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 >> Good morning. It looks like it's working. I see the three from the designated URL. Thank you very much. Were.

 >> CHAIR: Good morning, everyone. Welcome. I'm honored here to Chair this second meeting, second Closing Plenary of the Study Group 15 meeting here for the 2022‑2024 study period. My name is Glenn Parsons. I'm with Ericsson Canada. I just say this second in‑person meeting of the study period has been even better than our first meeting. We had over 400 Delegates registered for this meeting. I think that's a record of the number of registrations. And we had certainly a larger number of in‑person attendees than we had at our first meeting. And I think we're going to see a large number of new work proposals in A1 templates at this Closing Plenary as well. I feel there is a direct correlation between in‑person attendance and the consensus to start new work. At in‑person meetings where you can have side conversations over a coffee break, over a meal or during a networking reception, this is where we'll real progress towards consensus can be made. And I want to thank all of you who have made the effort to come here in person. I think it was worth your effort and I hope you see the value as well.
 I'm confident that we'll be able to meet in person for Plenaries for the duration of the study period. But I will talk more about that later. First I would like to introduce the head table. Sitting immediately next to me is our new director, TSB director, Seizo Onoe and then I'd like to introduce Study Group 15 Chairs and Vice‑Chairs. Next to him is Mr. Malcolm Betts from Zed TE, our Working Party 3 Chairman. Next to him is Mr. Sudipta Bhaumik from Sterlite in India, Vice‑Chair and Working Party 2 Vice‑Chair as well. Next to him is ‑‑
 (Laughter).

 >> CHAIR: Mr. Paul Dolan, Working Party 2 Vice‑Chair. And then starting on the right we have Mr. Tasik Chung from ETRI in Korea, Study Group 15 Vice‑Chair. We have then Mr. Fati Zhang from China. And then we have Mr. Tom Starr representing Huawei Working Party 1 Chairman. And then we have Study Group 15 counselor Hiroshi Ota. Thank you all. Now I would like to welcome our new director of the telecommunications Standardization Bureau to bring you some greetings. For those of you who don't realize before his election as a TSB director at the Plenipotentiary last fall he completed over a 30 year career with the Japanese operator NTT. Welcome and I invite you to address the Plenary.

 >> SEIZO ONOE: Thank you for your kind introduction. Gratings, person. Distinguished Colleagues and friends, it is my great pleasure to congratulate you for yet another successful meeting of SG15. I'd like to take this opportunity to thank you for your service to the ICT industry. SG15 is a well renowned center of excellence. It is a source of great proud to ITU. This group is consistent in delivering the impact for standards. And that results from your expertise, very hard work, and strong spirit of collaboration. I thank you very much for my ability to say that.
 And this meeting has welcomed 252 Delegates in Geneva and another 134 online.
 This compares to 164 Delegates in Geneva and 195 online at your September meeting.
 The increasing Geneva participation is very encouraging. I recognize that SG15 management team has made a great effort to promote this meeting in person.
 And I applaud you for the success that you are achieving in this endeavor.
 I'd like to applaud SG15 for how you are promoting your work at conference workshops and exhibitions highlighting standardizing tools available as well as opportunities to contribute to your work. This promotion benefits standards, developers, and implementers alike.
 My priority as director is to ensure that ITU attracts leading experts and promotes the adoption of new technologies and relevant standards in every region of the world. I would take every opportunity to improve our services to you, and I highly appreciate your support.
 I'm very much looking forward to our work together to ensure that ITU‑T remains efficient, effective and focused on global impact. Thank you. And I wish you a most successful Closing Plenary and a safe trip home. Thank you.
 (Applause.)

 >> CHAIR: And thank you very much, thank you very much for your kind words of welcome and recognition of Study Group 15 and our impact on industry and our continued goal to attract more industry here is what we feel is very relevant recommendations for the industry.
 We look forward to your leadership on TSB and the success of Study Group 15 would not be possible without the fantastic support that we have from TSB. So thank you very much.

 >> Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So Ladies and Gentlemen, as you may realize already there is no interpretation for this Plenary. However, there is captioning. You can see the captioning here on the screen. The captioning link is also available if you'd like to have it on your laptops direct from the Study Group 15 Web page. So you can find that information there. And Hiroshi is going to show you where the link is.
 Right there. Captioning streaming right there.
 So we'll continue with our agenda for today. The agenda is in TD112 of Plenary that we're showing here right now. The agenda shows the remaining items. So item No. 12 is the reports from the Working Parties. And this ‑‑ and I've added a table in here with the so‑called big five reports that we'll go through from each of the Working Parties and they're hyperlinked with links that I hope work. This should be posted. This is the agenda in No. 12. And so all of the subitems under No. 12, if you scroll down, Hiroshi, is ‑‑ will be covered in all of these reports as well as 13 and 14.
 Then we have some additional items in item 17 with the reports on Study Group 15 liaison, promotion and coordination group and other roles where we'll hear the promotion and coordination report as well as the electronic working methods report. And appoint a new liaison Rapporteur beyond the ones that we appointed at the Opening Plenary.
 So ‑‑ and then we'll have a look at our future activities with future Plenaries and hosting opportunities that I'll mention there. And then finally, we'll review the draft report for this Plenary meeting.
 So that is the proposed agenda, Ladies and Gentlemen. Does anyone have any comments on this? If not, can we agree this agenda?
 Okay. Thank you very much. That's agreed. Okay. So then we'll proceed to the reports of the Working Parties. So as Hiroshi noted there's a Revision 1 for one of the reports for Working Party 2. But we'll come to that later. We'll start with Working Party 1 and we'll start with the main report there.
 And so I'd invite Tom to lead us through the remaining report of Working Party 1.

 >> WORKING PARTY 1: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So Working Party 1 had a very productive meeting. Question 1 met for one day updating the Web based ANT standards overview and work plan documents. And the Web based HNT standards overview and work plan was revised. The list of the certification and interoperability activities for Working Party 1 recommendations was updated. In Question 2, met for three days. Working on passive optical networks. Preparing five texts for consent and agreeing to start work on supplements addressing pawn security and operational aspects of PON. Question 2 is joining the joint correspondence activity. Question 3 met for four days working on G.HN and G991 enhancements for visible light communications.
 A new project for G point to point fiber indoors was started. Four draft recommendations were prepared for consent. Two for approval. One under AAP and one under TAP. Yeah, I'll get that. Thank you. And one also recommendation for determination.
 Hiroshi kindly reminds me that G.FIN has now been assigned the number G.9940. And also the subsequent few numbers are associated with that.
 So we can have the G.9940 series numbers assigned. Question 4 met for one day producing a corrigenda for G.9701 and G.9711. That concludes the Working Party 1 report. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Are there any comments on the report from Working Party 1? I'm not hearing any. Then we can accept that report.
 To that I invite Mr. Starr to continue with the next document for text approval, determination, consent and agreement.

 >> WORKING PARTY 1: All right. Ready? Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So we find in TD PLEN132 the section for approval and consent and review. Starting with the text for approval on G9901 amendment 1. And under TAP approval and then AAP approval we have the G.9962. I'd like to note on the G9962 that it was originally consented as in amendment 2. But at this meeting Question 3 has requested that this actually be approved as a revision to G.9962. And then you have following the other texts I guess you'll take these one at a time.

 >> CHAIR: Yeah. You can introduce them all.

 >> WORKING PARTY 1: Okay fine. We have the G.9964 revised and then 11 texts for consent. Then moving on for agreement, we have nothing. And for review, the three, you know, standards overviews and work plans. That was prepared in Question 1. That introduces our text. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Before we proceed to the approval of these, we need to make note of the patent policy. So recommendation A1 notes that ITU has a common patent policy with ISO and IEC and patent statement and licensing recommendation that are relevant to recommendations for decisions. And ITU‑T patent statement database on the ITU website. For this Closing Plenary as Chair I'll make the following query on IPR before we go through any approvals here. Does anyone have any knowledge of patents or software copyrights that use of which may be required to implement the recommendations being considered which have not already been recorded in the IPR database? I don't see anyone requesting the floor. And in addition I'll confirm that TSB ‑‑ with TSB patent licensing have been received that would prevent any proposals being recommended.

 >> HIROSHI OTA: Thank you. TSB hasn't received any Declaration which would prevent approval of any of the candidate drafts. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. Then let's proceed then with the approvals within Working Party 1.
 So the first one is for a TAP approval of G.9901 amendment 1. This was determined in report 5 and the review from the Member States, the membership consultation is in TD172 of PLEN. Are there any comments on this? Can we take this for approval? It is approved.
 Next is G.9962. This is a revision that was noted as in TD115 R1 from Plenary. And this is for consent. Oh, this is for approval because it was consented the last time and brought back to this Plenary. Yes, of course. This is now for approval. Any discussion on this recommendation for approval? Okay. It is approved.
 Next we have recommendations for determination. So this is for G.9964. A revision with the document text in TD162 of Plenary. Is there any discussion on this? Okay. It is determined.
 And so then we now have a set of recommendations for consent. The first one is G.9802.2, a new recommendation with text in TD167 R3 of Plenary. Any discussion on this? Not seeing any. It's approved for consent.
 The G.987.2 amendment 1 with the text in TD161 of Plenary. Any comments on this one? It's consented. The next one is G9805 amendment 1. The text is in TD166 R1 of Plenary. Discussion here? This is consented.
 The next document is G.9806 amendment 3, the text is in TD153 R2. And the A5 for references is in TD181 of PLEN.
 Any discussion on this? This is consented. Next one is G989.3 amendment 1 with the text in TD170 R2. Any discussion on this? Consented.
 The next one is G.9963 a revision in TD168 R1 of Plenary. Any discussion on this one? It's consented. G.9961, revision in TD159 R1. Any discussion here? Consented.
 The next one is G.FIN or G.9940 now that we had ‑‑ was introduced. It's in TD152 R1 of Plenary. Any discussion here? It's consented.
 Next is G.9960, a revision in TD113 of Plenary. Any discussion here? Not seeing any. So it's consented. Next is G.9701, corrigenda 4, TD118 of Plenary. Consented.
 G.9711, corrigendum 2 and the text is in TD117 of Plenary. No discussion here. That's consented as well.
 Next there are no texts for agreement and there are texts for review. So this is the HNT standards overview and work plan in TD149 R1. The ANT standards work plan in TD48 R1 and the ANT standards overview in TD147.
 The Working Party has reviewed these. Can we approve these, please? No comments. Thank you.
 Is that the ‑‑ that's it for Working Party 1? Okay. Thank you very much for this excellent work and progress. So Tom, I invite you to proceed to the next report.

