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| **Abstract:** | This contribution makes proposals, based on TD 395, for modifications to Recommendation ITU‑T A.1 on working methods. For greater convenience, the proposals are organized in a table. The second column from the right gives the justification for our proposal, while the far-right column gives the proposed wording (where applicable). |

| No. | Ref. | Current | New proposal TD 395 | Justification from the Rapporteur Group on Working Methods | Proposal justification from contributors | Proposals |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 01 | Title | Working methods for study groups of the ITU‑Telecommunication Standardization Sector | Working methods for study groups of the ITU‑Telecommunication Standardization Sector and for the Telecommunication Standardization Advisory Group | WTSA Resolution 1, No. 4.7. "***In general, the same rules of procedure that apply to study groups shall also apply to TSAG and its meetings. However, at the discretion of the chairman, written proposals may be submitted during the TSAG meeting provided they are based on ongoing discussions taking place during the meeting and are intended to assist in resolving conflicting views which exist during the meeting.***" | We propose to maintain the status quo with respect to the title of the Recommendation.Recommendation ITU‑T A.1 concerns working methods while WTSA Resolution 1 concerns the rules of procedure of the Standardization Sector. (Are working methods part of the rules of procedure? See *considering* *h*.)Resolution 1, item 4.7 goes beyond the rules of procedure of the study groups and provides for the possibility of submitting proposals during a TSAG meeting, at the discretion of the TSAG chairman.Resolution 22The *resolves* includes assigning to TSAG the following specific matters: to create working guidelines and ensure they are up-to-date, efficient and flexible; | Working methods for study groups of the ITU‑Telecommunication Standardization Sector  |
| 02 | Summary | Recommendation ITU‑T A.1 describes general work methods for ITU‑T study groups. It provides guidelines related to work methods, such as the conduct of meetings, preparation of studies, management of study groups, joint coordination groups, the role of rapporteurs and the processing of ITU‑T contributions and TDs. | Recommendation ITU‑T A.1 describes general work methods for ITU‑T study groups and for the Telecommunication Standardization Advisory Group (TSAG). It provides guidelines related to work methods, such as the conduct of meetings, preparation of studies, management of study groups, joint coordination groups, the role of rapporteurs and the processing of ITU‑T contributions and TDs. | Same explanations as for the title | Proposal: no change | Recommendation ITU‑T A.1 describes general work methods for ITU‑T study groups. It provides guidelines related to work methods, such as the conduct of meetings, preparation of studies, management of study groups, joint coordination groups, the role of rapporteurs and the processing of ITU‑T contributions and TDs. |
|  | 1.1.1 | Study groups meet to facilitate the approval of Recommendations. Such meetings shall only be held with the approval of the Director of the Telecommunication Standardization Bureau (TSB), and with due consideration of the physical and budgetary capabilities of the ITU‑Telecommunication Standardization Sector (ITU‑T). To minimize the number of meetings required, every effort should be made to resolve questions by correspondence (No. 245 of the ITU Convention). | Study groups meet to facilitate the approval of Recommendations. Such meetings shall only be held with the approval of the Director of the Telecommunication Standardization Bureau (TSB), and with due consideration of the physical and budgetary capabilities of the ITU‑Telecommunication Standardization Sector (ITU‑T). To minimize the number of meetings required, every effort should be made to resolve questions by correspondence (No. 245 of the ITU Convention). To the extent possible, different study groups, or working parties of different study groups, should not hold an (opening or closing) plenary meeting at the same date and time. | Proposed addition highlighted in green | This proposal would allow a competent delegate representing a Member State, Sector Member or Academia to participate in more than one plenary of interest.This proposal would be of benefit for developing countries in general. | Study groups meet to facilitate the approval of Recommendations. Such meetings shall only be held with the approval of the Director of the Telecommunication Standardization Bureau (TSB), and with due consideration of the physical and budgetary capabilities of the ITU‑Telecommunication Standardization Sector (ITU‑T). To minimize the number of meetings required, every effort should be made to resolve questions by correspondence (No. 245 of the ITU Convention). To the extent possible, different study groups, or working parties of different study groups, should not hold an (opening or closing) plenary meeting at the same date and time. |
|  | 1.3.2 | A collective letter with an agenda of the meeting, a draft work plan and a listing of the Questions or proposals under the general areas of responsibility to be examined shall be prepared by TSB with the help of the chairman. | A collective letter with an agenda of the study group or working party meeting, a draft work plan, and a listing of the Questions or proposals under the general areas of responsibility to be examined shall be prepared by TSB with the help of the chair. The collective letter shall indicate for which sessions (including Question meetings), if any, remote participation is provided, allowing remote participants to actively take part in discussions. The collective letter shall also indicate if the study group and working party sessions are webcast, allowing remote participants to only listen to the discussions.  | Proposed additions highlighted in green | 1) To rule out any confusion, it would be better to simply refer to the agenda of the meeting rather than specifying “study group or working party”, since a working party is part of the organization of a study group.2) Online participation should be provided for without stipulating any restrictions. The circular should merely indicate if the meeting will also be remote and/or webcast. Online participants should not be constrained or excluded, as regards the sessions mentioned in the timetable, including versions of the timetable that have been revised during the SG meeting. | A collective letter with a meeting agenda, a draft work plan, and a listing of the Questions or proposals under the general areas of responsibility to be examined shall be prepared by TSB with the help of the chair. The collective letter shall indicate the possibility of remote participation and/or webcasting of the meeting, depending on the timetable of the meeting, including any versions that have been revised during the meeting.  |
