Once we have a host, then, you know, then we'll discuss, "Well, can you also support ad hoc meetings in the evening? What about through the weekend, could you do that as well? Could you actually do the whole two weeks?" You know. But let's be flexible and get some offers to host first, and then we'll look at the details, because otherwise, we'll just be back to it will be a virtual meeting.

The next question, I think, was back to Mr. Abbas, I think.

>> Mr. Abbas: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a question. What's the floor‑back situation? Is it virtual meeting? To be honest, I don't know why there is not a fourth option, and the fourth option is to have it in Geneva and ITU host it in Geneva in a hotel or in CICG, or is that an option as well? I know it costs money, more money, but maybe if I take your proposal, you know, maybe the ITU run out of budget for these meetings, perhaps should charge maybe attendance fee during that period. Thank you.

>> GLENN PARSONS: Yes. So, thank you. Yes. So, yeah, so the situation with ITU is that they've run out of money, yes. And so, one thing that is going to be discussed at the Plenipotentiary is how the ITU has these mandatory, unfunded expenses. So, what that means is that there is, I don't know, tens of millions of Swiss Francs of mandatory requirements through resolutions that ITU is supposed to do, but there's no money in the budget to handle it. So, there's already that situation. And so, there is certainly no money planned to rent hotel space.

The CICG space is made available through an arrangement with the Geneva Canton, and at a no‑cost arrangement to ITU for the facility. There is cost arrangement for AV and such, right? So, it is low‑cost for ITU to host it here. That has been Plan A for us to do that, but Geneva ‑‑ I mean, the CICG is full. There is one week available next year, which is in September. That's one week available for all of ITU, and ITU hasn't decided yet ‑‑ we've requested, yes, Study Group 15 would like that slot, but they haven't decided which Study Group in ITU‑T, or ITU‑R or ITU‑D they were going to give it to. So, right? So, you know, we're in line for that. So, that's one option. But there's no other options next year. So, if we continue in our nine‑month cadence, there's nothing in CICG, and ITU does not have the budget to host in a hotel. This is going to be a topic of discussion at Plenipotentiary and what ‑‑ because it's not just ITU‑T that has this issue. And so, I expect there is going to be some discussion about this, and there may be other options that come out of Plenipotentiary.

But what I'd like us to prepare, since we've been told, after the Management Team meeting, after WTSA, that the responsibility was on the study groups, the study group chairmen and management team to find new hosts. So, some study groups have decided, some that have already met, have decided they're going to meet virtually for the entire study period. Other study groups have found hosts for all their meetings for the entire study period. So, I'd like us to be in the "we find hosts for our meetings" for the study period, and this is sort of the flexible plan that we're proposing to encourage sector members to make such an offer to host. So, there's three meetings that we're looking to host: One next year and two in '24. So, I hope that answers your question.

Are there any other comments or questions? Yes, Mr. Betts, please.

>> Mr. Betts: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We did have extensive discussion on this in the Management Team meeting. And one thing that Mr. Parsons had mentioned is that, typically, when conferences of this size are planned, they're actually planned two to three years in advance. So, one of the reasons that Option 3 came up is not because we particularly like it, but pragmatically, even if we find a host, it's probably going to be easier to find meeting rooms if we split between Working Parties, particularly for next year.

So, we also need to be planning for the meetings in 2024 as well, because they're already running close to the deadline for when meeting space is available to accommodate such a large group, so please bear that in mind. We have to be pragmatic and remember that the option we have is fully virtual, so, any kind of face‑to‑face is a significant advantage. If people can think of other options, please feel free to share. Thank you.

>> GLENN PARSONS: Yes. Thank you very much for that additional ‑‑ those additional points, Malcolm. Okay, ladies and gentlemen, any other comments or questions? Yes, please.

>> Yeah. Carrying some of these ideas one step further, I'm wondering if it's possible to have a bunch of simultaneously held question‑hosted meetings, and at least they would all be at the same time; they would possibly be easier to find hosts for. Is that worth considering?

>> GLENN PARSONS: So, just let me ‑‑ help me understand your proposal, because the Options 2 and 3 are simultaneous question meetings. Is your proposal simultaneous question meetings, but each question is hosted in a different physical location? So, I have three physical locations in the Option 3 hybrid, so you're, instead, suggesting 13 different locations.

