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**3GPP SA4 #115-e Speech Quality Sub-Working Group**

The SQ SWG during SA4#115-e (30 participants) was held in four telcos (1-hour time slots). The SQ SWG e-mail discussions during the meeting can be tracked here:

<https://list.etsi.org/scripts/wa.exe?A0=3GPP_TSG_SA_WG4_SQ>

**Executive summary**

The meeting handled 12 documents including 4 output documents. The meeting outcome is summarized below:

* **Maintenance:** One Rel-17 CR to 26.131 in S4-211282 fixing one missing figure (Fig. 10), harmonizing the format of figures and fixing editorial issues has been agreed.
* **ATIAS (Terminal Audio quality performance and Test methods for Immersive Audio Services)**: No Tdoc at this meeting.
* **HaNTE (Handsets Featuring Non-Traditional Earpieces)**: Two input Tdocs have been discussed and noted: updated aggregated round-robin results in S4-211092 and a subjective assessment of DUTs used in the round-robin in S4-211280. The updated HaNTE time plan in S4-211277 has been agreed; the completion is shifted to Dec. 2021 with one AH telco on HaNTE (see below).
* **HInT (Extension for headset interface tests of UE)**: Initial measurement results validating the current dCRs on HInT in S4-211091 has been reviewed and noted. The dCR to TS 26.132 introducing test methods for the electrical interface has been updated in S4-211281 and agreed. The updated HInT time plan in S4-211278 has been agreed; the completion is shifted to Dec. 2021 with two AH telcos on HInT (see below).

**Agreed adhoc conference calls post SA4#115-e:**

* HaNTE (Oct. 11, 16-17 CEST; Deadline: Oct. 8 23:59 CEST; Host: Qualcomm)
* HInT (Oct. 8, 16-17 CEST; Deadline: Oct. 7 23:59 CEST; Host: HEAD acoustics)
* HInT (Oct. 29, 16-17 CEST; Deadline: Oct. 28 23:59 CEST; Host: HEAD acoustics)

**A.I. 10.1 Opening of the session**

The SQ Chair opens the session at 16:00 CEST on August 19. He shows the agenda including the Tdoc allocation and displays the meeting schedule.

**A.I. 10.2 Registration of documents**

The allocation of input Tdocs as shown in the agenda is agreed (see Annex A for the latest version of the agenda).

**A.I. 10.3 Liaison Statements**

No Tdoc in this A.I.

See EVS SWG report for the handling of S4-211069.

**A.I. 10.4 CRs to Features in Release 16 and earlier, and other contributions on terminal acoustics**

Stéphane: 1104 has been submitted by the deadline, and the revision in 1178 came one day after, are there any objections to take the late revision in 1178?

**Answer: none**

Stéphane: In this case, we go for the presentation of 1178

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [**S4-211104**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_SA/WG4_CODEC/TSGS4_115-e/Docs/S4-211104.zip) | Correction of missing figure for WB frequency mask in receiving | Apple, HEAD acoustics GmbH, Orange |

S4-211104 is revised to S4-21178.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [**S4-211178**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_SA/WG4_CODEC/TSGS4_115-e/Docs/S4-211178.zip) | Correction of missing figure for WB frequency mask in receiving (rev1) | Apple, HEAD acoustics GmbH, Orange |

**Presenter:** Jan Reimes

In V10.1.0 of TS 26.131 figures were introduced to illustrate frequency masks in NB and WB. Figure 10 has been missing since this first introduction of figures in TS 26.131. This bug was present in the approved CR (CR0041 SP-11042) and creates some confusion due to a missing figure in a normative specification. Besides, the note below Table 10 indicating that requirements ‘are enforced but are under evaluation’ may be removed (since this text dates back to 2011).

The following changes are implemented: Figure 10 is introduced and the note indicating that limits are under evaluation is removed. To avoid an inconsistent presentation of masks in figures, all other figures in NB, WB and SWB are corrected (in an editorial way) using the generation script. Minor editorial fixes are also implemented: an editorial fix in a caption (Figure 14a), wrong closing bracket (left over), table formatting.

**Comments / questions:**

Tomas: I saw the caption for Fig. 10 has a different style, styling could be changed.

Stéphane: good point, we will need a rev2 to fix this

any other comment on the contents?

**Answer: no**

Stéphane: any comment on the release? this CR is for Rel17, there may be companies asking for earlier releases to be fixed.