|  | 1.3.2 | The work plan should state which items are to be studied on each day, but it must be regarded as subject to change in the light of the rate at which work proceeds. Chairmen should try to follow it as far as possible. | Deletion | The proposal is to move this paragraph beneath the one dealing with the role of rapporteurs.  | Paragraph 1 specifies that the work plan is to be prepared by TSB with the help of the chair.Any revision must likewise be prepared by TSB with the help of the chair. We propose “No change” for this paragraph.The updating may also be assigned to a rapporteur, within the limits of the rapporteur’s responsibilities. | The work plan should state which items are to be studied on each day, but it must be regarded as subject to change in the light of the rate at which work proceeds. Chairs should try to follow it as far as possible. |
|  | 1.3.2 |  | The collective letter shall identify all documents scheduled for action under previously agreed adoption procedures, indicate the stage of approval procedures as appropriate (consent, determination or approval) and provide links to the final versions available for such documents. | New proposal  | The meeting agenda already includes a list of all indexed documents, including draft recommendations to be determined, etc.This proposal seems to us to be unnecessary.The TAP procedure for adoption of recommendations can also address this concern. | No change |
|  | 1.4.2 | The chairman is authorized to decide that there shall be no discussion on Questions on which insufficient contributions have been received. | **Proposal 1**: The chairman, where time is limited, is authorized to decide that there shall be no discussion on Questions on which only one proposal has been received. This shall only be permissible in the event of force majeure and shall be duly recorded in the meeting report, indicating the reason that there was no discussion of the document or the further course of action on the document. No contribution shall be dismissed from consideration entirely. Only a single deferral to the subsequent meeting shall be permitted.**Proposal 2** :The chair is authorized to propose that discussion on Questions on which insufficient contributions have been received be postponed. | Two new proposals for this new provision. | An option might be to delete provision 1.4.2, as ambiguous.We propose to use the formulation shown in the column to the right. | The chair, where time is limited, is authorized to propose that there be no discussion on Questions on which only one proposal has been received/insufficient contributions have been received. This shall only be permissible in the event of force majeure and shall be duly recorded in the meeting report, indicating the reason that there was no discussion of the document or the further course of action on the document. No contribution shall be dismissed from consideration entirely. Only a single deferral to the subsequent meeting shall be permitted. |
|  | 1.4.7.1 | …. The decision to add a new work item to the work programme shall be documented in the report of the meeting using the template in Annex A. Note that this may not be necessary to document the continuation of existing work (e.g., an amendment or revision of an existing Recommendation). | The decision to add a new normative work item to the work programme shall be documented in the report of the meeting using the template in Annex A. When opening a new work item, it is mandatory to have support from at least two ITU‑T members. Note that the use of the template may not be necessary to document the continuation of existing work (e.g., an amendment or revision of an existing Recommendation). | The new proposal is from TSAG.There is also a proposal from the RCC and one from the USA. | It is important to specify the number of supporters needed to open a new work item. It should be clarified whether the decision is up to Member States only, or the entire membership.Likewise it is important to distinguish between opening a normative work item and a non-normative one. This is addressed in §§ 1.4.7.2 and 1.4.8 below. | The decision to add a new normative work item to the work programme shall be documented in the report of the meeting using the template in Annex A. When opening a new work item, it is mandatory to have support from at least two ITU‑T members. Note that the use of the template may not be necessary to document the continuation of existing work (e.g., an amendment or revision of an existing Recommendation). |
|  | (1.4.7) | A work item may be considered for discontinuation from the work programme if it has not given rise to any contribution in the time interval of the previous two study group meetings. | **Proposal 1**A work item ~~may~~ shall be considered for discontinuation from the work programme if it has not given rise to any contribution in the time interval of the previous two study group meetings.**Proposal 2**A (normative or non-normative) work item shall be marked as discontinued in the work programme (without a priority or timing) if it has not received any contribution for two study group or working party meetings. Any subsequent contribution that proposes to progress the work item shall include a revision of the template in Annex A of this Recommendation (or in Annex A of [ITU‑T A.13] for a non-normative work item). | Two proposals are highlighted. The first is to change “may” to “shall” in the English version, in the reformulated provision.  | It is proposed to keep the existing provision, which is more flexible and leaves more options for the study group.A discontinued work item shall be reactivated and automatically re-entered in the work programme if a new contribution is received. The resumption of work on the work item need not necessarily require revision of the form in the annex. If it concerns the same work item previously validated by the corresponding form, the work item should not as a rule require validation anew.  | A work item may be considered for discontinuation from the work programme if it has not given rise to any contribution in the time interval of the previous two study group meetings.Any subsequent contribution that proposes to progress the work item shall include a revision of the template in Annex A of this Recommendation (or in Annex A of [ITU‑T A.13] for a non-normative work item), if necessary. This work item will not need to be validated anew. |
|  | 1.4.7.1 |  | The report will explain why the meeting did not accept a work item. | New provision | If the meeting decides to reject a relevant work item, introduced by a member on the basis of a contribution and a duly completed form, the reasons need to be stated.  | The report will explain why the meeting did not accept a work item. |
|  | 1.4.7.1 |  | When there is a lead study group (see 2.1.6 of [WTSA Res. 1]) relevant to the addressed topic, the work item is sent as a liaison statement to this lead study group, for action as appropriate. | New provision highlighting the role of the lead SG in the processing of a new work item | No objection to the wording | When there is a lead study group (see 2.1.6 of [WTSA Res. 1]) relevant to the addressed topic, the work item is sent as a liaison statement to this lead study group, for action as appropriate. |