>> There might be logistical advantages. That's exactly what I'm suggesting.

>> GLENN PARSONS: So, yes, I suppose we could consider that as well. That's the least favorite, I would suspect, right? Because then you cannot get even working party interaction, right? But yes, we could consider that as well, but I hope we don't ‑‑ I hope we wouldn't need to go that far, but in any case, yes. All options are on the table. I think from the Management Team, we want to find hosts for our meetings, and the critical one, of course, is our next one, if we're going to keep our nine‑month cadence for next July. Okay, thank you.

Any further discussion, comments, ladies and gentlemen? If not, I will work with Hiroshi and we'll update this TD46 of Gen to provide some specifics on the room sizing that we would have for all of the meetings. And we'll use the TSB numbers that they use, so please note that that would be if everyone shows up in person numbers, okay? Okay, great! So, thank you very much.

So, now we'll move on to the next agenda items. And so, these are just information items. Oh, sorry. Yeah, so, just to remind everyone that the decision that I want to make, or that I suggest that we make, I'd like to do that at the closing. And so, we can discuss the exact wording of that. I had proposed some wording here, but let's take that decision at the closing plenary. And hopefully, at the closing plenary, we may also have an idea of if there are some hosts that are available or that may be willing and so on. So, but it is my intent to ask the study group to approve that discussion so that meeting fees can be charged. And that will defray the costs of the host. So then the real burden on the host is on the logistics of organizing the meeting. And if you're holding it in a hotel, signing the contract with the venue, whether it's a hotel or conference center.

Okay. So, let's then continue. The next thing I want to mention is in 12.2. As Hiroshi already mentioned ‑‑ I'd like to mention it as well ‑‑ I will be hosting ‑‑ or Ericsson will be hosting a networking reception on Thursday in the cafeteria for all of the Study Group participants. And so, everyone is welcome. We will have drinks and refreshments and snacks, light snacks, for everyone. It will be from 6:00 to 7:30. And I look forward to seeing you all there. And it will be a great time to catch up with everyone and have a social interaction between all of us. So, I certainly invite everyone in Study Group 15 to join us for that reception on Thursday evening in the cafeteria. And it will be our last opportunity in that cafeteria, because it's going to be demolished, and we won't see it again.

>> We can get really wild!

>> GLENN PARSONS: So, we could get really wild, apparently, according to Mr. Starr. Okay. So, that's the first thing, I want to invite everyone to that.

The second thing to note, as Hiroshi already indicated, there's a newcomers tutorial that will happen during this lunch break here now. And that's in C1, is that ‑‑ and C2, as indicated. So, that's back over in the ITU Tower basement.

And then, the final thing to note is that there will be a SharePoint ‑‑ not so much a tutorial on SharePoint, but more of a sharing of how one of the questions in working party uses SharePoint to do document management and document building in their workflow. And so, that will be offered next Monday during lunchtime, I believe is the proposal for that. So, I would encourage other rapporteurs to join that tutorial to understand how other rapporteurs are using SharePoint facilitates offered by ITU.

And so, that brings us to the end of the agenda that I wanted to cover during this opening plenary, ladies and gentlemen. We'll be covering the remainder of the agenda at our closing plenary next Friday, on September 30th. And so, is there any other comments or requests for the floor before we close this opening plenary? Hiroshi, please.

>> HIROSHI OTA: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In terms of the CICG opening hours, it opens at 7:00 in the morning and closes at 7:00 in the evening. So, if you meet in CICG, you must leave before 7:00 p.m. each day, so please know that. And otherwise, we will be, you know, charged additional penalties. But you can come as early as 7:00 a.m. each day.

And if you're meeting ITU, there is no restriction. You can stay as long as you need. Thank you.

>> GLENN PARSONS: Okay. Thank you very much, Hiroshi. So, yeah, so the meeting hours are 7:00 to 7:00 within the CICG building. So, late‑night sessions available in ITU, in the facilities that we will benefit from for this meeting. And enjoy them for this meeting because it's the last time we'll have them for this study period.

Okay, so, are there any other comments or questions before we adjourn the opening plenary of Study Group 15 for this study period? I don't see any, so this opening plenary of the Study Group 15 is now adjourned. Thank you very much.

(Session concluded at 12:23 CET)
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