Jan: looking at agenda, not sure if the agenda item for the CR is correct as it mentions Rel16 or earlier, and if an editorial CR can be limited only to the latest release

Stéphane: The agenda item 10.4 refers to “CRs to Features in Release 16 and earlier, and other contributions on terminal acoustics”, so it is correct. The CR is a Cat F CR so it is not an editorial CR, if it was a Cat D CR it would not be justified to fix a frozen release, but in principle one may consider going back in previous releases with good justification, potentially not back to Rel10.

Can we keep the CR for Rel17 only?

**Answer: yes**

Stéphane: we can conclude that a rev2 of the CR fixing only the styles is required, the source companies are invited to check the styles in all changes. We can allocate a new Tdoc number for the rev2 version, it will be in S4-211279.

Anybody requesting to see this revision in the wrap-up session?

**Answer: no**

Stéphane: can we agree on this revision rev2 fixing only styles without presentation?

**Answer: yes**

**Decision:** S4-211178 is revised to S4-211279.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **S4-211279** | Correction of missing figure for WB frequency mask in receiving (rev2) | Apple, HEAD acoustics GmbH, Orange |

**Decision:** S4-211279 is initially agreed without presentation.

A draft version of S4-211279 is shared in the Drafts/SQ folder for review. A comment is received with suggestion of extra editorial improvements. See email discussion:

<https://list.etsi.org/scripts/wa.exe?A2=3GPP_TSG_SA_WG4_SQ;bee25fc6.2108C&S>=

<https://list.etsi.org/scripts/wa.exe?A2=3GPP_TSG_SA_WG4_SQ;f1913a4.2108C&S>=

<https://list.etsi.org/scripts/wa.exe?A2=3GPP_TSG_SA_WG4_SQ;6fe81c56.2108C&S>=

Stéphane: the draft of S4-211279 is limited to fixing the style of the caption for Fig. 10; based on the comments received by email, can we reopen the status of S4-211279?

**Answer: yes**

Stéphane: Suggest producing S4-211279 based on the previous discussion and revising it into a new version.

S4-211279 is revised to S4-211282.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **S4-211282** | Correction of missing figure for WB frequency mask in receiving (rev3) | Apple, HEAD acoustics GmbH, Orange |

**Presenter:** Fabrice Plante

When S4-211178 was presented, it was found that table headings could be further harmonized, in SWB table have both frequency and dB units. The suggested updates are purely editorial, but it would be better to have explicit units even if the text defines things in dB.

**Comments / questions:**

Stéphane: any objection to the draft version of S4-211282 from Drafts/SQ?

**Answer: no**

Stéphane: Fabrice is tasked to produce S4-211282 based on Drafts/SQ with some minor front page corrections (Tdoc numbers, rev1 and no change marks in front page) that can be done without presentation.

**Decision:** S4-211282 is agreed.

**A.I. 10.5 ATIAS (Terminal Audio quality performance and Test methods for Immersive Audio Services)**

No Tdoc in this A.I.

**A.I. 10.6 HaNTE (Handsets Featuring Non-Traditional Earpieces)**

Stéphane: suggest going in numerical order, take first 1092 and later 1105

Andre: Jan provided offline the Excel spreadsheet with all objective values from the round-robin, now I have values and I could create an appendix to add to 1105 and show this, can we revise documents during the meeting?

Stéphane: as a technical group we should be open to consider more data, if there is no objection, we can allocate a new Tdoc number, the revision of 1105 will be in 1280.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [**S4-211092**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_SA/WG4_CODEC/TSGS4_115-e/Docs/S4-211092.zip) | Aggregated results of HaNTE round robin test (update) | HEAD acoustics GmbH |

**Presenter:** Jan Reimes

This Tdoc contains the same results as in the previous version of the document, the main difference is in lab 1, which did some retests because in previous results some calibration issues were found offline, otherwise the contents is very similar. DUT 6 is damaged with cracks in display, data should be taken with care and Qualcomm even excluded this and it was left out for their measurement and analysis.

Results are overall more consistent now.

**Comments / questions:**

Stéphane: could results be presented separately for the two HATS types to see if there is even more consistency for a given HATS type?

Andre: this is one thing of concern, see loudness, quite a bit of difference, see Fig. 20, high difference for 2 different HATS with the same DUT

Jan: in lab 4, in some cases there was different volume settings between 2 HATS types, see Table 7

Antero: on volume level in lab 4, our specialist found that there was different sensitivity and a bit of frequency response difference, so he chose to adjust to the desired levels

Stéphane: lab 1 has been some retesting, should we invite other labs to double check results?