|  | 1.4.7.1 |  | Any non-editorial changes to the scope or summary of an existing work item (see also clause 2.3.3.9) shall be reflected in a revised version of the template in Annex A, and agreed by the study group or working party. The changes shall also be reflected in the work programme. | Under this provision, any non-editorial change to the form creating a work item would mean that the form would require the approval of the SG or working party. | No objection to this proposal | Any non-editorial changes to the scope or summary of an existing work item (see also clause 2.3.3.9) shall be reflected in a revised version of the template in Annex A, and agreed by the study group or working party. The changes shall also be reflected in the work programme. |
|  | 1.4.7.1 |  | When a normative work item is completed, initiation of the relevant approval process occurs either by "consent" per [ITU‑T A.8] or by "determination" per 9 of [WTSA Res. 1], depending on the approval process in effect for the work item. | New provision | No objection | When a normative work item is completed, initiation of the relevant approval process occurs either by "consent" per [ITU‑T A.8] or by "determination" per 9 of [WTSA Res. 1], depending on the approval process in effect for the work item. |
|  | 1.4.7.2 |  | The decision to add a non-normative work item to the work programme shall be documented in the report of the meeting using the template in Annex A of [ITU‑T A.13]. Note that this may not be necessary to document the continuation of existing work (e.g. revision of an existing non-normative ITU‑T publication). | New provision | No objection  | The decision to add a non-normative work item to the work programme shall be documented in the report of the meeting using the template in Annex A of [ITU‑T A.13]. Note that this may not be necessary to document the continuation of existing work (e.g. revision of an existing non-normative ITU‑T publication). |
|  |  |  | When a non-normative work item is completed, it is agreed per [ITU‑T A.13]. | New proposal | No objection | When a non-normative work item is completed, it is agreed per [ITU‑T A.13]. |
|  | 1.4.8 |  | Each supporting member shall nominate and commit technical experts to the development of the work item (see Annex A). Participation of experts from the industry is encouraged. | New provision | By stipulating that each member supporting a proposed new work item must nominate and commit technical experts for development purposes, this provision would create difficulties for developing countries. Such countries may well identify problems that they are faced with and request that a new work item be created, even though they do not themselves possess all the necessary expertise, but rather hope to benefit from the resident expertise elsewhere in the membership of the Union to develop the new item. After all, in validating a work item, all the members of the study group have to work together on the production of the desired outcome (hence the “Union” in ITU).We propose the wording shown in the column to the right. | All the experts of the study group and working parties are encouraged to participate in elaborating the work item. Participation of experts from the industry is also encouraged. |
|  | 1.4.9 | A work item may be considered for discontinuation from the work programme if it has not given rise to any contribution in the time interval of the previous two study group meetings. | **Proposal 1**A work item ~~may~~ shall be considered for discontinuation from the work programme if it has not given rise to any contribution in the time interval of the previous two study group meetings.**Proposal 2**A (normative or non-normative) work item shall be marked as discontinued in the work programme (without a priority or timing) if it has not received any contribution for two study group or working party meetings. Any subsequent contribution that proposes to progress the work item shall include a revision of the template in Annex A of this Recommendation (or in Annex A of [ITU‑T A.13] for a non-normative work item). | Two proposals are highlighted. The first is to change “may” to “shall” in the English version, in the reformulated provision.  | It is proposed to keep the existing provision, which is more flexible and leaves more options for the study group.A discontinued work item shall be reactivated and automatically re-entered in the work programme if a new contribution is received. The resumption of work on the work item need not necessarily require revision of the form in the annex. If it concerns the same work item previously validated by the corresponding form, the work item should not as a rule require validation anew.  | A work item may be considered for discontinuation from the work programme if it has not given rise to any contribution in the time interval of the previous two study group meetings.Any subsequent contribution that proposes to progress the work item shall include a revision of the template in Annex A of this Recommendation (or in Annex A of [ITU‑T A.13] for a non-normative work item), if necessary. This work item will not need to be validated anew. |
|  | 1.5.2§ | Liaison statements should be forwarded to the appropriate destinations as soon after the meeting as possible. Copies of all liaison statements should also be sent to the chairmen of the study groups and working parties involved for information and to TSB for processing. | Liaison statements should be forwarded to the appropriate destinations as soon after the meeting as possible. Copies of all liaison statements should also be sent to TSB for processing. | New wording from the RG-WM meeting | We propose amended wording to take into account the useful observation in the editor’s note in TD 395. | Liaison statements should be forwarded to the appropriate destinations as soon after the meeting as possible. Approved liaison statements should be published as working documents of the working party, study group or focus group. |
|  | 1.5.2 |  | NOTE – Liaison statements sent by a focus group (see [ITU‑T A.7], clause 3.4) include this disclaimer: "Working documents and deliverables from ITU‑T focus groups remain subject to review and further action by the parent group (ITU‑T study group or TSAG). Therefore this liaison statement does not represent action by a decisional body of the ITU." | New proposal for a note to ensure that standardization bodies receiving liaison statements from focus groups understand that the documents forwarded in those statements are subject to review by the focus group’s parent study group, or by TSAG if it is a TSAG focus group. | Is this detail really necessary for a document that will go outside ITU? Recipients may not even be aware of the circumstances in which a focus group can send a liaison statement to an SDO. The purpose of the statement is clear in any event, and the document is coming from ITU, so we don’t see the need for this new note. We are not in favour of the new note. |  |