 >> WORKING PARTY 1: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll wait for this to ‑‑ yeah. In 113 PLEN we find the work program updates. And on this I particularly wish to thank the Working Party 1 Vice‑Chair, Ian Horsley who helped prepare this document as well as the outgoing liaisons. Here we find updates to the work program and we have provided updated based text. There have been a lot of updates to the editors reflected throughout here.
 And as we scroll through the list, you will find there are four new work items that were agreed to start up from this meeting. And if you go to the bottom, you will find in the annexes the four A1 and A13 justifications.
 So this ‑‑ you can go through these. But that completes the review here. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. So these are the new ‑‑ so before was the table. Right? And so are there any comments on the updated work program first? Yes, and so just to make it clear, this includes the appointment of editors for the documents indicated here. The recommendations indicated here.
 Okay. So can we accept the main update to the table here? And then we'll go through the new work items one at a time. Not seeing any requests for the floor. So we can accept the work program update. But let's go through now the new work justifications here.
 So the first one is A1 justification for proposed new recommendation on point to point fiber in the premises with G.P2PF I presume we will find a number afterwards, right?
 So if we scroll down on Ron Herren is nominated as the editor and here is the summary and the scope and relations to other documents. And scrolling down, we have supporting members that are committing here. We only have three on the list. I hope there is more.
 Because normally we like to see four members in the Study Group 15 guideline to support an A1.

 >> WORKING PARTY 1: Well, that's all that's listed for now. There seems to be wide interest. So I expect more to come along. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. I would invite if another member would like to add your name here you can certainly raise your hand and we can note it. Otherwise, is there any objection to proceeding here noting that there's only three supporting members listed? Okay. We'll agree with this new work item.
 So the next one is A13 justification for proposed new supplement on the practical aspects of PON security. G suP PON sec, practical aspects upon security with the purpose and scope listed here.
 And if you scroll down, we'll see the summary. And then the supporting members are listed here. There are more than four, yes, listed here. Much more interested in the supplement. Okay. Any comments on this? Okay. Then this is approved.
 So the next is a new supplement on the operational aspects of optical access. GSUP OAN ops with the proposed scope indicated here. With the summary and with supporting members indicated here.
 Any discussion on this proposed new supplement? If not, it is approved.
 Next we have a new supplement on enhanced on premise networking with computing functions, GSUP edge for home. With the scope listed here. The timing in this one is TBD as opposed to a specific date. If you scroll down, we'll see the subject. And the supporting members. Maybe we ‑‑ you could comment on the TBD on the timing. Is this ‑‑ you have no ‑‑ maybe one of the proposers could comment on the timing on this, why it is TBD as opposed to a specific schedule. Is it because of the amount of work or ‑‑ no one wishes to comment on that. Okay. Is there any further comments on this one?
 Okay. Then we'll approve this new work. And is that it? Okay. And then so Tom, I would encourage you to go back to the Working Party to fix the TBD with a timeline, please.
 Okay. Thank you very much. So if we could go to your next report, Tom, please.

 >> WORKING PARTY 1: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In TD134 we have the outgoing liaisons which the Vice‑Chair of Working Party 1 helped prepare. So we have I think what was it seven I think here. And ‑‑ so I guess you can go through them one at a time. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. This is in TD134. So we'll go through these liaison statements for our approval for sending. The first one is for information to Study Group 5 and Study Group 9 and IEEE 2.3. And the topic is responding to their liaison statements on ANT and HNT standardization plans. If you can scroll down so we can see the content here.
 So this is thanking them for the updates and indicating we'll confirming the input, yes. Any comments on this liaison? Okay. It's approved.
 So the next one is to ‑‑ this one is for action to TSAG, Study Group 9, Study Group 12, 13, 16, 17 ITU‑R Study Group 1, 5 and 6 as well as ETSI, and the broadband Forum. So if we scroll down. This is the liaison. This is the new ANT standardization work plan. So updated them on that.
 Any comments on this? It's approved. The next one then is on the new version of the home network transport standards overview and work plan. Again to the same members. As we see here, any comments on this one? Not seeing any. So this is approved.
 Really approved.
 (Laughter).

 >> CHAIR: The next one is the liaison on conformance and operability testing with the reference table to Study Group 11. Any comments on this one? Not seeing any, it is approved.
 The next liaison is on the new version of the ANT and HNT standards overview and work plans. I guess this is different ‑‑ this is to Study Group 20 and ITU‑D Study Group 1. If you scroll down, this is a specific one to these groups. Any comments here? Nope. This is approved.
 Next is a liaison to IEEE to 2.3. And this is on bidirectional point to point, optical access at 100 gigs. If you scroll down, this is the text liaison with an attachment. Any comments on this? That's approved. So next is liaison to ‑‑ for information to ETSI I SG F5G to fiber to workshop as indicated here. Any comments on this? It's approved.
 And that's it. So thank you very much for your approvals here. So if we could move to your next document, Mr. Starr, please.

 >> WORKING PARTY 1: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will wait for Hiroshi to pull up the T135 holding the interim activities for Working Party 1 where you will find there is four face‑to‑face meetings planned and I think five virtuals. I will note the second item, the September Question 2 meeting under location host shows TBD. I expect that to be resolved and ready to be announced soon well before the two months before this September.
 But yeah, the rest of it is already confirmed besides that one. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. And so those are the in‑person meetings and there are these virtual meetings noted here as well at these times.
 Okay. And we'll have the TBD that's not until September. So we'll be able to confirm that two months before. So we'll ‑‑ we can do that. Are there any comments on the proposed in‑person and virtual meetings for Working Party 1? If not, these are approved. Thank you.
 Thank you very much, Mr. Starr. I believe that's the end of your report. So thank you very much. So now we'll move to Working Party 2. Invite Mr. Dolan to introducer unless Hiroshi, did you have something?

 >> HIROSHI OTA: Please note that TD136 was revised on that. Please pick up R1 version. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. So Mr. Dolan, please introduce your report.

 >> WORKING PARTY 2: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So the ‑‑ we R1'ed this last night to change the Chairman and Vice‑Chairmen details in a table right at the end of the report. Clearly Mr. Parsons didn't read it because he referred to me as the Vice‑Chairman in the introduction. So this is the report of Working Party 2.
 Our agenda was in 49 and approved at the start of TD49 of 2 and approved at the start of the meeting. Structure and leadership changed. Mr. Bhaumik is now the Vice‑Chairman of Working Party 2.
 We looked at our interim activities. The first significant note Mr. Daniel Daems indicated his intention to retire. He was thanked during the process of the meeting and maybe again today if he's still here. We will look to replace him. Although he has indicated he will provide input to our next meeting because the liaison, the meeting that he will send the liaison for will occur for his retirement. And so we're grateful for that. We had a number of joint meetings amongst our questions and questions of Working Party 3. All of our work program was completed. So we have three recommendations and two documents for review that you will see later.
 Liaison statements interim activity, all of that is pro forma. If you move down to the reports of the questions, Question 5 characteristics and test methods of optical fibers and cables, we had three contributions, I think from Central African or African countries. They dealt with the access network. We entertained them in Question 5 and we also discussed those in Jean Marie promotion and coordination meeting. We have a revision of L109 which we expect to consent at our next meeting. An amendment to L100 and we're trying to expedite work on that. There is an A1 for it and we're targeting doing that at the next Plenary. We have stable text on 650.1 and we intend to consent that in November.
 There are revisions, proposed revisions of G sub‑40 and GSTR. Optimal fiber and standards guideline, that's G sub‑40 we have an A13 for that. And we're going to get that done by the end of the Study Group period. So 2024 midyear. GSTR SDM is a new document and we don't feel that we need to do any more work to that. Revision of 6.52 and these are basically to get data on installed fiber and we're going to have correspondence activity on that. It is a sensitive matter in some respects of
 Moving on to the revision of 6.57 we have an A1 for that. There's a ‑‑ I think the dataset to 2024 for that.
 There's going to be correspondence activity as well. We had a joint meeting with 5 and 6 and that's agreed to have a correspondence activity. This I think is this ‑‑ yeah. Zero expression fiber, yes, it is. Future direction of the work, no initial proposals. We have stable text in TD61 R1. And that's a stable draft of 650.1 and will be consented in November we hope. We have annex A, we have an outgoing liaison to IEEE. So result of work between Working Party 1 and Working Party 2. So Q2, Q5 and Q6.
 We have no face to face interim activities planned but we do have a number of correspondence activities. Moving on to question 6, question 6 was quite busy here. All of their objectives were met. And I'm grateful to them for that. 698.1 is here for consent. We will see that later on. The same with 698.4. We have two recommendations or draft recommendations with similar names. OWDM2, they work ‑‑ the question worked very hard on these. And they are both now in stable state and we expect to consent them in November.
 We're going to do correspondence on this 100 gig and application code for 959.1. And moving then to 3328 point to multi point systems. This is a new topic that's attracting a lot of interest. We had joint meetings on this activity as well.
 And work is progressing. The Rapporteur is encouraging more contributions on it. But it seems to be moving on quite nicely. GSUP39 we have an A13 in here that we will see later on. This document hasn't been touched since 2015 and there are updating and tidying that needs to be done to it. Three. Slow down. Probabilistic constellation shaping and subcarrier multiplexing. And also been a request to talk about more contemporary. We will begin that work after today I hope.
 Moving down, optical fibers, I don't see anything huge. 33214 please. This is the start of a new recommendation. And this is very exciting. Terrestrial free space optics with backhaul. It is going to be challenging because we have not done anything like this at all. Free space optics is entirely new territory for us. Although we have had some interesting work in coming to justify the start of this. So I think also you will see that that has garnered a lot of support when you look at the A1. 400 gig and 800 gig and WDM applications below. It is great to see there is interest on this topic. All of the other standards bodies that we work with. So I think we can finally look forward to ITU beginning to work very actively on this topic, Q6 at lease. We got A13. So you will see the stable text.
 Future direction of the work, you can read all of that. Our interim activities, we have one face‑to‑face meeting, courtesy of some Swedish ‑‑ oh. Ericsson. Ericsson are going to host us in Pisa and we are going to kindly provide remote participation as well. We're grateful to that. Move on to question 7. Progressive documents, revision of will 250 time flies. It needs overhaul. There is some material in there for which many countries or operators is kind of old FTTx type stuff. But we believe that's valuable. So particularly to Developing Countries. It is useful experience, useful information. So we're going to create a new supplement for that. There is an A13 in that.
 Revision of L340, we have worked on that. It's here for consent this morning.
 And we have a questionnaire. That's one of the two documents that we have for review. I don't think we actual lie need to look at those. They're in the table in one of the later TDs from Working Party 2. We have a correspondence on L312, consent timing has been moved forward to the end of this year, to November. And A1 justification for a new recommendation, preconnectorized cabling components, targeted consent in the middle of 2025. I shouldn't say the middle. 2025. So that will be in the next study period.
 Revisions of LSTP and GSOR, interim activities, question 7 is going to do some correspondence but they are not meeting face to face. So that brings me on to question 8, optical fiber submarine cable systems. They met here this week. They made progress on all of their work items I believe. They also dealt with C315 and I think they ‑‑ there were some interaction with Jean Marie's PC on that as well. The Q8 have also agreed ‑‑ the Rapporteur has kindly agreed to do this to create a promotion for flyer in line with our intention and Mr. Noa's reminder of publicizing our work, the importance of our work. So flyer to come from Q8. A questionnaire that we're going to ask TSB to send to submarine or cable ship owners, not submarine owners. Cable ship owners. And we believe we'll get useful information back from that.
 G976, the consent date for that's been set to 2024. We have a changing editor for G supplement 414 and Mr. Shin has kindly agreed to take on that task as well. The agreement date for that revision of that supplement is 2024.
 And now we have these new study items where we're working on two new recommendations and they're progressing nicely. There is TDs with text that was drafted here in this meeting available if you want to go look at that. DSSSC, that's three Ss there, 2024, and the G smart, submarine sensing recommendation is submarine cable sensing is 2024 as well.
 There is no intent to ‑‑ I should mention the liaison report you will see a liaison later from question 8. There is no intent to meet face to face. But we do have a list of correspondence activities there at the bottom that the experts of Q8 will engage in before our next meeting. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 That concludes my report.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Dolan. Are there any comments on the main report from our Working Party 2? Mr. Shu please.

