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| **Abstract:** | This liaison statement provides ITU-T SG9 reply to TSAG-LS44 on the resolution of AAP comments, which was triggered by the proposal in TSAG-C95 (Rep. of Korea) that aimed to discuss possible clarifications on the process for resolution of comments received by a study group during an AAP Last Call. |

This reply liaison statement, which was developed during the ITU-T Study Group 9 meeting (2-10 September 2024, Tokyo, Japan) provides a response to [**TSAG-LS44**](https://www.itu.int/ifa/t/2022/ls/tsag/sp17-tsag-oLS-00044.zip). SG9 has thoroughly examined the request from TSAG and agreed on this feedback which is provided along each specific items as follows:

*TSAG Question a):  
Are there particular guidelines that your study group implement when resolving AAP comments?*

**SG9 answer to a):**a) ITU-T SG9 does not have a particular guideline when resolving AAP comments and simply adheres to the relevant provisions outlined in ITU-T Recommendation A.8, ensuring that all comments undergo rigorous scrutiny and are thoroughly discussed during comment resolution process (could be electronic correspondence, a dedicated e-meeting, a rapporteur group meeting, or a resolution during a SG9 meeting) to reach a consensus on the way forward.

*TSAG Question b):  
Do you think that harmonizing these guidelines for all study groups would be useful, or is better to leave these details to the purview of each study group, taking into account their established practice?*

**SG9 answer to b):**b) Taking into account the unique nature of work and established practices among various study groups, we believe that a degree of flexibility should be preserved, allowing each study group to develop specific guiding principles tailored to their individual circumstances, if they so need. In the case of SG9, based on our past experiences, which successfully concluded previous comment resolutions, we never thought necessary to develop such specific guidelines as the current ITU-T A.8 is considered sufficient. Nevertheless, in our opinion, if a study group would like to develop specific guidelines for their use, these would be acceptable but only applicable within that particular study group.

*TSAG Question c):  
Do you think that* [*Rec. ITU‑T A.8*](https://itu.int/ITU-T/A.8) *requires further text to clarify the comment resolution process to follow up on comments received during AAP Last Call or Additional Review, or is the in-force edition of* [*Rec. ITU‑T A.8*](https://itu.int/ITU-T/A.8) *sufficient? In the former case, would the change suggested in clause 4.4.2 of* [*TSAG-TD628R1*](https://www.itu.int/md/T22-TSAG-240729-TD-GEN-0628/en) *be useful for your study group?*

**SG9 answer to c):**c) As mentioned above, we believe that the currently published version of ITU-T Recommendation A.8 is sufficiently clear to resolve comments submitted during the AAP and to lead to their resolution. In fact, ITU-T A.8 clarifies that the comments resolution is undertaken under the direction of the study group chair. Therefore, the chair has the necessary authority to manage the comment resolution process the way he/she considers more appropriate. This seems a sufficient provision leading to the comments resolution in all cases.

In regards to the proposed updates found in [paragraph 4.4.2 of TSAG-TD628R1], the only text that might be possible to add is *“The objective is to develop a stable revised draft, including the disposition of all submitted comments (see clause 4.4.3)”*. However, this is certainly not an essential addition and could be considered if TSAG decides to reopen ITU-T A.8 for revision due to more substantial matters to be addressed.

*TSAG Question d):*  
*In case* [*Rec. ITU‑T A.8*](https://itu.int/ITU-T/A.8) *is updated and a deadline for confirming comments is added, would "6 weeks" be a reasonable period after which the study group chair may consider that the comment resolution is agreeable to all, even to those who did not respond explicitly to confirm it?*

**SG9 answer to d):**d) As said above, we do not believe that setting a specific deadline be useful or needed, and should depend on the chair’s disposal on a case by case basis, taking into account the specific circumstances of each comments resolution (topic, constituencies, urgency, sensitivity, etc.).

ITU-T SG9 hopes this feedback helps to address this topic and remains committed to maintaining a continuous collaboration with TSAG.
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