|  | 1.6 | A correspondence activity on a particular topic may be authorized to be conducted via e-mail between meetings. Each correspondence activity should have specified terms of reference. A convener is appointed to moderate the e-mail discussion and prepare a report to a subsequent meeting. A correspondence activity should normally conclude no later than the contribution deadline of the meeting to which it is expected to report (see also clause 2.3.3.5). | A correspondence activity on a particular topic may be authorized to be conducted via e mail between meetings. The mailing list is adopted by the study group meeting and maintained by TSB. Each correspondence activity should have specified terms of reference. A convener is appointed to moderate the e mail discussion and prepare a report to a subsequent meeting. A correspondence activity should normally conclude no later than the contribution deadline of the meeting to which it is expected to report (see also clause 2.3.3.5). | New proposal to stipulate that the mailing list is put forward by the meeting | No objection on the substance, but we would alter the wording | A correspondence activity on a particular topic may be authorized to be conducted via e-mail between meetings. The decision to create a new mailing list is taken by the study group meeting. The list is maintained by TSB. Each correspondence activity should have specified terms of reference. A convener is appointed to moderate the e-mail discussion and prepare a report to a subsequent meeting. A correspondence activity should normally conclude no later than the contribution deadline of the meeting to which it is expected to report (see also clause 2.3.3.5). |
|  | 1.6NOTE |  | Study group groups may also establish correspondence groups or ad hoc groups (see clause 4.7). | New proposal clarify the difference regarding correspondence activities, correspondence groups and ad hoc groups | No objection to the addition of this note | Study group groups may also establish correspondence groups or ad hoc groups (see clause 4.7). |
|  | 1.7.1 | A report on the work done during a meeting of a study group, working party or joint working party shall be prepared by TSB. Reports of meetings not attended by TSB should be prepared under the responsibility of the chairman of the meeting. This report should set out the results of the meeting and the agreements reached in a condensed form and should identify the points left to the next meeting for further study. The number of annexes to the report should be kept to a strict minimum by means of cross-references to contributions, reports, etc., and references to material in the documentation of a study group or working party. It would be desirable to have a concise summary of contributions (or equivalent) considered by the meeting. | A report on the work done during a meeting of a study group, working party or joint working party shall be prepared by TSB. Reports of meetings not attended by TSB should be prepared under the responsibility of the chair~~man~~ of the meeting. This report should set out the results of the meeting and the agreements reached in a condensed form and should identify the points left to the next meeting for further study. The number of annexes to the report should be kept to a strict minimum by means of cross-references to contributions, reports, etc., and references to material in the documentation of a study group or working party. A concise summary of contributions (or equivalent) considered by the meeting is required. | New proposal  | No objection |  |
|  | 1.7.1 | The report should concisely present the following: organization of work; references to and possible summary of contributions and/or documents issued during a meeting; main results, including status of new and/or revised Recommendations consented, determined or under development; directive for future work; planned meetings of working parties, sub-working parties and rapporteur groups; and condensed liaison statements endorsed at the study group or working party level. The table showing the status of Recommendations from the report is used to update the work programme database (see clause 1.4.7). | The report should concisely present the following: organization of work; references to and possible summary of contributions and/or documents issued during a meeting; main results, including status of new and/or revised Recommendations consented, determined or under development and a summary/list of changes (other than editorial ones) accepted and not accepted; directive for future work; planned meetings of working parties, sub-working parties and rapporteur groups; and condensed liaison statements endorsed at the study group or working party level. The table showing the status of Recommendations from the report is used to update the work programme database (see clause 1.4.7). |  |  |  |
|  | 1.7.2 |  |  |  | No change |  |
|  | 1.7.3 |  |  |  | No change |  |
|  | 1.7.5 |  |  |  | No change |  |
|  | 1.7.6 | ITU‑T participating bodies are authorized to transmit study group or working party reports and documents to any experts they consider it expedient to consult, except where the study group or working party concerned has specifically decided that its report, or a document, is to be treated as confidential. |  | Proposal to change “participating bodies” to “representatives participating in the work of ITU‑T” | No change  |  |
|  | 1.7.7 | The report of a study group's first meeting in the study period shall include a list of all the rapporteurs appointed. This list shall be updated, as required, in subsequent reports. | The report of a study group's first meeting in the study period shall include a list of all the working party chairs and rapporteurs appointed. This list shall be updated, as required, in subsequent reports. | Modification to include the working party chairs appointed in the first SG report | Proposal to adopt the modified version | The report of a study group's first meeting in the study period shall include a list of all the working party chairs and rapporteurs appointed. This list shall be updated, as required, in subsequent reports. |
|  | 1.8 | Definitions |  |  | No change |  |
|  | 1.9 | References |  |  | Updated references |  |
|  | 2.1.1 | Study group chairmen shall be responsible for the establishment of an appropriate structure for the distribution of work and the selection of an appropriate team of working party chairmen and shall take into account the advice provided by the members of the study group as well as the proven competence, both technical and managerial, of the candidates. | Study group chairs~~men~~ shall be responsible for the establishment of an appropriate structure for the distribution of work and the selection of an appropriate team of working party chairs~~men~~ and shall take into account the advice provided by the members of the study group as well as the proven competence, both technical and managerial, of the candidates.It is mandatory for study group and working party chairs and vice-chairs to attend a training session provided by TSB. | The proposal is to make it mandatory for study group and working party chairs and vice-chairs to attend one of the training sessions provided by TSB. | No objection to this addition. | Study group chairs~~men~~ shall be responsible for the establishment of an appropriate structure for the distribution of work and the selection of an appropriate team of working party chairs~~men~~ and shall take into account the advice provided by the members of the study group as well as the proven competence, both technical and managerial, of the candidates.It is mandatory for study group and working party chairs and vice-chairs to attend a training session provided by TSB. |