 >> Thank you, Mr. Chair. There is a reference to the joint M meeting as a TD108 PLEN in section 1.5. I'm not finding the TD108. Just for reference, there's ‑‑ this report joint M appears in the Q2 report as well as the Working Party 3 report. Actually was addendumed by three different Working Parties. I haven't seen the file. If you can chase that reference. Thank you.

 >> Mr. Shu is correct, it's not up there. We can't resolve that at the moment. Mr. Betts has kindly suggested that we can point to the Working Party 3 report where this is listed. Where the report of joint M is either there or the correct reference to it will be there. So it's up to you Mr. Chairman, to direct us as to how you would like us to fix this.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. We can just refer to the Working Party 3 report. I think that's sufficient which is in TD141.

 >> Right.

 >> CHAIR: So Mr. Betts confirmed that it is in there. Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much. So with that that change, is there any further comments on this report? If not, can we accept it as modified?
 Yes. So then if we can continue Mr. Dolan with the texts for determination, consent agreement and approval from Working Party 2 please, in TD137.

 >> WORKING PARTY 2: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes. Waiting for that to come up. So TD137 of PLEN which you can see there, full screen. We have three texts for consent listed there. 698.4. They are all revisions. 698.1 and L340. L340 is in an R2 of PLEN. The others R1s. I hope those documents are there. We have two texts for review. Both of these are questionnaires. One on optical infrastructure sharing. And the other on cable ship and submersible equipment. That's it Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So we already did the IPR call that applied to all of the documents we're going to approve, consent, et cetera, today. So we'll just proceed here now with the text for consent. The first one is G.698.4 that's in revision TD165, R1 of PLEN. Any comments on this document for consent? Not seeing any. It's consented.
 G.698.1, another revision in TD171 R1 of PLEN. Any comments on this one? Not seeing any. So this is consented. And then the last one is L340 of maintenance of underground facilities. TD163 R2. Any discussion? It is consented. For review, there are two questionnaires. The first one is on optical infrastructure sharing. So this is a questionnaire that ‑‑ so there is two documents indicated here. One in Working Party 2 and one of Plenary. Is the same document?

 >> HIROSHI OTA: It is.

 >> CHAIR: The one we will be approving is the Plenary. The second one is a draft questionnaire on cable ship and submersible equipment in TD164 of Plenary. Is there any comments or discussion on these questionnaires that will be sent out as described with the questions here to the membership? Not seeing any, so these questionnaires are approve. Thank you. Thank you very much Mr. Dolan. If we could proceed now to your work program review in TD138 of PLEN, please.

 >> WORKING PARTY 2: Thank you. We have a table there at the top showing the contents of the annexes or listing the annexes. And I think there is ten A1s and A13s that we can go through one by one when we reach them. Scroll down, please.
 Thank you. I just discussed with my Vice Chairman we apologize for the coloring that no one else seems to have done. We perhaps should have removed this. This is the modification as determined by the questions of the incoming work plan. So it has the usual format. The editors are all there on the right‑hand side. Some of those have changed during this meeting.
 Scroll down Hiroshi, please. I also don't know what the green is that ‑‑ it is what it is. The thing that's worth perhaps highlighting is at the top of the screen at the moment. Can you go back to it please, Hiroshi? Yeah. This was an item that was actually stale in the work program. The question had addressed this in her interim meeting and the report was in TD138. They'd already anticipated removing it from the work program here. And so we think that cleans up the stale items for us.
 Can you move, scroll on down, please? OWDM, we mentioned those earlier on. Those are high priority activities. And they will be presented at the next Plenary meeting. GSUP 39, undertake that task again. We have the new free space optics work there.
 And work on revisions of the 250, 312 which we already mentioned in the report. Carry on, please. We move down in to question 8, which doesn't have so much color there because I think things are more stable. Supplement 41, again a revision we talked about that earlier, the two G smart and the recommendation above it ongoing work. So nothing really to ‑‑ unless the membership have questions, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest moving on to the annexes.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much. Are there any comments on the list of documents in the work program? As it was indicated the highlighting in yellow indicates the new items. And the ‑‑ this includes the appointment of new editors that are indicated there. Does anyone have any comments about that? I have one comment, if you could scroll up Hiroshi to the last one on the list, one of the editors is listed as TBD. Is that ‑‑ is that Mr. Bhaumik would like to have additional help or was that a typo?

 >> WORKING PARTY 2: No. Thank you for pointing this out. I probably should have explained what's going on here. In line with the kind of intent to publish or to make greater publicity around our work and the influence of our organization, there are an in addition to flyers and technical reports and other documents like that, there is a significant piece of work out of Working Party 2 called the OTN handbook. Working Party 2 has a similar document last updated in 2015 which talks about the technologies that it's responsible for and how they're used and their importance. And Mr. Bhaumik has kindly agreed to drive a project to revise that 2015 document. We've ‑‑ I believe he has entrusted that to the editors, excuse me to the Rapporteurs to guide that work and we already have a significant number of experts volunteering to help them with that.
 I don't think we will in a future revision of this document list that loan group of people. So the TBD there is essentially redundant. It shouldn't be there. We can cross it out.
 Mr. Bhaumik is going to be in charge of it. The Rapporteurs are helping him. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you for that explanation. So we can scratch out the TBD here on this one. So we will note that. If there are no other comments can we agree this updated work program? So agreed. So then let's move to the justifications, A1 and justifications that we have here in the annexes. The first one is a proposed draft amendment to a recommendation L100 on optical fiber cables for duct and tunnel applications. So if you'll scroll down here, Hiroshi, we can see the existing scope and the summary. And if you scroll down a bit further we can see the supporting members.
 So any comments on this proposed new work item? Not seeing any. So approved.
 If we could go to the next one, in annex B, of TD138. This is an A13 justification now for a proposed GSUP40 on optical fiber and cable recommendations and standards Guidelines.
 And so the proposed scope is shown here. And if you scroll down with the base text. And then we see the supporting members listed here. Any comments on this one? If not, this is so approved. The next one is A1 justification for a draft revision to G657 with the base text being the current G657. And the scope indicated here. You scroll down, we'll see the scope and the relationship and then the supporting members.
 Any discussion on this one? Okay. Thank you. This is approved.
 So next one is A13 justification for revising GSUP39 on optical system design and engineering considerations with the scope, of course, as it currently is and then if you scroll down to the summary of what they'd like to add. And then we see the list of supporting members there.
 Any discussion on this one? Yes. Mr. Betts, please.

 >> MALCOLM BETTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just scroll up to the place text. I believe that that will make it a stale work item. This isn't published. Perhaps Mr. Ota can tell us how to avoid that. Thank you. Oh, yeah, 2016.

 >> CHAIR: So thank you Mr. Betts. The point is correct given the current definition of how TSAG defines the stale work items. But I mean what we would ‑‑ I mean it seems like, I don't know, perhaps I mean what we could do is just issue it as a TD to which ‑‑ I mean we could if we wanted to do that. But ‑‑

 >> WORKING PARTY 2: We could. But the TSAG report that marks it as stale is not going to be considered until our next Plenary. We're going to ‑‑ okay. Let me finish Malcolm with my suggestion. Malcolm can correct me. This ‑‑ this thing will be ‑‑ it will be text. New draft text for this very, very quickly. Out of the interim meeting in Pisa I'm sure.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. So I ‑‑ from my perspective, I think ‑‑ so we could either create a draft text now but I don't think it's necessary to do that. I think we can as Mr. Dolan indicated they will have a draft text coming out of their next meeting. And that will handle the time by ‑‑ by the time we need ‑‑ I'll be reviewing the stale work items with you. So I think that will be covered there.

 >> WORKING PARTY 2: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Can we agree this new work item? We have another comment from the floor, please. Go ahead.

 >> Thank you. I think for each editors should include his full name under the e‑mail address. The but there are only have e‑mail address. And many justifications documents in the previous had lost the name of the editors pen name. I think the table should include these three features, these three key features.

 >> CHAIR: Yes. Thank you very much for that comment. Yes, that's correct. It shouldn't just be the e‑mail address. It should be the name, the member and then their contact. So I presume, Mr. Dolan, you have that information and we can update as appropriate.

 >> I can almost guarantee can I determine it from the e‑mail address. Could the commenter clarify, was the comment restricted solely to these annexes, these A1s and A13s of Working Party 2 or was he referring to annexes in Working Party 1's report as well? Please. Could you restate that for me, Mr. Parsons?

 >> CHAIR: My understanding the comment was just on this report. That was my understanding. Was that correct? It was just on the Working Party 2 report?

 >> Yes, I only have ‑‑ show ‑‑ I only have seen this document, only include the e‑mail address. But the previous, previous justification document in this document, in this text have lost the name of his pen name. I think we should check this text. Yes. Which one should include the three key features, full name, company name and his e‑mail address. Yes.

