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# 1 Introduction

TSAG Rapporteur Group on Working Methods (RG-WM) held two virtual sessions during this TSAG on Tuesday 26 and Thursday 28 October 2021 respectively, from 14:30 to 16:00 Geneva time with captioning.

Mr Stephen J Trowbridge (Nokia, USA), Rapporteur of TSAG RG-WM, chaired RG-WM meeting.

The first session of RG-WM meeting started on 26 January at 14:35.

# 2 Opening and agenda

Mr. Trowbridge extended his warm welcome to the participants of the meeting. He explained a colorful agenda he prepared in [TD1026](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-211025-TD-GEN-1026) – green items are prioritized based on input documents to this TSAG; yellow are for continued discussion from prior e-meetings and/or to discuss IRM (21 Oct 2021) or WTSA-20 input, if time permits in this RGWM meeting, if not for possible interim meeting until next TSAG; red are items where discussion is not necessary as consensus seems to exist, e.g., Resolution 35 (suppression) and Resolution 45 (merge into Resolution 22, pending consensus on how to merge).

Rapporteur noted especially that there are some of these topics that are touched on by more than one TSAG Rapporteur Group. He clarified that to the extent that the work is to align with ITU wide initiatives and if there were to be any proposal to suppress these in favor of Plenipotentiary Resolution, that would be the responsibility of the RG-ResReview. If there will be any updates of substance that were proposed within the context of the T Sector's working methods, that would take in this RGWM.

Rapporteur suggested to go through green items in order beginning with the 1st RGWM session with two exceptions: noting that TSAG plenary on 25 October 2021 established ad hoc groups to discuss C192 on virtual ITU-T meetings and two particular proposals of C195 on IPR and Mark issues respectively between two sessions of RGWM, agenda item 4.b and 9.a were agreed for discussed in the 2nd RGWM session on Thursday so as for the AHG results be available for consideration.

After the correction of a typo from C187 to C184 in 6.a, the agenda of the RG-WM meeting as found in [TD1026R1](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-211025-TD-GEN-1026) was approved. [TD1165](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-211025-TD-GEN-1165), the report of the ad hoc session on IPR matters, was also added to agenda point 4.b as it is relevant to two of the proposals contained in C195.

**3 Information documents**

The meeting noted the following documents for information:

1. Interim Activity Report – 23-24 March, 29 June, 27 July and 15 September 2021 ([TD1053](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-211025-TD-GEN-1053))
2. Electronic working methods services and database applications report (TSB Director) ([TD1037](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-211025-TD-GEN-1037))

TSB was commended and appreciated by delegates for the electronic working methods services and applications. Comments/requirements were raised on the order display of participant’s name and organization in Zoom, technical contact for ITU-T webpage, harmonization of webpages and virtual meeting tool across ITU Sectors, etc. It was noted mechanical translation is available through the MyWorkspace interface.

# Agenda item 4 Recommendation A.1

## 4.a [C180](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-C-0180) Proposal to revise A.1 for cancellation of rapporteur group e-meetings (Korea)

Korea introduced [C180](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-C-0180) which proposes to revise A.1 to reflect practices of rapporteur group e-meetings being held without new contributions to continue discussions.

Clarification was requested on how to implement this proposal, what meeting would agree in advance, would it be the Rapporteur meeting itself or a different meeting that would agree and how would this work in light of the contribution deadline. Also the request for a ‘convening letter’ was considered not practical especially for virtual meetings due to COVID-19. ‘sufficient’ or not depends on ToR of the meeting and should be a judgement call for Rapporteur.

The meeting invited members to refine this proposal.

# Agenda item 6 Recommandation ITU-T A.7

## 6.a [C184](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-C-0184) Proposed to revise A.7 (China)

China proposes in [C184](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-C-0184) to revise ITU-T A.7 by adding a procedure of working group establishment in a new sub-clause 3.2, explaining the base material examples in clause 10, and introducing the post-processing procedures of deliverables transfer from the focus groups in Appendix I.

Questions were raised on languages used in this proposal which are difficult to understand, e.g., ‘dimension’, ‘tallied’ etc. Concerns were raised against calculating the rate of focus group deliverables transferred to ITU-T Recommendations as it might presuppose obligation that the Parent Group must adopt focus group deliverables but it should be up to the Parent Group to decide if and how it will use those deliverables.

The meeting did not support this proposal and invited participants to take onboard this discussion in considering any future revised proposals.