|  | 2.1.2 |  |  |  | No change |  |
|  | 2.1.3 |  |  |  | No change |  |
|  | 2.1.4 |  |  |  | No change |  |
|  | 2.1.5 |  |  |  | No change |  |
|  | 2.1.6 |  |  |  | No change |  |
|  | 2.2 | Joint coordination activities |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2.3.1 |  |  |  | No change |  |
|  | 2.3.2 |  |  |  | No change |  |
|  | 2.3.3 |  |  |  | No change |  |
|  | 2.3.3.1 |  |  |  | No change |  |
|  | 2.3.3.2 |  |  |  | No change |  |
|  | 2.3.3.3 |  |  |  | No change |  |
|  | 2.3.3.4 | Rapporteurs, and their associate and liaison rapporteurs as well as the editors, play an indispensable role in coordinating increasingly detailed and often highly technical study. Consequently, their appointment should be primarily based on their expertise in the subject to be studied. | Rapporteurs, and their associate and liaison rapporteurs as well as the editors, play an indispensable role in coordinating increasingly detailed and often highly technical study. Consequently, their appointment should be primarily based on their expertise in the subject to be studied. It is mandatory for rapporteurs, associate rapporteurs and editors to attend a training session provided by TSB. | The proposal is to make it mandatory for rapporteurs and editors to attend one of the training sessions provided by TSB. | No objection to this addition. | Rapporteurs, and their associate and liaison rapporteurs as well as the editors, play an indispensable role in coordinating increasingly detailed and often highly technical study. Consequently, their appointment should be primarily based on their expertise in the subject to be studied. It is mandatory for rapporteurs, associate rapporteurs and editors to attend a training session provided by TSB. |
|  | 2.3.3.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2.3.3.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | a.bis |  | to prepare a draft agenda for the meeting stating which items are to be studied on each day and to try to follow it as far as possible, but it must be regarded as subject to change in the light of the rate at which work proceeds | New item that charges the rapporteur with preparation of the agenda | No objection on this point.We would only propose to specify that the rapporteur may be supported in this by TSB, and make it clear that we are talking about the agenda for the rapporteur group meeting.  | to prepare a draft agenda for the rapporteur group meeting, with TSB support, stating which items are to be studied on each day and to try to follow it as far as possible, but it must be regarded as subject to change in the light of the rate at which work proceeds |
|  | c. | to adopt methods of work (correspondence, including the use of the TSB EDH system, meetings of experts, etc.) as considered appropriate for the task; | to adopt methods of work (correspondence, including the use of the TSB electronic document handling (EDH) facilities, meetings of experts, etc.) as considered appropriate for the task; | Reformulation | No objection | to adopt methods of work (correspondence, including the use of the TSB electronic document handling (EDH) facilities, meetings of experts, etc.) as considered appropriate for the task; |
|  | f. | in particular, to submit a progress report (e.g., of a rapporteur's meeting or editor's work) to each of the parent group's meetings (see suggested format in Appendix I), in the form of a TD to be submitted as soon as possible (see clause 3.3.3); | in particular, to submit a progress report (e.g. of rapporteur group meetings or editor's work), including references to meeting reports (see clause 2.3.3.12) and to baseline documents, to each of the parent group's meetings (see suggested format in Appendix I), in the form of a TD to be submitted as soon as possible (see clause 3.3.3); | Proposed change to detail the responsibilities of the rapporteur | No objection to this proposal | in particular, to submit a progress report (e.g. of rapporteur group meetings or editor's work), including references to meeting reports (see clause 2.3.3.12) and to baseline documents, to each of the parent group's meetings (see suggested format in Appendix I), in the form of a TD to be submitted as soon as possible (see clause 3.3.3); |
|  | 2.3.3.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2.3.3.8 |  |  | New reference |  |  |
|  | 2.3.3.9 | Rapporteurs should normally base any draft new or substantially revised Recommendations on written contribution(s) from ITU‑T members (see also clause 1.4.7). | Rapporteurs should normally base any draft new or substantially revised Recommendations on written contribution(s) from ITU‑T members (see also clause 1.4.7). Contributions submitted to the meeting shall be handled equally (see also 3.9 of [WTSA Res. 1]). When concluding the discussion on each matter, the rapporteur should announce the decisions adopted, which will be reflected in the meeting report. | Additional text to clarify the role of the rapporteur further. The discussion is about the word “equally” in English, in the context of the rapporteur’s treatment of contributions. It has been pointed out that the interpretation of this term varies depending on the context in which it appears in documents of the Union. The possibility of using “impartial” is mentioned. | No objection to this proposal | Rapporteurs should normally base any draft new or substantially revised Recommendations on written contribution(s) from ITU‑T members (see also clause 1.4.7). Contributions submitted to the meeting shall be handled equally (see also 3.9 of [WTSA Res. 1]). When concluding the discussion on each matter, the rapporteur should announce the decisions adopted, which will be reflected in the meeting report. |
|  | 2.3.3.10 | In conjunction with their work planning, rapporteurs must give advance notice of any meetings they arrange, not only to the collaborators on their Question or project, but also to the study group and working party (see clause 2.3.3.11) and to TSB. TSB is not required to circulate collective letters for meetings below working party level. The intention to hold rapporteur group meetings, along with details of the issues to be studied, should be agreed in principle and publicized with as much notice as possible (normally at least two months) at study group or working party meetings (for inclusion in their reports) and via the study group webpage, for example. | In conjunction with their work planning, rapporteurs must give advance notice of any (interim) rapporteur group meetings they arrange, not only to the collaborators on their Question or project, but also to the study group and working party ~~(see clause 2.3.3.11)~~ and to TSB. TSB is not required to circulate collective letters for meetings below working party level. The intention to hold rapporteur group meetings, along with details of the issues to be studied (i.e. terms of reference for the meeting, including the deadline for contributions), should be agreed in principle at study group or working party meetings and publicized with as much notice as possible ~~(normally at least two months) at study group or working