 >> Okay. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. So the ‑‑ the Working Party Chair will prepare an R1 to clarify this information which he has. And so given that can we approve this ‑‑ can you go to the one that we're approving please, Hiroshi? Yes. This one.
 And the editor name will be updated. Okay. So approved. So if we could move to the next one, this is A1 justification for new recommendation on terrestrial free space optics for mobile backhaul with shorter reach. And the base text as indicated here, editor is listed here. Scope indicated here. Scroll down. The summary. And then the list of supporting members is indicated here. Is there any comments on this proposed new recommendation? Okay. Seeing none, it's approved. So the next one is a justification for the proposed revised L341. And this is indicated here. And if the scope is here, if we scroll down and we'll see the summary of what's needed. And then we have the indicated supporting members.
 Any comment on this one? Okay. This is approved. The next one is A1 justification for proposed revised recommendation L360 with the scope indicated here. And the summary scope liaisons and then the supporting members indicated. Okay. Any discussion on this one? No. Okay. This is approved.
 The next please. The next one is A1 justification for a new recommendation L.PCC on preconnectorized cabling components with the base text in these contributions.
 The editor noted there. Needs an affiliation. Okay. But and the summary, the description and the supporting members. Okay. Any comments on this one? Not seeing any. It is approved. Next is A13 justification for a proposed new supplement on national experiences for FTTx network architectures. Base text in TD and the editor indicated that also needs a member indication here. And the supporting member is listed here. Any discussion on this one? No. It's approved.
 And then we have an A13 justification for a technical report on optical fibers cable and systems. Cables and systems. While it is correct in the A1 with the title, missed the S on cables.
 And this is a revision of the base document that already exists. That was indicated and then if we scroll down, we'll see the scope and then the supporting members indicated.
 Any discussion on this one? Seeing none, so approved. So thank you very much. That's the last one I think in the set. Okay. So thank you very much. So Mr. Dolan, you will provide a revision of this one with the notes that we indicated on the member listing of the editors?

 >> WORKING PARTY 2: I will.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. If we can move to the next report, which I believe is the liaison statements in TD139.

 >> WORKING PARTY 2: Excuse me. 139. We have two outgoing liaisons. One is in the table there. One spontaneous and the other is a response to TD42 40 of 2, IETF. So you can just go down and show these. This is a joint ‑‑ it is a liaison that was created at a joint meets between 2, 5 and 6. It's ‑‑ you see the three authors there. It is to IEEE to tell them that we're starting discussions or continuing discussions on dispersion properties of G652 fiber. We see the text that we're telling them that we're going to do a correspondence activity under the Chairmanship of Rapporteur Q2 and we attach a document for their convenience and tell them when the results are expected to be available.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. And so this document that we're attaching this was a contribution. So what was the ‑‑ is the contribution the proposal to do this or is the contribution draft text?

 >> WORKING PARTY 2: It is not draft text. It is a statement of the problem and it is what provoked the correspondence activity.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So any comments on this liaison? You scroll up it's again it's to 802.3 for information. I don't see any comments. So it's approved. So the next one you said. Would you like to introduce it?

 >> WORKING PARTY 2: I am happy to do so. This is a response liaison, common control and management plane and it is commenting on items. No they're not blah blah blah. It's very straightforward. Very simple.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. Can we agree this liaison to ITFC cap? Okay. So approved.
 So then the last one before our coffee, if we could do the interim activities in TD140?

 >> WORKING PARTY 2: I'm not sure I can get through it. This is the interim activities of which we only have one. It is a Q6 interim meeting that is kindly hosted by Ericsson and arranged by the Rapporteur. Q6 are going to go to Pisa in Italy which will be wonderful in July. It is not mentioned in this TD. But as I mentioned in the report they have also kindly arranged for remote participation at this interim.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. And so there is only one interim meeting here. There is no virtual meetings?

 >> WORKING PARTY 2: No. If you remember when I went through the report there are many correspondence activities between 5, 7 and 8. But the only question that's having face to face interim is question 6.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. This is an interim with remote participation offered, in person in Pisa. Any comments on this? Can we approve this interim meeting for question 6? Okay. So approved. Thank you very much, Mr. Dolan and that concludes your report. Now we can take a coffee break. And then we will resume at 11:15 with Working Party 3. So we're in recess until 11:15.
 (Break).

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you for coming back, Ladies and Gentlemen. We'll continue our deliberations here on our Study Group 15 Closing Plenary. We have concluded Working Party 1 and Working Party 2.
 So next we'll proceed to the reports of Working Party 3. So I'll invite Mr. Betts to introduce TD141 of Plenary first which is the main report of Working Party 3.

 >> WORKING PARTY 3: Thank you. I'll do my very best to make sure we finish before coffee break this afternoon.

 >> CHAIR: That would be most obliged.

 >> WORKING PARTY 3: All the input documents and the allocation provided in annex A of this report, and as you can see we have a long list of joint sessions were held with references to the report sections that contain the reports of these sessions. The interim activities are in annex B. We have had the usual IPR standard statements. And the documents for consent are in 142 Plenary. And the first thing of note is the use of noninclusive language in Working Party 3 recommendations. We sent a liaison out of our 2021 meeting. A follow‑up liaison to TSAG and TSB. Unfortunately the director provided some advice on how to proceed while we are waiting for an answer and that's in TD121 of Plenary. And this meeting question 13 have removed some of the noninclusive language from the synchronizations related languages. We sent liaisons to partner organizations that are referencing our work and to TSAG and SCB. Moving on to question 10, they have been busy revising 8013 which is Ethernet OAM. Consenting this at this meeting.
 And planning revisions of some other MPOS and NSTP and Ethernet OAM recommendations for the next meeting.
 Moving down to Question 11, Question 11 was actually very busy doing complete section 3.3, Hiroshi. They have been very busy working on two completely different topics. They were working on OTN beyond 400 gig. And we will be consenting a recommendation on flex 08 which is an 800 gig mapping. And also agreed to and we will be seeing the updates to the work program to restructure the 709.x series of recommendations. And that will be ‑‑ we'll look at that when we get to the work program.
 The other major area of work was at the exact opposite end of the bit rate scale, looking at TDM services below one gig. And we have made some significant progress there. And had some good understandings. And we have agreed to document two different cases. One where we have an MTN server layer and other for an OTN server layer. We have number of new work items coming out of this meeting to document that.
 If we then move on to section 3.4, question 12 transport navigate architecture, they're looking at the media layer. This was in conjunction with some work on Question 2 and question 6 that's already been alluded on point to multi point and applications. And making the network media channel point to multi point. And the work in question 6 on the clarification of the definition of an OTSI when it is using subcarrier multiplexing.
 Question 12 met jointly with question 14 as usual on a number of management control issues. And progressing work on the 7701, 02, 03 recommendations that provide the generic overview of our control, SDN and ASON respectively.
 We'll come to the liaisons and interim meetings as we hit those documents. Moving on to question 13 on network synchronization. You will notice it's a very long section in the report. They have been as usual extremely busy. And further refining the synchronization related for time synchronization, getting every higher degrees of precision. And question 13 working jointly with question 14 on the management of synchronization. Question 13, question 14 focusing on encoding. As far as we are aware question 14 is the only place working on unifying management for synchronization across the network.
 So moving on to question 14, they have once again been very busy with the management control recommendations mainly focusing on the management interface recommendations for the various technologies. Perhaps while I'm on question 14, once again acknowledge the tremendous contribution that Mr. Lan has made to this work over his long and distinguished career as the Rapporteur of question 14. And starting in 1997 and he gave up that position at the beginning of this meeting. And he has been here once again working hard but looking much more relaxed without the burden of being the Rapporteur. So once again, thank you to Cam and thank you to Scott for picking up the mantel from Cam.
 So that concludes the brief introduction of my report. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Betts. Are there any comments or questions, Ladies and Gentlemen, on the Working Party 3 report?
 If not, can we accept and approve this report? Yes. So thank you very much. So now if we can move on, Mr. Betts, to your next report, in TD137. I'm sorry. TD142, which is the text for determination, consent agreement and approval.

 >> WORKING PARTY 3: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have a relatively short list of texts for consent. As usual we have nothing for approval of dissemination. We have two texts for agreement and one text for review. So if you would like to take them one at a time.
 Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. So let's proceed with these texts. The first one for consent is G.8013/Y.1731. Are there any comments on this revision?
 If not, this is consented. Thank you very much.
 Next is G.709.1 amendment 4, flexible OTN short reach interfaces with the base text in TD114 R1. The A5 in TD179 of PLEN. Any comments on this one? If not this is consented. Next is G.798. This is in TD160 R1 with the A5 in TD176 of PLEN. Any comments? Seeing none it's consented. Next is G.8251 corrigendum 1 and text for this is in TD173 of PLEN. Any discussion on this one?
 Seeing none, this is consented. Next is G.8271.1, the text is in TD151 R1 of PLEN. Any discussion on this? It is consented. Next is G.8273. Which is framework for phasing time clocks. This is consented. Next is G.8273.2. This revision is TD156 R1. Any comments on this? If not, it is consented. The next one, final one for consent is G.8051 amendment 1 which is the management aspects for Ethernet transport. In TD158 R1 with the A5 in TD174. Any comments here?
 Seeing none this is consented as well.
 Then we have some candidate text for agreement. The first one is G.SUP58 which is the OT module framework interfaces in TD116 R1. Any comments on this revised supplement for agreement? It is agreed. The next one is a corrigenda on G8052.2. It is for agreement. So this is in TD175 of Plenary. So can we agree this corrigenda. So agreed. The next is the OT standardization work plan which is in TD150.
 This is for review. So we can ‑‑ any comments on this one? Okay. So we can approve that. Thank you very much.
 So thank you very much for your approval here. Let's move then to the next Working Party 3 document, which would be TD143 of PLEN. This is the work program updates. Mr. Betts, please.