Jan: for lab 2, we don’t think we need retesting, we conducted extensive measurements and each test was done twice

Alain: it can be possible for lab 3 to redo some tests in September

Antero: I don’t know if we need to repeat and if the data would show something different, we could consider repeats of some tests

Stéphane: what is the view of the Rapporteur on this?

Andre: lab 1 has calibration off, this is fixed, unless we did something wrong if the issue is this. Within a lab you see variations, there is a problem of general repeatability of this test. The question is how to handle this conclusion. My opinion is that the tests are not reproducible across different equipments. Maybe there is inconsistency between what we get for HaNTE and non-HaNTE devices. It is difficult to say, we need to wrap-up.

Jan: in general I agree with Jan, we should compare first with subjective data, only for one device we had the recommended MECRP point, for others we used the same, but this MECRP may not be suitable, this could be a reason for variations with shifts on the left or right.

Antero: good point, other reason, devices are quite different, from different time from design to time to market, they use different technologies, but there are under the umbrella of HaNTE. There is a different integration, and for the traditional device we had only one example, there could have been different selections and price points.

Some DUTs passed current masks for frequency responses, devices with a smoother responses have less variations.

In conclusions can we collect more findings?

Jan: in this Tdoc? conclusions only reflect the views from HEAD acoustics and were not from the group

Andre: conclusions are one thing, what is more important is the CRs for the test plan, which subset of tests do we want to include in the CR? it may be OK for RLR, same for frequency responses, are we OK to include or not new tests, like speech quality or privacy.

Stéphane: this Tdoc represents a lot of work, if interested to capture this, I would suggest proposing an update of the WID to had a CR to the TR on the new acoustics tests (TR 26.931) in scope. This cannot be considered at this meeting, however one may produce the updated WID and corresponding CR to the TR at the next SA4 meeting in November.

Andre: good idea, there are lots of results

Stéphane: time to conclude, can we just note this Tdoc based on this discussion?

**Answer: yes**

**Decision:** S4-211092 is noted

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [**S4-211105**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_SA/WG4_CODEC/TSGS4_115-e/Docs/S4-211105.zip) | Input on subjective assessment of HaNTE devices and relation to objective tests | Qualcomm Incorporated |

S4-211105 is revised to S4-211280.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **S4-211280** | Input on subjective assessment of HaNTE devices and relation to objective tests | Qualcomm Incorporated |

**Presenter:** Andre Schevciw

This contribution reports on informal listening evaluations of Handsets featuring Non-Traditional Earpieces (HaNTE). A test plan was drafted to evaluate, subjectively, similar audio quality attributes tested as part of the HaNTE objective test methods. The test plan was administered to a small sample of subjects, and an analysis and comparison of the results to the objective test methods results performed.

The test methods used in the round robin test seems generally appropriate bearing correlation to the results of an informal listening test. However, the source suggests that a deeper investigation should be conducted on the adequacy of P.863 to assess speech quality for the receive path. In addition, a more careful data analysis and discussion is suggested on the robustness to ECRP shifts test.

**Comments / questions:**

Jan: in section 4.2.4, there is a comparison of artefacts, this is the most interesting figure, I also listened to few files after measurements, also found that DUT8 is an outlier in objective and subjective scores. I have the impression that the P.863 discriminates in an unreasonable way, DUT8 has smoothest transfer function but in speech quality it is not well ranked. This is also what I observed. It is good to have this conclusion backed up in this data.

Andre: DUTs 3, 4 and 8 are the only one that pass the RFR mask when averaging across labs and also with the highest scores for timbre. Why DUT8 is not achieving a good objective score, it’s unknown.

Jan: could have expected the opposite, HaNTE may not be well suited for HATS so could have had low scores compared to DUT8 but it’s not the case.

Andre: DUT8 has a POLQA score of 2.85 on average, this is not a typical POLQA score.

Jan: there may be some frequencies missing, below 200 Hz, not sure, there may be a technical explanation

Other comment on section 4.2.2, on robustness to ECRP and physical attributes, just to understand, you took the standard deviation of RLR? when a point is more on the right it’s less variant?