party meetings (for inclusion in their reports) and via the study group webpage, for example~~. TSB will post a convening letter (using a TSB-defined template), normally at least two weeks prior to the meeting, on the study group webpage. Contributions to rapporteur group (physical or virtual) meetings shall be made available to meeting participants by a deadline of normally at least seven calendar days.For physical rapporteur group meetings, the convening letter includes logistic details. Visa support should be provided by the meeting host. The convening letter shall indicate whether remote participation is provided, allowing remote participants to actively take part in discussions.In exceptional cases, a rapporteur group meeting can be approved by the study group management team. | Proposal to reword the provision | The final paragraph of the proposed passage is not very clear regarding what is meant by “exceptional cases”. We propose to delete this paragraph in the new proposal.We also propose to keep the existing Recommendation’s reference to a notice period of two months normally, for TSB to publish the letter of invitation to the rapporteur group meeting. | In conjunction with their work planning, rapporteurs must give advance notice of any (interim) rapporteur group meetings they arrange, not only to the collaborators on their Question or project, but also to the study group and working party ~~(see clause 2.3.3.11)~~ and to TSB. TSB is not required to circulate collective letters for meetings below working party level. The intention to hold rapporteur group meetings, along with details of the issues to be studied (i.e. terms of reference for the meeting, including the deadline for contributions), should be agreed in principle at study group or working party meetings and publicized with as much notice as possible (normally at least two months). TSB will post a convening letter (using a TSB-defined template), normally two months prior to the meeting, on the study group webpage. Contributions to rapporteur group (physical or virtual) meetings shall be made available to meeting participants by a deadline of normally at least seven calendar days.For physical rapporteur group meetings, the convening letter includes logistic details. Visa support should be provided by the meeting host. The convening letter shall indicate whether remote participation is provided, allowing remote participants to actively take part in discussions. |
|  | 2.3.3.11 | TSB will post a convening letter for rapporteur group meetings (using a TSB-defined template), normally at least two months prior to the meeting, on the study group webpage, as provided by the study group. Visa support should be provided by the meeting host. | If an insufficient number of input documents has been submitted, the rapporteur group meeting should not be held. The decision whether to cancel a rapporteur group meeting shall be taken by the rapporteur, in agreement with the study group management team, and shall be reflected in a convening letter. | The content of the existing § 2.3.3.11 has been incorporated in the reworded § 2.3.3.10. | This new provision appears to be subjective in nature; how should one determine what number of documents is insufficient? If a study group or working party plenary decides to hold a rapporteur group meeting, that means there is a relevant body of documentation which cannot be taken up at a WP or SG meeting.We propose to dispense with this new provision. |  |
|  | 2.3.3.12 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2.3.3.13 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2.3.3.14 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2.3.3.15 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2.4 |  | Attendance of chairs, vice-chairs and rapporteurs | New text | We propose to delete the proposed new § 2.4. Since this Recommendation is about working methods for study groups, we do not believe it appropriate to include in it this new § 2.4 which concerns the participation of chairs, vice-chairs, rapporteurs and editors in meetings and proposes to sanction them; something that is extraneous to working methods. These options could perhaps be discussed under Resolution 1. The issue should be brought to the attention of the Plenipotentiary Conference, which could take a decision dealing with the issue. |  |
|  | 2.4.1 |  |  | New provision | Deletion proposed |  |
|  | 2.4.2 |  |  | New provision | Deletion proposed |  |
|  | 2.4.3 |  |  | New provision | Deletion proposed |  |
|  | 2.4.4 |  |  | New provision | Deletion proposed |  |
|  | 2.4.5 |  |  | New provision | Deletion proposed |  |
|  | 3 | Submission and processing of contributions |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.1 | Submission of contributions |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.1.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.1.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.1.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.1.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.1.6 | By making a contribution, contributors acknowledge, to the best of their knowledge, that material such as text, diagrams, etc., submitted as their contribution to the work of ITU‑T has no restriction in order to permit the normal distribution of this material for discussions within the appropriate ITU‑T study groups and other groups and possible use, in whole or in part, with or without modification, in any resulting ITU‑T Recommendations that are published (see [PP Res. 66]). | By making a contribution, contributors acknowledge, to the best of their knowledge, that material such as text, diagrams, protected designations, proper nouns, etc., submitted as their contribution to the work of ITU‑T has no restriction in order to permit the normal distribution of this material for discussions within the appropriate ITU‑T study groups and other groups and possible use, in whole or in part, with or without modification, in any resulting ITU‑T Recommendations that are published (see [PP Res. 66]). |  | No observation on this proposed addition. |  |
|  | 3.1.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.1.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.1.9 | The full text of contributions that are to be considered at a study group or working party meeting shall reach TSB at least 12 calendar days before the meeting. | The full text of contributions that are to be considered at a study group, working party, rapporteur group or joint coordination activity meeting, whether physical or virtual, shall reach TSB at least 12 calendar days before the meeting. |  | For a rapporteur group meeting, if the invitation letter is to be published two weeks before, as proposed, then that leaves too little time for the submission of contributions. This corroborates our view that we should not change the two-month deadline to two weeks in § 2.3.3.10. | The full text of contributions that are to be considered at a study group, working party, rapporteur group or joint coordination activity meeting, whether physical or virtual, shall reach TSB at least 12 calendar days before the meeting. |