 >> WORKING PARTY 3: At the start of the document, Hiroshi just scrolling through his list of 26 new work items that we will go through later. So you want to scroll down to the table, maybe shrink it just a little. So question 10 we have one recommendation that we just consented. And two that are planning to consent at the next meeting.
 Question 11, you'll notice a lot of blue rows, which are in fact, new work items. And some red rows which are things that have been deleted. As you scroll up just a little, yep, you will notice that we have not assigned editors to many of these new work items. We have an on the flexible OTN interfaces, we have a number of recommendations with fairly ambitious dates. So that we need to be very careful about assigning editors who are not only knowledgeable on the subject matter but actually have the time to do the work. And are able to spend the time required. So it's a question of talking to a number of people and making sure we can distribute the work appropriately.
 But that same remark, actually applies to the fine grained OTN and fine grained MTN recommendations as well. Perhaps even more so that we need to carefully coordinate and make sure that we're not overloading one or two people who would be very willing to volunteer for everything but we are very concerned with getting an even distribution of the work. And making sure it is shared amongst the companies appropriately.
 If you would like to scroll down to question 12, we have a few new work items there. We've added in there the ones in green. Question 13, you will notice a lot of highlighting on the right‑hand side, which is changes in editors. We've had three very long serving and hard working editors who are no longer able to attend the meetings. Some have different jobs. Some have retired.
 And we have two new people, Francois and Helmet who have volunteered to act as editors. You will see these are being added in various places.
 Scrolling down to question 14, we have the usual suspects, all of the management work that's going on with editors and this is fairly stable.
 That's the tables. I'll pause there. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr. Betts. So are there any comments on the work program from Working Party 3 noting that when we approve the work plan we're approving the new editors that are noted. And in the cases there are no editors noted Rapporteur of course is always the default editor. So any comments. Mr. Chung please.

 >> Mr. Chung: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the table for Question 11, the editor's last name of G.88.4 is missing. So please add the last name, please. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much for that minor point. I think that Mr. Betts can make that fix.
 Are there any other comments, Ladies and Gentlemen? Not seeing anything with that fix, noted. We'll approved the work program. So now let's go through the justifications for the new work program. Mr. Betts, do you wish to introduce any of them or will I go through them?

 >> WORKING PARTY 3: Maybe you should just go through them. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. So we'll go through these new work items. Starting over with annex A, which is the A1 justification for a proposed amendment to G.798 with the base text is G.798 and then the scope here of the work to be completed with the number of supporting members indicated there.
 Is there any comments on this proposed new work item? If not, this is approved.
 So the next one in annex B is a proposed draft new recommendation G.709 amendment 3, on, of course, interfaces for OTN. And so indicating here what the scope of amendment 3 will be on the new mapping for 800 gig. And a new annex for fine grain OTN. Indicating the summary here. And the supporting members listed here.
 Any comments on this one? Okay. This is approved. The next is A1 justification on new recommendation G8023, amendment 2. Indicating the base text is the existing text and this is going to update references to A2.3 to 800 gig. So with the supporting members indicated here.
 Any comments on this, Ladies and Gentlemen? If not, this is approved. The next is A1 justification for revision to G709.1 on flexible OTN. This revision is going to rename this recommendation as I understand there is a reorganization of the G709 series. And this is part of that. And the supporting members indicated here, are there any comments on this A1 justification? If not, this is approved. Next is the revision to G.709.3. And again this is part of the rework making this specific to 100 gig interfaces. So if you scroll down, we'll see the summary and the supporting members. Any comments here, Ladies and Gentlemen? If not, this is approved.
 Next one is the A1 justification for G709.SR. And so this is to add flexible OTN short reach interfaces. And if we scroll down, we can see the summary and the supporting members.
 Any comments here? Not seeing any. So we can approve this.
 The next one is proposed new recommendation G.709.B400GLR for a 400 gig interface. And so if you scroll down, here we will see the scope that's defined in the summary and liaisons, of course, in the contributing members supporting.
 Any comments here? If not, this is approved. The next one is A1 justification for a draft new recommendation G.709.20. Overview of fine grain OTN. This recommendation is to provide an overview of the fine grain OTN. There is no base text yet. But the ‑‑ there are a number of supporting members here. And as I understand there's ‑‑ they will probably be base text very soon. But this is the high level or the overview for the ‑‑ for this set of fine grain OTN.
 Any comments here, Ladies and Gentlemen? And this is approved. The next one is the A1 justification for a draft new G8312.20 on overview of fine grained MTN which is again the overview document for this layer network on fine grained MTN that's described here. And this is being a summary document as well with the supporting members indicated.
 Any comments here, Ladies and Gentlemen? Not seeing any this is approved. The next one is a proposed amendment for G.8312 with the base text noted. And this is to add a new annex to specify FG MTN and if you scroll down, we see the supporting members.
 Any comments here? If not, this is approved. The next one is A1 justification for a draft new G.808.4 to provide linear protection for FG MTN and FG OTN and the editor is John Dong. His last name is indicated here and the supported members are listed. Any comments on this one? Okay. This is approved. The next one is A13 justification now for a revised GSUP58 on OTN module framework interfaces. And the summary is indicated here with the supporting members.
 Any comments here, Ladies and Gentlemen? If not, this is approved. Next is the A1 justification for a G.7703 amendment 2 on ASON and we have the scope indicated here. A large number of supporting members. Any comments on this one, Ladies and Gentlemen? If not, this is approved.
 The next one is A1 justification for a draft revised G.807, generic functional architecture for the optical media network. The scope on what updates you can provide are indicated here with the supporting members listed. Any comments here? This is approved.
 Next is annex O, this is the A1 justification for G.872, which is the architecture for OTN. The scope of the work intended to cover updates to 400 gig. And the reorganization that we talked about before, supporting members indicated below.
 Any comments on this one? If not, that's approved. Annex P is the A1 justification for G.8310 which is the architecture of the metro transport network, MTN. And so the base text of course is the enforced document with the scope being to add the FG MTN work here and then the supporters listed there. Any comments here? Not seeing any, this is approved.
 Next the A1 justification for proposed amendment 1 to G.8260. And this is a terminology document with the scope indicated here. And supporting members listed here on the bottom. Any comments on this one? If not, this is approved. The next one is the A1 justification for revision recommendation to G.8261.1 with the base text. The scope indicated here on the new type of clock to be added.
 And the supporting members listed on the bottom. Any comments on this one? If not, this is approved. The next one is on G8271.1, amendment 2. Again the base text is in the TD that's indicated here with the scope noting that updating network limits and some examples. And we'll see the supporting members listed here as well.
 Any comments on this one? If not, this is approved. Next we have the amendment 1 to G.8251 with the base text and the TD indicated there. Updating terms and adding FG MTN. Any comments here? This is approved. The next one is on G.8273 on ‑‑ this is amendment 1 on the framework for the phase and time clocks with some new tests added is what the proposal for this work item is. If you scroll down, we'll see the supporting members indicated there.
 So any comment on this one? If not, it's approved. Then we have G.8273.2, amendment 1, with the base text and a TD. And indicating the scope on class D clocks here. And supporting members indicated here on the bottom. Any comments on this one? If not, this is approved. Then we have A13 justification to revise GSUP68 on sync OAM requirements. And adding PTP performance monitoring details. If we scroll down we will see the supporting members listed here.
 Any comments here? If not, this is approved.
 And the next we have the A1 justification for G.875 revision on the protocol neutral management information model with the indication of the scope of this revision on adding harmonizing with various other texts that have already been approved. And then if you scroll down you will see the supporting members as well.
 Any comments here? Any requests? No. Then we will approve this one. And then we have G.7710, common equipment management function requirements. There is no base text for this. But the revision will cover these aspects that are indicated here. And then we have the supporting members on the bottom.
 Any comments on this one? No. Then we can approve that. And to the last letter of the alphabet, annex Zed we have G.874 draft amendment as the base text as the input text here with the summary of the scope on how we're aligning the management aspects with them. And then the supporting members indicated here.
 Any comments on this one? If not, this is approved. Thank you very much. And I congratulate Working Party 3 with making it all the way through the alphabet with their proposed work items that have now been approved. I will ask Mr. Betts to continue reviewing the Working Party 3 reports. The next one would be the liaison statements in TD144 of PLEN.

 >> WORKING PARTY 3: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At the top of the document, we have the usual list, the usual table, that shows which documents we're responding to. And on the right‑hand side is the responses. And those with no entry on the left are spontaneous liaison statements. So that's just the summary. Maybe we should just go through the liaison statements one by one.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you Mr. Betts. We will see how far through the alphabet we get with the liaison statements. The first one in annex A is liaison statement for information to the ITF MPLS Working Group. If we scroll down we'll see that this is to inform them of our consent of G.8121 amendment 1. And we'll attach the TD with the document. Any comments on this?
 Okay. Can we approve this liaison? So approved. The next one is liaison statement for information to OIF. And open ROADM. If you scroll down you will see this is informing them of the flex 08 800 gig work in Question 11. And we're attaching the draft amendment for their information.
 Any comment on this one? If not, so approved. The next one is for information to OIF. This is a liaison statement that summarizes the work on G.709 amendment 3. And if you scroll down a bit to Hiroshi here. And explains the work that we have here. But there's no attachments here. So this is just a simple text liaison. Any comments on this one? This one is approved. The next one is in annex D. This is for action to IEEE, COM PLC which is the power line communication standards Committee. For information to IEEE PSA. This is regarding 2893 which is a draft standard that was we understand has been approved. We had sent a liaison to this group before but there has been no response. We understand that it's now approved. And we'd like to as we indicated before see a draft of this document. So that we can assess its overall impact to the OTN network.
 And so the attachment here is attaching our previous liaison statement.
 So any comments on this one, Ladies and Gentlemen? If not, this is approved. The next one is liaison statement for action to TSAG. Study Group 12, 13, 17, IEC, IETF, a bunch of Working Groups there and IEEE and so on. This is on the ITU‑T standardization plan update. This is issue 32 that's being sent. And we're thanking them for their update previously. And we are sending the current version which will be attached.
 Any comments on this? If not, that's approved. The next one in annex F is for information to 1588 to ORAN Working Groups 4, 5, 6, 9, 3GPP, RAN, and 802.1 and IETF on inclusive language. Scrolling down this is summarizing how we upped ‑‑ updated a number of recommendations based on the conclusion of the IEEE 1588G work that has alternative inclusive language. And that we have aligned our recommendations with those. And indicating which ones they are. And then we're attaching those for their information.
 Any comments on this? If not, that's approved. Next we have in annex G again on the inclusive language, so this is for action to TSAG and SEV. This is again in regards to that work, but noting that based on the guidance that we'd had from TSAG last time that we did do these updates when we had revisions open. And indicating to them that we have aligned with the 1588G terms of time transmitter and time receiver. And further indicating that we're looking ‑‑ we have another liaison that we're looking to encourage IEEE 1588E to align with these terms in their yang model so we can leverage those, those yang models in our management work.
 Any comments on this liaison? If not, this is approved. So the next liaison is in annex H. Also on inclusive language. This is the one that we referred to. This is to IEEE 1588, copy to 802.1, on that point, that we would encourage them to consider using the terminology, the inclusive terminology in 1588G that they have chosen if their yang modules so that other organizations like ITU can leverage that base yang module with the inclusive terminology included. Any comments? If not, approved. Next is a liaison to again 1588 with copy on modeling coordination. And so this is the ongoing series of sort of cross‑SDO virtual meetings that question 14 has been leading. And so just gives an indication of when these meetings will be. And that we will be facilitating this with ITU Zoom meetings and TSB has asked to set up Zoom meetings for this and insert the link in to this liaison. Any comments on this? If not, this is approved. Next in annex J is liaison to JCA machine learning. And this is for information. And if we scroll down, this indicates to them that we have interest in this group from our questions 12 and 14.
 And that we will be identifying a liaison Rapporteur to the JCA AML which is a Jingling Yi to take on that role. Any comments? We will be updating later in the agenda the liaison Rapporteurs to add Jingling Yi as a Rapporteur there as well. This is approved.
 Next or that's it. Okay. We didn't make it all the way through the alphabet. Okay.
 Thank you very much to Working Party 3 for the excellent work and liaison statements to ‑‑ that we have to the other organizations. And next we'll review the report on proposed interim activities in TD145. Mr. Betts, please.