Andre: yes

Jan: not surprising that DUT8 is bad, with attenuation by 20, 30 or 40 dB, maybe it should be excluded there as there is no signal and one may just evaluate idle noise

Andre: clear, it’s also a poor choice of the subjective semantic descriptor, robustness is defined as comfort, so it’s not surprising that there is no correlation, even if one looks at one sub-attribute, it would be different if instructions explained that robust is how you listen to it at different positions.

Jan: the explanation is not the same as for RLR, when ECRP for DUT8 is quite far way, DUT8 is expected to fail, same for subjective part

Andre: do people have an issue, do they have to center or not, it requires more thinking. Objective tests work, but we have to see if there is a component that matters.

Alain: regarding DUT8, we selected test positions as for HaNTE, not too close to the earpiece, this is the reason why results are not so good for robustness

Andre: the result is bad once we move from the earpiece, it’s not radiating into the canal, but in the soft pinna, so there is high variation. When say that objective test is failing, could be that that with actual subjects there are differences between the actual pinna and HATS. This requires more studies.

Alain: another remark, this study is interesting, did you conduct a subjective test regarding privacy?

Andre: no due to lack of time and constraints with the setup. Don’t know if objective results are clear and there does not seem to be a lot from objective tests on privacy. It is a bit more complicated, in this tests each person could easily alternate between phones, for privacy the phone has to be on a HATS and one would assess loudness from distance, but it could be considered. One has to see if there is a fundamental problem with HaNTE, it did not seem so from objective tests.

Alain: privacy is not so easy to differentiate between devices

Andre: good point, could have measured this one as well

Alain: another comment on the privacy test, I made some mistakes in the round robin, would you agree to send some of the DUTs to compare if we can do better in the lab, one would need one or two device to check the setup

Andre: sync offline, I can send couple of devices

Antero: was it testing with experts?

Andre: yes, not only, there were experienced with BS.2399 assessment.

Antero: did you get comments, not just numbers?

Andre: not many, main comment was that some subjects complained that not assessing at the same loudness, we set up volume to NOM, but 2 or 3 subjects complained we are comparing at different volumes. It is part of the problem, different labs would have come up with different definitions. It depends on how people hold the phones.

Antero: any of testers had prior experience with HaNTE?

Andre: some used such devices before, and participated in an evaluation with HaNTE about 1 year ago or more

Stéphane: did you use any training session or calibration, as the scale goes from 0 to 100?

Andre: semantic clarified the scale, they were experienced listeners and participated before in MUSHRA tests, so they interpret 0 to 100 from MUSHRA

Stéphane: did you consider the ITU-T loudness recommendation to check the issue with DUT8 in loudness?

Andre: don’t know if one can calculate this from the data, DUT8 is an outlier, one hypothesis is related to how you hold it

Stéphane: did you do any randomization to avoid bias in evaluations (e.g. having DUT8 always tested last)?

Andre: there was no explicit order, testers could go back and forth, and used quite a bit of iterations, listening to one DUT or another, but no ordering, including for DUT8

Jan: on P.700 loudness, possible to evaluate with recordings, for ECRP shifts. It will be interesting to see if the variance is the same as for RLR, to see the issue with RLR. It’s a good idea.

Andre: Interesting to see the difference in confidence intervals. For DUT4 there was one outlier, one subject could have been excluded. The problem is with the semantic descriptor.

Jan: for max RLR, the level is set for sure at max, still there is variance, can be explained by method? Maybe the P.700 method shows less variance, will think about it.

Stéphane: little time left for discussion, is it considered to merge this report with the aggregated results, not lose this study?

Andre: makes sense, looks more like a study item

Stéphane: in this case it may be more relevant to prepare a CR to the HaNTE TR (TR 26.801), but this requires to also prepare an updated WID for the next meeting

Andre: looking at results, in some cases, the HEAD acoustics HATS has a higher level, DUT8 is slightly higher, one should look at that and see if there is any significant difference between HATS.

Stéphane: if this report is to be inserted in a CR, you will have to check the formal aspects such as figure captions, etc.

Andre: seems RFR method is doing its job, robustness to fork is interesting as it correlates to vibration, so robustness to fork is good. Speech quality needs to be checked for DUT8, otherwise it would have been suitable. Privacy is for discussion, I have no strong opinion whether to include it or not, but it’s time consuming.

We can discuss offline about the P.700 method. We may consider a dCR ith P.700 loudness.