|  | 3.2 | Processing of contributions |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.2.1 | Contributions received at least two months before a meeting may be translated (see clause 3.2.2) and will be posted in the original and, if applicable, in translated languages, on the web as soon as practicable after they are received. They will be printed and distributed at the beginning of the meeting only to the participants present who request paper copies. | Contributions received at least two months before a study group or working party meeting may be translated (see clause 3.2.2) and will be posted in the original and, if applicable, in translated languages, on the web as soon as practicable after they are received. . ~~They will be printed and distributed at the beginning of the meeting only to the participants present who request paper copies.~~ | The proposal is to limit translation to documents of study groups or working parties only. | Keeping the provision as it currently stands would make it possible to have some documents of rapporteur group meetings to be translated. We are in favour of deleting the last sentence.The proposed wording is given in the column to the right. | Contributions received at least two months before a meeting may be translated (see clause 3.2.2) and will be posted in the original and, if applicable, in translated languages, on the web as soon as practicable after they are received. |
|  | 3.2.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.2.3 | Contributions received by the Director less than two months but not less than 12 calendar days before the date set for the opening of a meeting cannot be translated. |  |  | No change | Contributions received by the Director less than two months but not less than 12 calendar days before the date set for the opening of a meeting cannot be translated. |
| 3.3.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.2.5 |  | Contributions received by the Director less than 12 calendar days before the meeting will not appear on the agenda of the meeting, will not be distributed and will be held for the next meeting. Contributions judged to be of extreme importance may be admitted by the Director at shorter notice. The final decision as to their consideration by the meeting shall be taken by the study group (or working party). |  |  | No change |  |
|  | 3.2.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.2.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.2.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.2.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.3 | TDs |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.3.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.3.3 | TDs input before the start of the study group or working party meeting, including documents from the ITU secretariat, should be posted on the relevant page of the website not later than three working days from the date on which they are received by the secretariat, to ensure their availability not later than seven calendar days before the start of the meeting. This deadline shall not extend to administrative documents or reports on events that have taken place less than 21 calendar days before the start of the meeting, nor to proposals from chairmen and convenors of ad hoc groups, compilations of proposals prepared by chairmen or the secretariat, or documents specifically requested by the meeting. Reports on events that have taken place less than 21 calendar days before the start of the meeting should normally be posted on the relevant page of the website not later than two calendar days before the beginning of the discussion of the item in question at the meeting, unless otherwise agreed by the meeting. |  | There are at least two change proposals.  | We propose not making any changes. |  |
|  | 3..3.4 |  |  | No change |  |  |
|  | 3.3.5 |  |  | No change |  |  |
|  | 3.4 |  |  | No change |  |  |
|  | 3.5 |  |  | No change |  |  |
|  | 4 |  |  | No change |  |  |
|  | 4.1 |  |  | No change |  |  |
|  | 4.2 | The objective of focus groups is to help advance the work of the ITU‑Telecommunication Standardization Sector (ITU‑T) study groups and to encourage the participation of members of other standards organizations, including experts and individuals who may not be members of ITU. Focus group activities may include an analysis of gaps between current Recommendations and expected Recommendations, and provide material for consideration in the development of Recommendations. Their working methods are documented in [ITU‑T A.7]. | The objective of focus groups is to help advance the work of the ITU‑Telecommunication Standardization Sector (ITU‑T) study groups and to encourage the participation of members of other standards organizations, including experts and individuals who may not be members of ITU. ~~Focus group activities may include an analysis of gaps between current Recommendations and expected Recommendations, and provide material for consideration in the development of Recommendations.~~ Their working methods are documented in [ITU‑T A.7]. | The proposal has been made to delete the part that allows focus groups or specialized groups to analyse current Recommendations and propose improvements. | We propose not to make any changes to this provision. Focus groups may well have an opinion to contribute on an existing Recommendation and make proposals for improvements.  | The objective of focus groups is to help advance the work of the ITU‑Telecommunication Standardization Sector (ITU‑T) study groups and to encourage the participation of members of other standards organizations, including experts and individuals who may not be members of ITU. Focus group activities may include an analysis of gaps between current Recommendations and expected Recommendations, and provide material for consideration in the development of Recommendations. Their working methods are documented in [ITU‑T A.7]. |
|  | 4.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4.7 | In addition to the group types documented above, additional groups exist that operate with working methods distinct from those documented above. [WTSA Res. 22] *resolves*1 *e*) provides more information. TSAG and study groups should terminate inactive groups. |  |  | We propose to refrain from modifying this provision, in view of the editor’s comment. | In addition to the group types documented above, additional groups exist that operate with working methods distinct from those documented above. [WTSA Res. 22] *resolves*1 *e*) provides more information. TSAG and study groups should terminate inactive groups. |
|  | 5 | Joint coordination activities |  | It has been proposed to develop a new A-series Recommendation on JCAs. | No objection from us, if it allows for a clearer exposition of JCA working methods.  |  |
|  | 5.1 |  |  | No change |  |  |
|  | 5.2.1 |  |  | New wording | See AFCP.The editor’s proposal is acceptable. |  |
|  | 5.2.2 |  |  | New wording | See AFCP.The editor’s proposal is acceptable. |  |
|  | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5.4 |  |  |  | Nothing to add |  |
|  | 5.5 |  |  |  | Nothing to add |  |
|  | 5.6 |  |  |  | Nothing to add |  |
|  | 5.7 |  |  |  | Nothing to add |  |
|  | 5.8 |  |  |  | Nothing to add |  |
|  | 5.9 |  |  |  | Nothing to add |  |
|  | 5.10 |  |  |  | Nothing to add |  |

