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ITU-T Study Group 13 would like to inform TSAG of an opinion on the resolutions of AAP comments.

During the SG13 meeting held in March 2025, SG13 carefully reviewed and discussed the discussion item a-d) in the liaison statement. On item b), SG13 would like to use the same rules among ITU-T SGs because of avoiding unnecessary confusion of commenters.

However, SG13 would like to suggest that the item d) still have contained problems for conducting AAP processes.

1. 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?

As TSAG C-95 mentioned, SG13 believes that the proposed “6 week” duration can be shorten particularly when the compilation of comments in a table form is appropriately prepared by Rapporteurs and/or editors and promptly sent to commenters for smooth communication.

The following case are an example of LC process in SG13:

1. Commenters provide their input using revision marks in documents or as inline comments (e.g., using comment bubbles in Word files);

NOTE ‒ This is not an unusual case in SG13’s AAP.

1. Rapporteurs or editors manually convert commenters’ inputs into the table format;
2. Commenters confirm the accuracy of the table;
3. If a commenter does not explicitly confirm within expected days, the process becomes stalled because of no mechanism to proceed without the confirmation;
4. Rapporteurs or editors propose a "proposed change" based on the agreed comments;
5. Commenters review and respond to these proposed changes;
6. If commenters delay responding, the process is blocked or forcing Rapporteurs and editors to wait indefinitely.

SG13 requests commenters’ feedback in step a) is given in table format (Annex A of Rec. A.8) for streamlining step b).

Steps d) and g) should be avoided in the processes. In relation to step g), the proposed “6 week” duration for step f) seems to be too long compared to the assumed AAP periods (Figure 1 of Rec. A.8).

Under the current interval of SG meeting is almost 36 weeks (9 months), there may be no room for sufficiently preparing comments’ resolutions.

According to typical cases in SG13, there is a possibility that it takes 36 weeks: 20 weeks for Last Call, 16 weeks for additional review if “6 weeks” duration is applied for commenters’ consideration.

The envisaged last call processes are:

* 3 weeks for announcement of the AAP after consent in general;
* 4 weeks of last call: step a);
* 2 weeks for the preparation of the compilation of the Table: step b);
* 5 weeks for finding out resolutions: step c) and e);
* 6 weeks for commenter’s consideration: step f).

NOTE ‒ It can take more time in step c) and e) rather than this case for finding suitable resolutions, which includes communication between Rapporteurs/editors and commenters.

The envisaged additional review processes followed by the last call are:

* 2 weeks for editing updated texts for additional review;
* 3 weeks of additional review;
* 1 weeks for the preparation of the Table: step b);
* 4 weeks for finalizing resolutions: step c) and e)
* 6 week for commenters: step f).

The period of commenters’ consideration should not be longer than one of finding out resolution. SG13 requests TSAG consider shorten the underlined processes.
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