Jan: can do this

Stéphane: Recall that it is expected to prepare CRs to 26.131 and 26.132 on HaNTE, we will need to update the time plan, which will be in 1277.

**Decision:** S4-211280 is noted.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **S4-211277** | Proposals for data collection of HaNTE – test methods | Qualcomm Inc (Editor) |

**Presenter:** Andre Schevciw

See edits in the draft version shared in Drafts/SQ.

**Comments / questions:**

Stéphane: The WID modification should be in SA4#116-e, having powers in a telco is difficult because SA plenary is too close in September and there is no issue to have the WID updated agreed and the dCR to TR 26.801 in sequence. One should fix also the the Tdoc number in the draft version.

For AH telcos we can then skip the telco with powers to agree on the WID, will park this Tdoc to see the HInT time plan and set the date.

Tomas: CEST if the meeting is in October

(*the meeting checks the draft of* S4-211278)

Stéphane: any proposal for the date?

Andre: can we share a telco with HInT?

Stéphane: if we have a 1-hour slot, this is typically too short to handle both HaNTE and HInT

Andre: suggest a telco on Oct 11

Jan: there is an ITU-T SG12 meeting the week of Oct 11 but could work

Stéphane: can we agree on this date with the usual submission deadline?

**Answer: yes**

**Decision:** S4-211277 is agreed.

The following AH telco dedicated to HaNTE is agreed:

Telco (October 11, 16:00-17:00 CEST; Submission Deadline: October 8 23:59 CEST; Host: Qualcomm Inc)

**A.I. 10.7 HInT (Extension for headset interface tests of UE)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [**S4-211091**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_SA/WG4_CODEC/TSGS4_115-e/Docs/S4-211091.zip) | Initial measurement results for HInT (update) | HEAD acoustics GmbH |

**Presenter:** Jan Reimes

The 3GPP work item HInT introduces test methods and requirements in 3GPP TS 26.131 and TS 26.132 for the analogue and digital headset interface of UE. Based on the latest drafts of change requests for 3GPP TS 26.131 and 26.132, an initial test series was conducted in order to investigate the applicability of test methods as well as the provisional requirements. This document summarizes initial results for several devices and electrical interface types.

For testing the performance of electrical (headset) interface according to the latest draft CR to TS 26.131/132 and latest proposals, initial results were obtained in a test series with several recent mobile phones. Three DUTs are used, there is no jack for DUT1 and DUT2 so an adapter is used in this case.

Due to time constraints, only the most important measurements could be tested, reviewed and reported so far. In case of a schedule extension of the work item HInT, more analyses are expected for SA4#116-e. However, the preliminary agreed setup and test descriptions seem to work as expected. Also, the provisional requirements are already in a reasonable range.

**Comments / questions:**

Stéphane: suggest going section by section to structure the discussion

(*Jan scrolls over each section and asks for comments question*)

* on clause 4.2.1:

Fabrice: fails are mainly for NB analog, could be something with the setup?

Jan: all fails are for NB-A, except DUT1 in WB, but good point, measurements were not done the same day and week, I have to check if this is a systematic error or due to the USB-C interface, I will also check the fails for idle noise

* on clause 4.3:

 Stéphane: there are currently no masks defined in the dCR to 26.131, companies are welcome to consider proposing masks to progress

Jan: I would propose curves wrt P.381, with a correction for NB send, otherwise P.381 masks seem feasible. One might consider send side that flat is demanded for field testing. Not sure it is relevant, masks could be almost flat with more freedom in high frequencies.

Fabrice: tried masks in handset for send and receive, instead of P.381?

Jan: not yet, the reason for the tilt in high frequency has been discussed, send masks for handset are more flat, did not try to check, but high frequencies are quite flat

Fabrice: have two curves to update masks

Stéphane: clarify?

Fabrice: instead of P.381, one should check how this would look like for masks for handset

Jan: not looking for best frequency masks that no device would pass

receive masks are good to propose in 26.131

* on clause 4.7:

Fabrice: for Bluetooth, thought we had no delay requirement

Jan: this is a provisional value

Stéphane: for headset we have no requirement, for electrical interface?

Fabrice: there is no requirement for Bluetooth in 26.131 and 26.132, doubt that we can have no delay margin for Bluetooth based on the results

Jan: can define different values for electrical interface types, we had a proposal for each case

Stéphane: good input to have a sanity check on the current draft requirements, it will be updated in a future meeting, suggest noting this Tdoc

**Decision:**  S4-211091 is noted

Stéphane: It seems we will not finalize requirements this meeting, we will update the time plan for HInT, this will be in S4-211278.