 >> WORKING PARTY 3: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have the table at the front that lists three face‑to‑face meetings. And below we have the virtual meetings. I believe we have two stand alone and three series of virtual meetings. Maybe if you want to go to the annexes. Take them one by one, you will notice with the face to face we're explicit about annex A there is no remote participation. And this one has already been approved. Because it's occurring slightly less than two months from today. Maybe you want to just take them one by one, Mr. Parsons.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. So in annex A this is the description of this particular remote, I mean interim meeting. This is an in‑person only interim meeting. This has again already ‑‑ I have already approved this actually. So I don't need to approve it again. I can say I approved it again. Next Mr. Betts, please.

 >> WORKING PARTY 3: Yes. Annex B is a face‑to‑face meeting between questions 12 and 14 with the terms of reference are shown here. This will be in Hong Kong. And it will be with remote participation. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much. Any comments on this particular interim meeting? Okay. This is approved.

 >> WORKING PARTY 3: Annex C is a face‑to‑face meeting of question 13. Again with remote participation. It's being hosted by microchip in San Jose. And scroll down a little, you will see the number of documents that question 13 will be tackling. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. Are there any comments on this interim meeting? No. Okay. Thank you. This is approved. Next. We have some virtual meetings.

 >> WORKING PARTY 3: Annex D is a virtual meeting of question 12. Look at the results of question 6 activity on OTSI. Just a single meeting in the beginning of July.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. And it is between 14 and 16 Geneva time. Yes. Okay. Any comments on this? Not seeing any. This is approved.
 And next we have annex E.

 >> WORKING PARTY 3: Yes, so this is a single e‑meeting between questions 13 and 14 to coordinate the synchronization modeling. This is to be held in June.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. June 21st between 13 and 15 Geneva time. Any comments on this one? This is approved.

 >> WORKING PARTY 3: So annex F is an e‑meeting on information modeling and data modeling, track A we just approved the liaison to tell the partner organizations about this. So I hope we can confirm this meeting. And this is a continuation of the meetings that have been held for several years now. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Yes. Thank you. Yeah, we just approved a liaison on this one. This is for these five meetings, 13 to 15 Geneva time. These will be hosted on Zoom because it is the other SDOs who are invited here. So any comments on this one? If not, this is approved. Next.

 >> WORKING PARTY 3: Question 14 had four tracks. They decided they don't need to continue with track B at the moment. If we need to bring that one back, we are going to stick with the existing track numbers. Thank you.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Okay. Thank you very much. And so this is on these five dates in ‑‑ until our next Plenary in November, 13 to 15 Geneva time. Any comments on this one? Not seeing any so it's approved.

 >> WORKING PARTY 3: Annex H is a series of meetings on track D which is OTN and media.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much. So this meeting here is proposed on these dates. Again between 13 and 15, any comments on this one? This virtual meeting series? Not seeing any, so this is approved.
 Thank you very much, Mr. Betts. So I believe that concludes the Working Party 3 report, reports. So thank you very much. So let's continue on our agenda, Ladies and Gentlemen. We have then concluded item 12 as well as items 13 and 14 in the review of the Working Party reports. So now we'll continue items 15 and 16. There are no items here. I mean there is nothing to approve under these. So we'll proceed past them. And then we'll continue on item No. 17. So this is on reports on the liaison promotion coordination group and other roles. So we'll start off with the 17.1. Which is to promotion and coordination group, which is in TD146 of Plenary. And so I'll ask Jean Marie to introduce the report here for the promotion and coordination group.

 >> Jean Marie: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So promotion and coordination held its meeting on last Tuesday 25th April at 6 p.m. to late afternoon. The report itself contained several main sections, mostly promotion, bridging the standardization gap, that means a contribution from the Developing Countries. Liaison from TSAG and TSB and numbers of liaisons such as TDs address to all question as for information or for action. And basically in the report this TDs are sorted out by topics. For example, intersectoral coordination, IMT‑2020, standardization Committee work vocabulary. Artificial Intelligence. So let's go on the first big topic, promotion. We have two subsections. One is review of the promotion item from the last September meeting. And the second one is, of course, the new proposed item for promotion resulting from this meeting.
 So let's go to the promotion ‑‑ to the subtopic review of the promotion from the last meeting. We published three news. And the report contains the link to the news. And we have one currently in the final stage of preparation. I hope that will be published quite soon. Question 13, published text in the ITU news magazine. So here we are put the link of this ITU magazine in the report. And we participate in four international conference. So ITSF‑2022. FC203, the WTSS2023 and the smart week. I don't want to go in to detail. But at each conference a report provide a brief feedback from the speakers. All presentations that we did at this conference on Study Group 15 Web page tutorial.
 So note that during the last FTTH conference held in Madrid, last week, our new Deputy Secretary‑General, Mr. Tomas held a speech. And he pointed out, of course, the work of Study Group 15 on the FTTH and on PON technology. The items resulting from this meeting, we have so far no new items. I got no proposal for consented items to be promoted with ITU news so far. But if after the meeting if you think you have an item to promote, please drop me a mail and we will proceed. We plan to participate to four international events before the end of this year. The first one is WSIS Forum 2023. World Summit on the Information Society for all. And it is basically a crowdsourcing virtual event. And I don't want to go through the details. We will have a workshop on the topic and this workshop will be split in three sessions. And the session duration is one hour. Note the date, that's Monday 22nd of May, 23rd and 25th. And we are in the process of preparing all this session. So because it is a crowdsourcing virtual event we have to assure at the promotion of this event.
 We will also attend for the first time the next generation of after 5G transport conference. We received a invitation and we have a speaker. For the first time we have been asked to present an update on our standardization run by the ECOC 2023 in Glasgow in October. Some work to do.
 And we continue to participate in the ITSF in October, November. We want to attend with the technical session that will be in March next year. I have another typo here. Sorry for that. And with TSB some work that we will so to start to do by the end of May. Now we started the discussion during this promotion and coordination meeting regarding the issues that we have now with exhibition booths. For example, at large conference like OFC or ECOC. We would like to discuss the possibility of get the booths sponsored from our venders and the potential to ‑‑ the opportunity to us for interoperability test or demo platforms.
 So why we would like to do that, first because initially before COVID OFC, for example, was giving us a booth free of charge, right? And they are not doing that anymore. And, of course, if we participating in ECOC they offer us a booth but that's definitely not free of charge. If we want really to emphasize as a standardization work from Study Group 15, there is opportunity to have a booth. But we need to cover the booth on a certain way. So that's a topic started for discussion. And basically the members of ‑‑ so you are requested, you know, to provide feedback on the interests of your companies, of your interest to participate and on potential topic to demonstrate the interoperability or breakfast. And you are requested to continue the discussion via e‑mail exchange with the promotion and coordination group TSB and, of course, our Study Group 15 Chairman.
 And also request that we have several questions published already very nice flyers, which now can be found in our Study Group 15 page, technical flyers. And we request all questions to have at least one flyers showing the key technology. And potentially also technical report on the key topic.
 So simply to remind us flyers do not need A13 justification. Flyers are promotions material. And have the same approval process for the powerpoint that we present at external event. So to mention as a workshop, organized by Study Group 13 on future trend 2030 and beyond which will be held in Geneva from 24 to 28 July. We are requested to give an insight of our work. Especially regarding optical transport work including support for IMT2030 and beyond. Surely some more. So that is basically regarding promotion. To remember that TSB offers a possibility to ‑‑ for video interview with our experts. There was one this week. Rapporteur of question 6 has been interviewed. And, of course, remember IEEE communication magazine, a question can publish some document, some text around the respective work.
 So that was set for promotion. And I want to take the opportunity here to say thank you to all for your contribution for this promotion work. We know it is not so easy because it is promotion ‑‑ promotion is a work that you do on top of your current work.
 So now let's move, scroll down. Thank you. To section 4. We receive four contributions from Developing Countries. Mostly related to the physical infrastructure of broadband network. The author of the contribution attended the meeting of Q5 and Q7. And I met with them to provide additional information and we had really a nice discussion. I thought that was really great. And I would like that for the next Plenary meetings that we could have an opportunity to better understand the requirement of our Developing Countries. So this contribution is the subject of the liaison to the ITU‑D sector. And to the Study Group 11. So liaison is in annex 1 of the report. We will go through at the end. All right?
 So now I now go through the liaison from TSAG and others to Study Group. And I will only point out the liaisons that requested response from us.
 There is two liaisons related to ‑‑ now I'm looking for. Okay. Scroll down to intersector coordination section 9. Thank you. Section 9. We have ‑‑ we receive a liaison from ITU‑D on disaster risk reduction and management. And our response, liaison response is in annex 2. We have also another liaison from ITU‑D Study Group 2. This is a request for collaboration on raising awareness and sharing experience and improving connectivity. And here we have a response that is annex 3. We could use ‑‑ okay. You scroll down to section 11. We, of course, responded to GCA IMT‑2020 request to update roadmap and project list that's in annex 4. There is an attachment to this liaison. We do note that all liaisons receive for action for Artificial Intelligence, machine learning has been dealt by the question 12 and 14.
 And now if you could scroll down to section 13, thank you. We receive liaison related to SCV. That means standardization Committee vocabularies. And our SCV liaison Rapporteur and Study Group 15 Vice‑Chairman started to work on the liaison to respond. And during this meeting we receive feedback from our Working Party in order to complete the text of this liaison. The liaison is in annex 5. And we got also several other incoming liaisons to respond. Joint Smart Cities task force. That's also ‑‑ we respond that is liaison in annex 6. And the last one it's the liaison that we usually receive for Study Group 2 on telecommunication management and OAM project plan. And that's in annex 7 with two attachments.
 So far the report I suggest that we now go through the liaison.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. So we will go through the liaisons. Before we do that are there any comments on the report?