# Agenda item 7 Recommandation ITU-T A.8

## 7.a [C191](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-C-0191) Rec A.8 Amendment to clarify Last Judgment steps in AAP (UK)

UK proposes in [C191](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-C-0191) an amendment to Recommendation A.8, on the alternative approval process (AAP), to ensure consistency and transparency in addressing comments submitted during the last call judgement process.

Opposition was voiced against the change of leading role/responsibility for comment resolution from rapporteur to editor. Observations were shared on exceptional circumstances where the ‘4 weeks’ time requirement for comment resolution is not appropriate or not proportionate to the amount/difficulty of comments to be resolved.

Several clarifications emerged during the discussion: the “LJ” state in the AAP database persists across three separate steps in the process: making the judgment as to whether received comments are typographical, making the judgment whether there is sufficient time prior to the next plenary to resolve comments, and the actual time during which comments are being resolved. One idea that emerged during the discussion is that it could be helpful to reserve “LJ” for the time over which the actual judgments were being made, and have another status (e.g., “CR”) to advertise the situation where the judgments had been made and comment resolution was underway. Several examples were given (e.g., large numbers of comments, or deferring start of AR to avoid a holiday period) where the proposed 4-week limit might not be possible or desirable. The contributor expressed there could be flexibility on the time limit. Participants were invited to consider this discussion in developing an improved proposal.

The first session of RG-WM meeting on 26 October was closed at 16:16. The second session of RG-WM meeting started on 28 October January at 14:35, resuming from green item 4.b in the agenda.

# Agenda item 4 Recommendation A.1 (Continued in 2nd RGWM session)

## 4.b [TD1165](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-211025-TD-GEN-1165) Report of the TSAG ad hoc group meeting on IPR matters in Contributions C195 and C197 (26 October 2021)

Relevant part of [TD1165](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-211025-TD-GEN-1165) *Report of the TSAG ad hoc group meeting on IPR matters in Contributions C195 and C197 (26 October 2021)* i.e., relevant to C195 proposals on the IPR notice used for A-series Recommendations and Mark issues, was presented to RGWM.

Since [TD1165](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-211025-TD-GEN-1165) indicated lack of support for those particular proposals of C195, RGWM decided to wait for further guidance from IPR group before considering these two proposed changes from C195.

## 4.b [C195](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-C-0195) Proposals on the revision of Recommendation ITU\_T A.1 (09/2019) Working methods for study groups of the ITU Telecommunication Standardization Sector (Russia)

The meeting discussed additional proposals not related to the IPR issues mentioned above from [C195](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-C-0195), but there was not sufficient time for a complete discussion of all proposals contained in this contribution.

Concerning the proposal to add to 1.3.2 requirements for Collective letter to include planned decisions for TAP and AAP at the meeting notification, there was general support for the idea to better advertise intended actions, but there were differing views on the details. Some questioned whether the collective letter was the best mechanism. Some SGs (e.g., SG15) have established practices, for example to have a TD(PLEN) labelled for consent, for determination, or for agreement posted by the contribution deadline. It was suggested to align around an existing deadline (for example, there are other deadlines 2 months, 3 weeks, and 12 days prior to the meeting, so it was suggested not to add a new deadline 14 days prior to the meeting). While this could be a good general practice, it was noted there are also appropriate exceptions: for example, an unplanned corrigendum might be consented to correct an error pointed out by a member contribution to a meeting without needing to wait a full plenary cycle because this action was not known in advance of the meeting.

RGWM agreed with the removal of the last sentence of 1.3.2 on receiving (paper) documents as obsolete.

Concerning the proposal regarding 1.4.2 on conditions to postpone contribution discussion, some RGWM participants had difficulty to understand the proposed new sentence. The original text dealt with a situation of a question receiving insufficient contributions (where the meeting might decide to handle these contributions in a different way, for example, to assign the contributions for consideration in a different question or by the working party). The new proposed text attempts to capture requirements regarding deferral of consideration of contributions due to lack of time. It was suggested that any updated proposal should try to separate these two issues. One delegate suggested a better approach might be to delete clause 1.4.2 entirely. RGWM invited members to consider this discussion for any future proposals on this subject.

Concerning the proposal in 1.4.7, there was support for establishing a minimum number of supporting members (the contribution proposes at least two). It was noted that when this template and process was first added, a number of four had been proposed. Canada proposed that the two members should be from different countries (although this judgment can be complicated with multi-national corporations). A view was expressed that the wording should not preclude that individual study groups apply a higher threshold (SG15 currently requires four), and another view expressed that all study groups should apply the same threshold. Concern was expressed regarding the proposal to document negative decision in the report, as considered might hinder future different decision on same subject.