Should we consider any online editing of the latest version of the dCR to 26.131 based on S4-211091? Any supporting an online editing session to edit requirements?

**Answer: no**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [**S4-211156**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_SA/WG4_CODEC/TSGS4_115-e/Docs/S4-211156.zip) | DraftCR TS26.132 on Headset Interface Description (update) | HEAD acoustics GmbH |

**Presenter:** Jan Reimes

This Tdoc is the same as S4-210945, except that some comments are updated. This is the same text otherwise.

**Comments / questions:**

Stéphane: on the first updated comment, should there be any requirement on the adapter?

Jan: just different connections, electrical signals are the same, there are two types of adapter, one for 2ch and one with an additional microphone signal, this could be clarified, both work

Stéphane: about comment with editor’s note on max level, should be set to max?

Jan: If we remove the Editor’s note, we set it to max, and a phone would fail if the volume control is not well handled, prefer to have it this way

Stéphane: can we agree on removing the Editor’s note?

**Answer: yes**

Jan: thank you, I will do the edit

Stéphane: we will have to revised this Tdoc, the revision will be in 1281

**Decision:** S4-211156 is revised to S4-211281

Stéphane: invite Rapporteurs to share an updated HInT time plan for the wrap-up session

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **S4-211281** | DraftCR TS26.132 on Headset Interface Description (update) | HEAD acoustics GmbH |

**Presenter:** Jan Reimes

This Tdoc is the same as S4-211156. See DIFF version in Drafts/SQ for updates (clarification on USB-C, types of sockets...)

**Comments / questions:**

Stéphane: last update on removing the Editor’s note was already agreed, suggest reviewing other changes one by one.

(*Jan scrolls over changes)*

Jan: no comment on reference and abbreviations

* in clause 4.4:

Stéphane: same results for both interfaces (analog and digital)?

Hans: performance differs

Stéphane: this is new text, so we have to check if this can be added or put in brackets

Jan: something to discuss, for digital we have also wireless (Bluetooth)

Tomas: if several interfaces, all to be tested? or, if not tested, those could be not working fine

Jan: could test all of them

Stéphane: Bluetooth is so far not tested for headset mode

Jan: leave it in brackets

(*Jan adds brackets around the new text*)

* in clause 5.1.6.1:

Stéphane: also new text, seems one could illustrate the paragraph with a kind of block diagram to clarify

Fabrice: request to put this in brackets, want to add comments into the main text?

Jan: no, comments are more informal, we have a long IF THEN ELSE sequence, this could be illustrated

(*Jan adds brackets around the new text*)

Stéphane: can we agree on this update with online edits?

**Answer: yes**

**Decision:** S4-211281 is agreed

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S4-211278** | Time Plan for HInT, v0.6 |  | HEAD acoustics GmbH, Orange |

**Presenter:** Jan Reimes

See edits in the draft version shared in Drafts/SQ.

**Comments / questions:**

Stéphane: proposed dates for two telcos?

Jan: suggest Oct 8 and Oct 28

Stéphane: can we agree on the time plan with these two dates?

**Answer: yes**

**Decision:** S4-211278 is agreed.

The following AH telco dedicated to HInT are agreed:

Telco (October 8, 16:00-17:00 CEST; Submission Deadline: October 7 23:59 CEST; Host: HEAD acoustics GmbH)

Telco (October 29, 16:00-17:00 CEST; Submission Deadline: October 28 23:59 CEST; Host: HEAD acoustics GmbH)

**A.I. 10.8 New Work / New Work Items and Study Items**

None.

**A.I. 10.9 Any other business**

Fabrice: will output Tdocs be handled in the Block B closing plenary?

Stéphane: SQ SWG (like EVS SWG) does no go with Block A/B divisions, so we will have SQ handled on Friday in the closing plenary.

**A.I. 10.10 Close of the session**

The SQ Chair thanked all delegates for their participation and contributors. He commented that at this meeting there was no Tdoc on ATIAS and he invited to contribute to progress this WI. He noted that HaNTE and HInT were supposed to be finalized at this meeting, and the completion is shifted by one meeting; he invited to contribute to next meetings (including AH telcos).

The meeting was closed at 16:49 CEST on August 25.
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