Annex A

Template to describe a proposed new Recommendation
in the work programme

(This annex forms an integral part of this Recommendation.)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Question: |  | / | Proposed new ITU‑T Recommendation | <Meeting date> |
| **Reference and title:** | Recommendation ITU‑T <X.xxx> "Title" |
| **Base text:** | <C nnn> or <TD nnnn> | **Timing:** | <Month-Year> |
| **Editor(s):** | <Name, membership, e‑mail address> | **Approval process:** | <AAP or TAP> |
| **Scope** (defines the intent or object of the Recommendation and the aspects covered, thereby indicating the limits of its applicability): |
|  |
| **Summary** (provides a brief overview of the purpose and contents of the Recommendation, thus permitting readers to judge its usefulness for their work): |
|  |
| **Relations to ITU‑T Recommendations or to other standards** (approved or under development): |
|  |
| **Liaisons with other study groups or with other standards bodies:** |
|  |
| **Supporting members (from at least two different countries) that are committing to contributing actively to the work item:** |
| <Member States, Sector Members, Associates, Academia> |

Appendix I

Rapporteur progress report format

(This appendix does not form an integral part of this Recommendation.)

The following format is recommended for the progress reports of rapporteurs to enable a maximum transfer of information to all concerned:

*a)* brief summary of contents of report;

*b)* conclusions or Recommendations sought to be endorsed;

*c) status of work with reference to work plan, including baseline document if available;*

*d)* draft new or draft revised Recommendations;

*e)* draft liaison in response to or requesting action by other study groups or organizations;

*f)* reference to contributions considered part of assigned study and summary of contributions considered at rapporteur group meetings (see Note);

*g)* reference to liaison statements from other organizations;

*h) major issues remaining for resolution and draft agenda of future approved meeting, if any;*

*i)* response to question on knowledge of intellectual property rights issues, including patents, copyright for software or text, marks;

*j)* list of attendees at all meetings held since last progress report.

A meeting report shall clearly indicate in its title the Question number, meeting venue and meeting date. In general, the title shall be of the form "Rapporteur Report Qx/x".

Any draft Recommendations produced shall be presented as separate TDs (one document per Recommendation). The title of the TD shall be of the form "Draft new Recommendation ITU‑T X.x: abc", where "abc" stands for the title of the draft Recommendation, or "Draft revised Recommendation ITU‑T X.x: abc", or "Draft Amendment 1 to Recommendation ITU‑T X.x: abc", etc.

A progress report shall not be used as a vehicle to violate the rules concerning the submission of contributions that are inappropriate to the assigned study task.

NOTE − The progress report may make reference to the meeting reports (see clause 2.3.3.12) in order to avoid duplication of information.
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