 >> Jean Marie: No, I simply want to say thank you to everyone because we know that giving update or feedback on all these liaisons addressed to you all, it is not so easy. That's a job that you do at the end of your priority list. Thank you to all for your contribution. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Yes. And thank you Jean Marie for your excellent work in coordinating all of the questions and working parties to provide input on these TDs that coming in for question. All as well as on the promotion activity which I think is a very, very important piece that we need to do for Study Group 15.
 Are there any other comments, Ladies and Gentlemen? If not we can approve to your report and move on to the liaisons. I think you have introduced them.

 >> Jean Marie: No, you can go through them. If there is a question then I can answer.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much. We will continue with the liaisons. The first one here in annex 1 is liaison to ‑‑ for information to ITU‑D Study Group 1 Question 1 and Study Group 2 Question 4 as well as Study Group 11. This is on the contributions that we received from Developing Countries indicating to them our review of them and what we have done as a result of that.
 Any comments on this liaison? If not, we can ‑‑ we'll approve this one. The next liaison in annex 2 is to ITU‑D for information to Question 3 of ITU‑D. This is on disaster risk reduction and management and is in reply to the liaison request from them. So you scroll down, we'll see some of the background that was indicated, material we have from some of the questions here, 7 and 8 I believe. And so is there any comments on this text? If not, this is approved. The next liaison we have is in annex 3. This is on some collaboration here. So if you scroll down, we'll see that this is in reply to their request. And what on connectivity and underlying infrastructure. And so this is a liaison with attachment list of Study Group 15 documents. So this is attachment is this in a TD? I think I saw from you there was a set of zip documents with attachment. Is that here or provided separately to TSB?

 >> Jean Marie: No, no that's normally attached to the report. 146 report in the zip. We have all attachments in the zip.

 >> HIROSHI OTA: Okay. The attachments were missing. So we will post it immediately after.

 >> Jean Marie: Ahh. I drop it to TSB normally.

 >> CHAIR: That's fine. So TSB will update the TD146 with the zips in the attachment. And so then it will be obvious what the attachments are that need to be attached here. Any further comments on this liaison? If not, then this is approved. The next one in annex 4 is liaison for information to the JCA and IMT‑2020. This is a response to the information to ‑‑ I mean the request to update the roadmap. And if we scroll down here, we will see the ‑‑ our response here on what we are ‑‑ what we are doing to update this. And again the attachment that will be in the zip. Or that is in the zip that will be attached to the revised version. Any comments on this one, Ladies and Gentlemen? Okay. Not seeing any, this is approved. The next one liaison statement is in annex 5. This liaison statement is for information to SCV on ‑‑ this is a reply from a liaison that they sent on definitions that are being developed in other Study Groups. We have some comments on some of these definition that were proposed and were providing them, our definitions that are perhaps related for some of them. But we don't have comments on all of them.
 Okay. If you scroll down, I think there is any attachments here. Any comments on this liaison? Not seeing any, this is approved. Next is annex 6, this is a liaison for information to Study Group 20 on their response on their activity on mapping work on Smart Sustainable Cities from vis SDOs. If you scroll down you will see the response that we have here from Study Group 15 providing some input to them.
 Any comments on this one? If not, this is approved. And the next one is in annex 7 is liaison for information to Study Group 2 on a response to their liaison on the OAM project plan. If we scroll down, then that provides some feedback on our work here. And there are a number of attachments here as well.
 Okay. Any comments on this? Not seeing any, then this is an approved liaison as well. And then that concludes the liaison set here. So thank you very much, Jean Marie, for the excellent report. And well done work here. So next on our agenda is 17.2, electronic working methods. This is in TD182 of PLEN. And I'll ask Mr. Dolan to present this one, please.

 >> Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Wait for it to come up. So it is displayed there. This is TD182 of PLEN. It is the report of the UWN coordinators of which I am one. And the other two. We were appointed by the Opening Plenary. And in my absence these fine gentlemen nominated me as a Rapporteur. We have not going to issue a liaison. I'm presenting our report. We solicit input via e‑mail questions, if you have something that you have a problem with, come and get us one way or the other. It is not that hard to find colleagues here. There are three or four topics introduced with a little editing here. So ITU facilities, there is a TSAG document that talks about the experience to try to run meetings both in person and virtually. So hybrid meetings when you are trying to monitor the floor, monitor the chat and deal with displaying documents and that said using a second monitor would help enormously there.
 So that's history. But what we're concerned about or what some ‑‑ let me stop here. When I say we, we're not representing ourselves. We're representing input from all of you.
 So we ‑‑ concerns have been expressed to us when the meets are held in CICG if we will have the same excellent facilities that we have here. And there is a list of things that Delegates feel are important and they want people to think about in terms of planning facilities and meetings. Not just at CICG but during the hiatus when the new buildings are being built, we have to go elsewhere. There is notation we greatly appreciate I think all of us, the support from the TSB and the IS people in particular I would mention perhaps a little unfair to the ones that you don't see, Gent, the gentleman runs around getting everything started in the morning that's much support. Coordination with ITU staff. This is a comment from us as coordinators. We feel it would be most efficient and most useful if we could talk directly to the staff here in Geneva about problems that we have rather than issuing liaisons to TSAG and having that come back down. Hiroshi has pointed us out to people in the building that we have already talked to and are quite supportive and willing to talk to us in the future. As Mr. Parsons said that's the advantage of face‑to‑face meetings for doing our work. It is one of the advantages of being here in Geneva and talk to these guys one to one and it is much appreciated they are willing to do that. You have probably heard these before, people who use Macs still find the sync tool difficult to use. I didn't make this comment. But I know it's true because I find it difficult to use on a Mac. So there is a couple of comments there related to that.
 I have to say when I looked at some of this material and we're reporting it because you reported it to us when I looked at it I was kind of like guys go and deal with yourselves. Some of these things, configuration of your client, of your PC is not really responsibility of the TSB.
 Perhaps your colleagues who could help there as well. IFA, everyone loves, I think that everyone loves the IFA. Everyone that could use it loves it I think. Some people apparently find it hard to use and would appreciate some tutorials or demonstrations in helping learn how to use it.
 And the presence of these kind of informal index files that you may have seen lurking in the bottom of some of these directories it is noted here.
 I picked on ITU Question 11 because I know that Mr. Huber generated this file. This kind of an old school way of providing a repository and useful information about this. And its documents. People do find it useful but it is an onerous task whoever maintains it to maintain it. There seems to be an intent to try a new SharePoint as an alternative and the EW coordinators would greatly appreciate feedback, for example, Working Party 3 or Question 11 if they do decide to use SharePoint to understand the benefits and drawbacks and to disseminate that material more widely throughout the Study Group.
 The IGM SharePoint there is a complaint or an observation here that it does not currently have a way to go back and look at RGM meetings from previous periods in the same way. If you go look at our Study Group main page you can go back and find previous periods. There is a suggestion is adding to the IGM work space is useful. But in the latest update I guess of My Meetings and we've received no feedback on that My Meetings, I would add my feedback that I think it works fantastically almost all the time.
 Study Group 15 Web pages, this again, I scratch my head and go wow. If you go to Google and ask them for ITU Study Group 15 you get pointed to an obnoxious old page. This is stale information inside of Google. It is well‑known that you can nix or manipulate search indexing. Robots, meta tags, blah blah. There is a suggestion that ITU could perhaps go fix that for us. Do something so that when you type in ITU‑T Study Group 15 you actually get to a more useful page.
 Of course you could also actually just work it out, put it in to your browser yourself and save it as a link. E‑mail list usage, we still see this feature, if you send to multiple lists you get an acknowledgement only from one and you scratch your head and wonder gosh did it go to the other one. Now that we have people we can talk to one‑on‑one we will bring this up again and see, you know, whether this is something that we can hope to be fixed or whether it's just too difficult and not going to happen.
 So we'll continue to inform you of the progress or lack of with that.
 DDP, which I think works pretty well, but then I don't often submit contributions with long lists of companies, apparently that's problematic and painful and it is more problematic if you want to R1DDP document to add other people, other supporters.
 And so we will make this observation to the IT responsibilities and see if they can help with that.
 There is also an interesting suggestion that about having, you know, prefilled or default information filled in there so that when you go to the DDP a document it understands who you are and fills in some default information.
 So that's it really. That last line there says apparently, TSAG going to rewrite DDP. I don't think that TSAG would rewrite. There are plans to rewrite DDP. In conclusion we thank all of for your inputs. Frankly there weren't that many. We wish there were more. I got zero. They bore the brunt of collecting the input and creating the draft of this report while I was doing other things. If there are any questions I would like to entertain them.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you. Are there any questions or comments on this UWM report? I have one I will just reiterate what I mentioned in the Opening Plenary, the UWM team would very much appreciate us meeting with them in person while we're here. As you indicated from the next meeting you can as well as meeting amongst yourselves maybe you could meet amongst yourselves in the first week and then arrange a meeting with the UWM team to discuss whatever issues are outstanding with them. So whether it is just one of them or different people as we said before that in‑person interaction is probably easier to resolve any of these issues.

 >> Thank you. Yes. Agreed.

 >> CHAIR: Okay. Thank you. And so there's nothing notable here for us to send to TSAG, so we won't be sending a liaison to them on this point. We a little bit passed the bottom of the hour. We are almost to the bottom of the agenda. So if I'll beg your indulgence to continue probably for another 15 minutes and then we can conclude the Study Group 15 Plenary. Do we have a comment? Mr. Brown.