Concerning the proposal for the 1.7.1 requirement to have a concise summary of contributions and list of agreed/not agreed proposals in Question report, concern was expressed that this puts too much burden for Rapporteurs. It was agreed that the report should clearly identify which proposals were considered and which might have been deferred due to lack of time, however there is no need to repeat the proposals from the contribution in the meeting report as the contributions are archived indefinitely online. Concern was expressed about allowing a contributor, e.g., through the abstract, to compose text to describe their own contribution in the meeting report.

The contributor skipped over the proposal to replace “bodies” with “members” in 1.7.6, thinking this might or might not be editorial. But this was not discussed.

Concerning the proposal for 2.3.3.12 equal footing of contributions and transparency of decision making process, ‘equal footing’ has been questioned in previous RGWM meetings as ambiguous to be interpreted and applied in practice. There was concern that this implied equal time allocated to each contribution and this might prevent a chairman or Rapporteur from creating a suitable agenda, e.g., by prioritizing contributions intended for action in this meeting. It was also noted 2.3.3.12 is about Rapporteur Group meeting outside SG meeting, not Question meeting during a SG meeting, so the proposal may not be made against the appropriate clause.

Due to time limits, C195 discussion was interrupted here. In particular, the proposal to establish additional deadlines for certain TDs in 3.3.3, or to add new Appendix II were not discussed due to lack of time and the desire to introduce all contributions submitted to this meeting.

# Agenda item 9 Proposed new Recommendation A.xx on Virtual Meetings

## 9.a [C192](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-C-0192) Alignment of meeting rules for virtual meetings (Australia, Canada, Japan, UK)

While appearing on the RGWM agenda, consideration of this document was overtaken by events with the agreement to form an ad-hoc group to consider this matter up until the January 2022 meeting of TSAG (ref. [TD1167](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-211025-TD-GEN-1167)). So there was no need for discussion of this document in RGWM during this meeting of TSAG.

# Agenda item 10 Resolution 1

## 10.a [C181](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-C-0181) Suggestion to modify NOTE of clause 9.4.6 in WTSA Resolution 1 in TSAG-[TD924](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-210111-TD-GEN-0924) (Korea)

Korea proposes to modify the NOTE of clause 9.4.7 in [TD924](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-210111-TD-GEN-0924) to avoid ‘not’ which could lead to misinterpretation. However, it was pointed out that the proposed new text in the 1st sentence impacts and necessitates change of the reference in the 2nd sentence. While the intended meaning of the proposed new text seems to be the same as the existing text, some delegates found the new sentence more difficult to read. Concern was expressed that the proposed new wording might not translate well into all languages. In particular, the delegate from Orange noted the NOTE in [TD924](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-210111-TD-GEN-0924) is difficult to translate into French. TSB was asked to check the possible translation of the existing and proposed replacement sentence and report to next RGWM meeting.

## 10.b [C182](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-C-0182) Comment on clause 9.5.3 in WTSA Resolution 1 (Korea)

Korea proposes to revise the clause 9.5.3 to clarify the meaning of “the delegations” by adding reference “No.1005 of the Constitution”.

This proposal received support. The Rapporteur proposed, instead of addition reference to “No.1005 of the Constitution”, to add ‘of Member States’ after ‘the delegations’.

There was no time to confirm consensus at this point.

# Agenda item 25 Future plans

As indicated in report of 4.b C195 and 10.b C182 discussion above, this RG-WM e-meeting was not able to finish the whole agenda [TD1026R1](https://www.itu.int/md/meetingdoc.asp?lang=en&parent=T17-TSAG-211025-TD-GEN-1026) before it exhausted allocated meeting time, therefore future RG-WM e-meetings are to be authorized to address topics in its remit towards WTSA-20.

RGWM agreed to hold a two-day e-meeting at 1300-1500 Geneva time on Tuesday 30 November and Wednesday 1 December 2021. Contributions on all subjects within the scope of RGWM are invited by 22 November 2021, seven days in advance. Participants should advise the Rapporteur if there are particular documents from the RGWM agenda of this TSAG (contributions where discussion was not completed, or items shown in yellow that there was insufficient time to consider) that they would like to have discussed at this e-meeting by the contribution deadline in lieu of submitting an updated contribution taking on board the discussion of this meeting.

***Action for TSAG:***

Authorize a two-day e-meeting of RGWM at 1300-1500 Geneva time on Tuesday 30 November and Wednesday 1 December 2021.

# Agenda item 26 Closure

The Rapporteur closed the second session of this RG-WM meeting at 16:19 on 28 October 2021 thanking contributors and meeting participants for their active involvement and fruitful discussions, and for the captioners who were able to continue to the end of the RGWM session.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_