 >> Mr. Brown: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If this is the appropriate time to raise it I'm not sure but I wanted to raise it before you close the meeting. When we were reviewing the E13 justifications for updating supplements, I happen to note by accident that SUP39 had some inappropriate text in this. I raised this issue with you during the coffee break. Since then I have noted that it is much larger problem than just SUP39. There are significant number of supplements that have the recommendation boilerplate text suggesting it is a normative document. As well as having many of these as well as having mandatory text using shalls and musts in the text.
 It's probably not practical to try to go back and fix all of these completely. That would be the ideal solution. But finding editors to do that may be a problem. I would like to make a couple of suggestions. One suggestion is that we request the TSB to fix the problem of the boilerplate text on all the supplements. I suspect this goes beyond Study Group 15 in fact. It is probably quite widespread. To put the right boilerplate text on it clearly spells it out as an informative document.
 The second request I would like to make is for us to update our Study Group 15 guidelines and potentially the editor Guidelines to let people know they should not use the words must and shall within supplements and that these supplements are informative documents. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

 >> CHAIR: Thank you very much for that comment. Yes, so we'll ‑‑ I'll ask TSB to review the boilerplates on the supplements as we had indicated we would do during the coffee break. And if this is a bigger issue, then ‑‑ so we'll let TSB review that and discuss with me. If it is a bigger issue I will submit something on this point to TSAG Study Group 15 Chair, if it is not only one template, for example, I don't think that's it. But in case. I'll make that a determination after I discuss with our counselor on it if this can be resolved expeditiously or if we need to revise them. In any case we will assess that. The second point on the Guidelines, the Guidelines indicate what you already say. We will have a look at so that it is clear, that supplements are informative and should not include any language that would make one think that it is a normative specification. The same thing for goes for appendices within recommendations. And it is clearly indicated at the top of the appendix that this is informative. It should also shouldn't have any language to elude it is normative. We will have a look at the Guidelines before our next Plenary to make sure it is clear. Thank you for raising these points. You have taken note of this Mr. Hiroshi. We will continue no later than 1 p.m. I think we can finish our agenda. The next item is 17.3 which is appointment of liaison Rapporteurs and actually there is only one and we have alluded to this already in a liaison we have seen before. We will show us TD123 R2 and go down to the bottom here where will should be a new liaison Rapporteur for the JCA on machine learning. Maybe it is not at the bottom. Maybe it was inserted in alphabetical order.
 Yes. So the JVA on machine learning, so this is appointing Jingling Yi from CICT as Rapporteur to this JCA. Any comments here? All right. So appointed and approved. I'm sorry. Please.

 >> I had an affiliation change since I was assigned the FCM liaison at the last Plenary.

 >> CHAIR: I thought we covered that at the Opening Plenary. We will just check to make sure. But I think we already did that. Yes, there it is. Thank you very much.
 Okay. Thank you. So next let's move to agenda item 18, this is in TD167 of GEN. So this is a ‑‑ the indication of our future Plenaries and our hosting arrangements or encouragements.
 So with this TD I'd just like to remind everyone as you are probably aware because I mentioned it last time that the ITU will be demolishing the Varembe building and that's supposed to have already started. There has been some delays. And it won't start until after summer. But in any case when it starts there there will be no meetings at least while the demolition is underway, possibly while the construction under way. We will need to find alternative locations to hold our Study Group meetings. It is not just us. It's all of the ITU meetings we'll need to find alternative arrangements. As we noted last year we were able to find some time where the CICG building was available later this year. We agreed to take those two weeks and to have this Plenary here. So we reduced our cadence a little bit. And so we're meeting every 7 months. The third Plenary will be November 20 to December 1 to CICG. That's the situation. While traditionally the intent or the tradition has been only Member States has been hosting Plenaries outside. They are currently negotiating with both Member States and sector members to host Study Group meetings.
 So I would encourage if there is any sector members or Member States here that would be interested in hosting one of our future meetings, you are most welcome and encouraged to do that.
 So after the third meeting of this study period, we have the fourth meeting, which is intended to be July of next year. So there are two negotiations under way. One is to hold it in Montreal, back to back with the IEEE 802 Plenary. We would meet for two weeks as Study Group 15 and then have joint workshop with IEEE 802 and then the IEEE 802 Plenary would continue in the same facility. The plan B or backup plan is arrangement for a date slightly earlier than that but to be held here in Geneva at the yet undisclosed and not yet agreed alternative location that ITU hopes would be able to host meetings in Geneva. But we have pencilled in these dates as indicated here. These are two options for next July. Or June/July for the fourth Plenary of the Study Group. We would have hoped that we would have finished negotiations by now certainly on the Montreal option. That hasn't concluded. The Geneva option won't be concluded until ITU Council meets in July of this year. And so we'll let you know for sure at the November Plenary of Study Group 15. But for now, these are the two alternative dates for the fourth Plenary.
 And so but for the remaining Plenaries for the next study period and I have listed some tentative dates for the next study period, starting in 2025, these are dates that we don't have any hosts for. And it's also not clear if there will be facilities here in Geneva at this time as well. And so if there is any sector member who is interested in hosting, or if there's any Member State interested in hosting, please come talk to me or Hiroshi and we can discuss some details with you.
 Now what we have in the rest of this document, if you scroll down a bit here, Hiroshi, is the ‑‑ some high level view on the expectations of hosting where the host covers all of the meeting and facility support costs, defrays the cost of TSB travel expenses and, of course, provides Visa letters. As you may recall at our last Study Group 15 meeting as allowed by A1 we agreed the exception that hosts could charge a meeting fee if they felt that they needed to do that in order to defray the costs of host. It is a significant burden to host Study Group 15, especially if we grow to 400 in person attendees.
 And so please take note of that. The main point I want to highlight here is that all members are invited to consider hosting a future Study Group 15 meeting with the dates in 2025 are the dates that we need to start looking at.
 So that's my pitch for a host. I will be talking to some of you offline to encourage you to consider hosting. But please come reach out to me as well.
 Any comments or questions on future Study Group 15 meetings? Okay. Seeing none, there is an annex here with some typical requirements for Study Group 15 meeting with typical sizing and such.
 Historical sizage shall we say. So let's move to the next agenda item, which is agenda item 19. This is the draft Study Group 15 report. I will give you a preview of the report from the Study Group. There are some highlights in here in yellow which indicate text that is to be filled in. And then there's the other text that we have here. So we would ‑‑ we'll publish this of course after the meeting. But I would welcome if you have any input on this to either let me know now or comment to me.
 Okay. So let's just scroll down. So this is the report here with the various reports and then the determined text that we'll have in the report and then some general information on when we met. And the closing remarks of our director, which I didn't know what he would say before he said them here, earlier this morning. And then summarizing that we ‑‑ the opening agenda was here. And this is what we reviewed. And we agreed our meeting reports from the last time we appointed the liaison Rapporteurs as well as new Rapporteurs and Working Party Chairs as we did in the Opening Plenary. Then there were some highlights from TSAG that I reported on. Summarizing that. Summarizing that we have approved the texts from the last except for the one, I didn't say except for one. I said the 46 that were approved. And then brought attention to the candidate list for text at this meeting that we have in the document approval. And then the promotion and coordination meeting that was held earlier this week as well as the newcomers with the text there.
 And then finally my point on that I continue to say, that the value of these in‑person meetings. And the human interaction that we have, the interpersonal interaction is essential for reaching consensus. And we really appreciated Nokia for hosting the networking reception. So thank you again for that. And I'll be asking others of you to host future receptions at our next Plenaries. So because I think this is very important to allow us to have these networking events and again thank you for all of those of you here in the room who attended here in person. Then we have the organizations, the objectives we had in the Opening Plenary we reviewed. This is now the list of appointments of indicating here the new Working Party 2 Chairman, the new Question 4 Rapporteur, 14 Rapporteur. I do have the whole list and the new liaison Rapporteurs that we did as well. Knowing that we updated the guidance. This is for the ASUP4. We going to look at it again in context of what was mentioned by Mr. Brown. And then we had lots of documents, nearly 700 documents and liaison statements. The work program was updated as indicated here in the various documents. And we will have the list of approved documents. We did the IPR call. And then these are the list of documents that we'll indicate here recommendations approve ‑‑ that's wrong on 4.4 because we did approve a recommendation under TAP at this meeting. We need to change that. And then there is the determined consented approved, we didn't delete anything. So we don't need that annex either.
 So that's ‑‑ I'm just noting that. We reviewed this several times already. We will review that and delete that after we post the report. And then the electronic working methods report that was just given and some summary of that that we'll include here.
 The promotion and coordination report that we approved, and then sending the liaisons and then the list of ANT, HNT and NOT work plans here, our lead Study Group point, the newcomers meeting that we had. And then the list of liaison statements that we sent. We didn't qualify any new groups at this meeting. And we approved a bunch of interim meetings, internal meetings. We thank you Nokia for hosting the event, the networking event. We need hosts for future Plenary meetings because we don't have a stable conclusion on where we are going to meet for Geneva next July. There are two negotiations underway one. Of course we will pick one of them. We're not going to meet in two places. So we'll pick one of them. And we'll do that ‑‑ hopefully that will happen before November. In worst case we will be deciding that in November. That's the draft report. So besides the points that I noted already that we'll change before we make that a report, are there any comments or questions on this report? Mr. Brown, please.

 >> Mr. Brown: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Is it worth noting in the report the problem that I highlighted about the supplements, that it gets addressed?

 >> CHAIR: We can certainly do that. I indicated that I would mention the second point on the Guidelines and we can mention the first point on the supplements. We will include that as well. We'll talk about that in any case offline. And as I said as well if necessary, I'll bring forward a contribution to TSAG on this if this needs to be escalated. Okay. Any further comments or questions, Ladies and Gentlemen? Okay. Seeing none, then we can continue with agenda item 20. So unfortunately, we are not going to be able to meet during the third quarter today. Because we don't have any further business to conclude. So we'll conclude now. So there won't be any meeting in the third quarter. And but before we conclude, I would like to thank my management team, the Chairs, Vice‑Chairs and the Working Party Chairs for the excellent work in coordinating and leading the group such that we do not have to meet in the third quarter here. There is no issues brought forward here that we needed to deal with.
 Thanks to the I guess what we call the extended leadership team, which includes all the Rapporteurs that we took a picture of here earlier this morning. And those pictures will be available on the ITU Flickr site later on. I will send out an e‑mail to the link when it is available. Most of all, thanks to the experts, especially those who stayed here for the Closing Plenary. We had over 250. There is not 250 here. Thank you for those who stayed for the Closing Plenary. Thanks to our counselors, Hiroshi and Norukir who is sitting in the back there. And Emmanuel who is on vacation. But she helped us in the beginning but also Shabina who helped us from Study Group 13. And finally, of course there is the rest of the TSB staff, I mean Gent was helping us with the coordination and then Marc helps us booking the meetings, the interim meetings. Thank you to Ana for helping usher us in and finding our seats in the rooms. And finally thank you to the captioners. Thank you for captioning and we're just about out at the timeout for the captioners. So I think now it is time to conclude the meeting. So thank you, everyone. And this meeting is adjourned. And now that it is adjourned I would like to ‑‑ we're going to have a short little brief meeting with the management team. After that I would like to invite you for a toast out in the lobby and we will toast to the close. I will see in the lobby in five or ten minutes. Thank you.
 (Session concluded at 1 CET)
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